



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2019

No. 71

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 1, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

CONGRATULATING DAVID BLOM ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest gratitude and to recognize the career of David P. Blom, who is retiring as president and CEO of OhioHealth after 36 years. David became president of Grant Medical Center, located in downtown Columbus in my district.

Dave set out to make healthcare more accessible to underserved and di-

verse populations. Providing care to our most at-risk population was a focus of his for 30 years, and it is one that he has never lost. Mr. Speaker, I know that firsthand because I had the opportunity to witness his work.

I am so honored that David is with us today in the gallery.

As president of the entire OhioHealth system for the past 17 years, Dave has molded and elevated OhioHealth's commitment to all of the communities it serves as the largest hospital system in central Ohio.

Let me tell Members what I have witnessed.

When we talked about our babies and infant mortality, I remember it so well when Dave made that call and said we are going to keep our babies healthy. Thus, he spearheaded Wellness on Wheels' Women's Health, or as we like to call it in our home district, WOW, and what a wow it has been.

There is not enough time for me to highlight all the things that this incredible leader has done, but let me fast-forward to my time in Congress. I can remember how and when Congressman STEVE STIVERS and I talked about the great work, and there was an opportunity when then-Speaker Boehner wanted to revise the whole system for our veterans. STEVE STIVERS, a veteran, and Dave Blom, caring about our veterans, thus, he was appointed to the Federal commission to reform the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I can remember the exciting day when Dave Blom walked into my office, and it was the same day that we were having the House Chamber's joint session to hear the Japanese Prime Minister. I remember how excited he was to hear that we were going to host the Japanese Prime Minister, how great it was when he sat front and center in the gallery to hear that message.

The list goes on and on, but today is simply a day to say the two most powerful words that I can say about a great

leader, about someone who has changed the healthcare system not just for my district or Columbus, but for the Nation, and those two words are "thank you."

Thank you for being a leader. Thank you for being a public servant. But most of all, Dave P. Blom, thank you, thank you for being my friend. I salute you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

CONGRATULATING DAVID BLOM ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Dave Blom as he retires after 17 years of service as president and CEO of OhioHealth this July.

While his leadership in the industry is unparalleled, as a veteran, I want to focus on what strikes me about Dave the most, and that is his commitment to improving access to healthcare for those who have served our Nation.

In 2014, the Department of Veterans Affairs was facing rising numbers nationally, and, unfortunately, many veterans were not receiving the good care that they deserved. As a result, the Congressional Commission on Care was formed, a 15-person task force that would make recommendations about how to best serve our Nation's veterans with healthcare.

I knew Dave's knowledge of healthcare and longstanding commitment to our Nation's heroes made him an outstanding candidate for that Commission, and I was proud to work with my colleagues, Representative BEATTY and Representative Tiberi, at the time, to secure him an appointment from Speaker Boehner.

In 2015, Dave Blom and the Commission got to work. After over 10 months

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3343

of effort, they ultimately produced 18 reforms for the VA and Congress, including the VA Mission Act, which gives veterans access to local providers outside the VA system and guarantees timely access to care.

Dave was a vital contributor to these reforms, and I know he counts his time on the Commission among the most rewarding experiences of his life.

It is impossible to quantify the impact that he has had on the lives of millions of veterans and their families across this country, but it is certain to resonate with veterans far into the future.

I am incredibly grateful for Dave's service and his leadership, and I wish him all the best in his next chapter of life. I am confident that he will remain involved in central Ohio and its communities for a long time to come. I am also fortunate to call him a friend. He is a great leader in healthcare, and he has been a great leader for our country.

I thank Dave Blom for his service to our veterans, and I congratulate him on an incredible career in healthcare.

STOP ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, our Nation was again stunned by yet another horrific attack on Americans gathered at worship. Saturday's shooting at the Chabad of Poway synagogue in California came as Jews around the world celebrated the last day of Passover.

One woman, Lori Gilbert Kaye, was murdered in the attack and three others were wounded. I continue to pray for the recovery of those injured in the shooting and offer my deepest condolences to the family and friends of the victims.

The latest attack happened exactly 6 months to the day after the assault on worshipers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, which claimed the lives of 11 people, the deadliest attack on the American Jewish community in our history.

These shootings were committed against a backdrop of rising anti-Semitism both here at home and around the world.

According to the Anti-Defamation League, in 2017, anti-Semitic incidents surged in the United States by 57 percent. This represented the largest single-year increase on record and the second highest number of incidents since the ADL started tracking such data in 1979. In 2018, we saw nearly the same number of reported incidents as in 2017.

In recent weeks, there have been other chilling displays of anti-Semitism beyond our borders as well. In February, a Belgian carnival float featured grotesque caricatures of Orthodox Jews standing on large piles of money. On Easter Sunday in a small Polish village, adults and children beat and burned an effigy of Judas, but the

effigy did not look like a character from Biblical times. Rather, it was a stereotypical Orthodox Jew dressed in nineteenth century Hasidic garb.

Feeding into these dangerous incidents, just last week, the international edition of The New York Times published a disgusting anti-Semitic cartoon. The paper subsequently apologized, but the damage was already done. It was an astonishing editorial failure by one of the Nation's most important papers of record. I was pleased today to see the editorial board of the Times directly address this issue.

Especially at these times of growing anti-Semitism, we must all be extra vigilant, lest we add fuel to the flames of hate and intolerance.

Whenever and wherever we see anti-Semitism, we must speak out to stanch it, for what begins as stereotypes and cartoons far too often leads to violence that has claimed so many lives throughout our history.

Our Nation was founded on the idea that every American of every religion has the fundamental right to practice their faith without fear of persecution or violence. This was established in the very first amendment to our Constitution and enshrined in our Bill of Rights. But this right has been shattered far too many times at the synagogues in Poway and Pittsburgh; at an African American church in Charleston, South Carolina; and at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin.

I will not repeat the Poway shooter's name or give him the notoriety he sought, but it is clear that he was motivated by white supremacism and anti-Semitism, citing the shootings at the mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand, and the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh in his manifesto.

The sad truth is, far-right white supremacists have been responsible for more terror attacks and deaths in the United States in the past two decades than any other domestic extremist movement. We need to update our laws to reflect the growing threat of domestic terrorism.

That is why I introduced, with Senator RICHARD DURBIN, the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act, legislation that would strengthen coordination among the Federal agencies in monitoring radicalized groups and individuals and, hopefully, preventing hateful acts of violence.

This is a necessary first step to help our law enforcement agencies contain the threat, and I urge my colleagues to join me on this legislation.

We also have a duty to responsibly update our gun laws. I am proud that this House voted earlier this year to pass universal background checks and close the Charleston loophole, a loophole that allowed the Emanuel AME shooter to acquire a firearm before the results of his FBI background check were complete.

We need the Senate to stop stonewalling and bring these bills up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but reflect that, this week, the United States is observing Holocaust Remembrance Week and honoring the 6 million Jews and millions of others murdered by the Nazi regime.

In the memory of all of those lost to anti-Semitism and other forms of hate, we have a moral responsibility to stamp out intolerance and prejudice in our time. Otherwise, as the late Elie Wiesel famously said: "To forget the victims means to kill them a second time."

HONORING HOLOCAUST VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 6 million Jewish men, women, and children who were violently murdered for their religious beliefs by the Nazi regime.

This week remembers the victims who lost their lives to this evil regime and honors the survivors who beat the unthinkable odds.

Sonia Warshawski, a Kansan from Overland Park, was a young teenager when Nazi Germany invaded her home in Poland. She was imprisoned, locked inside a Nazi concentration camp, and then later sent to the Auschwitz death camp. There, she saw human hatred in a way many of us today cannot comprehend.

Sonia tells a story of waking up each day suffering from starvation and seeing thousands of bodies stacked where she was imprisoned. She watched as her mother was forced into a gas chamber. And still, through this torture and through it all, she never gave up hope or abandoned her faith.

Sonia will not forget the hatred and horrific injustice that the murderous Nazi regime put her and millions of others through in the name of anti-Semitism and neither will this country.

As the most well-documented genocide in human history, a genocide documented and confirmed by General Eisenhower, the evil and unimaginable torture throughout the Holocaust will forever haunt us. We must never tolerate or overlook anti-Semitism in any form.

In 2017, I had an emotional experience at the Holocaust museum in Israel with my wife. There, we met and heard from many survivors and walked through the Hall of Names honoring the 6 million victims of the Holocaust.

Sadly, we have recently seen the ugly face of anti-Semitism rearing its ugly head. We must continue to fight it with full force. It should be made abundantly clear to those with this deep hatred of Jewish people in their heart that this country has zero tolerance for this type of evil.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with the survivors like Sonia and those who lost their lives during the darkest days in the history of our world, and I stand against anti-Semitism.

□ 1015

JUDICIAL OVERREACH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my disappointment at the judicial overreach by my home State's supreme court this past Friday.

In a 6-1 vote, the radical Kansas courts ruled the State's constitution guarantees unlimited rights to an abortion. This verdict came in response to a 2015 State law that prohibits performing a dismemberment abortion procedure in the second trimester, except when necessary to save the life of the mother. Two doctors who performed this barbaric and painful procedure in the second trimester of pregnancy have challenged the law.

As someone who has dedicated my career to bringing life into this world and has delivered 5,000 babies in my home State of Kansas, please forgive me and allow me to be graphic for just a moment.

This horrid procedure literally tears the live baby apart limb by limb in the womb and then evacuates the dismembered baby body parts one at a time from the uterus. Then the person who performs the procedure pieces these parts back together to make sure they have removed the entire baby. This very pain-capable baby literally bleeds to death to end its life.

Sadly, the method is used today in 95 percent of second trimester abortions, even though the child's heart is beating and the baby is breathing and, as I said earlier, is quite capable of feeling pain. It is despicable, and this procedure should be banned nationwide.

It sickens me to the core that the Kansas Supreme Court violated the sanctity of life and voted to deny the rights of the unborn in our State.

Today, I call upon our State legislators to quickly pass a constitutional amendment that overrules and protects these precious babies.

Many of us have fought our whole life to defend the unborn. Now, we must all fight harder than ever. I ask for you to fight alongside me.

HONORING REV. DR. CHARLES E. BOOTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I know that Representative JOYCE BEATTY would join me today in what I am about to say.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American and a distinguished man of God, the Reverend Dr. Charles E. Booth. Dr. Booth transitioned from this earthly plain on Saturday, March 23, 2019, after a valiant battle with cancer.

Dr. Booth's life and mine moved along many of the same paths. Through those shared experiences, we developed a deep personal bond.

He was born in my hometown of Baltimore, Maryland, on February 4, 1947,

to Hazel Willis Booth and William W. Booth. He attended the same high school as I did, Baltimore City College High School in Baltimore. We also attended the same college, Howard University.

Dr. Booth went on to earn a master's of divinity degree from Eastern Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He then earned a doctorate of ministry degree from United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio.

As a testament to his commitment to Christian education, Dr. Booth served as a member of the board of trustees of that institution from 2011 until his recent passing.

At the age of 23, Dr. Booth pastored his first church, St. Paul's Baptist Church in West Chester, Pennsylvania. In 1978, he became pastor of Mount Olivet Baptist Church in Columbus, Ohio, where he remained the faithful leader for 41 years.

Dr. Booth proudly made Columbus his home, but he never forgot his roots. He visited Baltimore often to preach at various churches and spend time with family and friends. In fact, he preached revival services each year in my own church, the New Psalmist Baptist Church, where Dr. Bishop Walter Scott Thomas, Sr., is the pastor. When I was not in Washington, I was at church to listen to his prolific sermons.

As the son of two preachers, I understand the power of the preached word, and Dr. Booth could deliver like none other. They often called him a preaching machine. He had a commanding presence in the pulpit with his towering stature and baritone voice. He studied the Bible voraciously and had the uncanny ability to make Biblical text relevant to the issues we face today in our daily lives. At a time when people are turning away from traditional religion, Dr. Booth made Christianity accessible and inspired people to deepen their faith.

Dr. Booth was a pastor's pastor. He traveled the world to preach the gospel, and he was tremendously respected by his peers. He found joy in mentoring young preachers and made time to listen to their concerns and offer his counsel.

In 2011, Dr. Booth founded the Charles E. Booth Preaching Conference, which focuses on the tenets of keeping passion in one's preaching, Christ-centered preaching in contemporary life, building relationships with preachers, strengthening the preacher's devotional life, and remaining true to the sermon ingredients of information and inspiration.

Education was central to Dr. Booth's life. Not only was he continually learning, but he also encouraged others to use education as a key to open doors of opportunity. In 1994, he founded the Gloria S. Friend Academy, a fully accredited elementary school at his church that emphasized academic excellence and cultural enrichment centered on African American history. Dr. Booth also authored several books focused on Christian education.

A pillar in his community, Dr. Booth used his position as a faith leader to be a strong voice for the voiceless. He worked tirelessly to help create solutions to issues such as poverty, homelessness, unemployment, and access to quality healthcare.

As I mourn the loss of my friend, I am comforted by the inspiring legacy he leaves for all of us. In the New Testament book of Titus, the Apostle Paul writes: "Show yourself in all respects to be a model of good works, and in your teaching show integrity, dignity, and sound speech."

Dr. Booth lived this creed. Through his example, he encouraged everyone he encountered to do the same.

He leaves to mourn his wonderful wife, Crystal. He was a tremendous blessing to his family, his church, his Nation, and, indeed, the world.

He will be sorely missed, but we give great thanks that God allowed our lives to eclipse with his.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Teacher Appreciation Week, I would like to recognize an extraordinary educator in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who is making a difference in the lives of our community's young people.

George Daka, a U.S. history teacher at Bensalem High School, was recently selected as an honoree for the 13th annual Teacher as Hero Awards. Later this month, George will receive his award at the National Liberty Museum in Philadelphia alongside 11 other outstanding educators from Pennsylvania and Delaware.

George sees his job as more than just teaching his students about history, and he seeks to inspire them about our Nation's rich traditions. We applaud George on this well-deserved award, and we wish him and his family all the best.

We would also like to thank Kathryn Hinshaw, an English teacher at Bensalem High School, for nominating George for this well-deserved honor.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MARJORIE BURTIS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of a Bucks County resident who is sharing her talent and creativity with others.

Last month, Langhorne resident Marjorie Burtis celebrated her incredible milestone with more than 100 family members and friends.

This was no ordinary birthday celebration, however. It also served as the unveiling of Marjorie's new art exhibit at the Bucks County Visitor Center.

Despite her many life experiences, Marjorie discovered her passion for watercolor painting merely 12 years ago after taking an art class. Since that

time, she has sharpened her skills, with one fine arts professional saying Marjorie paints “as a realist.”

Mr. Speaker, we wish Marjorie a very happy belated 100th birthday, and we congratulate her on her exhibit.

We thank Marjorie and her family for all that they do in our community.

RECOGNIZING THE BENSALEM HIGH SCHOOL JAZZ BAND

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a talented group of young musicians from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who were recently honored for their performances.

Last month, the Bensalem High School Jazz Band traveled to perform in the Cavalcade of Bands Jazz Championships. Bensalem High School Jazz Band, well-known for their outstanding performances, was the only band given the superior rating at the event and was also named grand champion.

This is the third time that Bensalem High School Jazz Band has been named grand champion over the past 11 years, a testament to the band's skills, dedication, and work ethic.

Critical to the success of these young people is the director of the Bensalem High School Jazz Band, Michael Zimmerman. We extend our gratitude to him for working with our community's youth and students to sharpen their musical abilities, and we congratulate all performers in the Bensalem High School Jazz Band for their earned distinctions.

RECOGNIZING MILTON “WOODY” WOODSIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Milton “Woody” Woodside for serving more than 30 years as president of the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce.

After graduating from the Citadel, Mr. Woodside has dedicated his entire career to public service. Without his work, coastal Georgia would likely look very different than it does today.

To start, he worked 13 years for the First Congressional District of Georgia with Representatives Bo Ginn and Lindsay Thomas. Since his work with the House of Representatives, he has held the top position with the Chamber of Commerce and is one of the longest continually serving chamber leaders in Georgia.

In his position with the chamber, Mr. Woodside advocated for the creation of the South Georgia Parkway, funding to deepen the Port of Brunswick, a replacement for the Sidney Lanier Bridge, the building of both the Golden Isles Convention Center along with the Career Academy, and much more.

Whether it was at the Capitol in Washington, D.C., the statehouse in Georgia, or the mayor's office in Brunswick, Mr. Woodside was constantly working to help Brunswick

grow. Although he is retiring on May 15, I am sure that Mr. Woodside will continue to help the Brunswick community in any way he can.

Woody, thank you for your service. You have been an inspiration to all of us. You were an icon in our community. Our community thanks you, our State thanks you, our country thanks you, and I thank you, my friend.

REMEMBERING ROY KENT HODNETT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Roy Kent Hodnett who passed away at the age of 98 on Friday, April 26.

Known throughout Glynn County in the First Congressional District as a gentleman with a caring personality, he brightened the day of everyone around him.

He served in France during World War II directly after D-day, earning the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, and Victory Medal. When he came home to the United States, he stopped in St. Simons Island while vacationing, fell in love with the area, bought a home that same weekend, and started raising a family.

While there, he built one of the most successful companies in the area, Hodnett Cooper Real Estate and Vacation Rentals.

Through all of this, Mr. Hodnett's passion was with his family and his community. For him, the key to a successful business was having a wife of 75 years who has stood beside him and believed in him. He also mentored and advised countless young people, helping them to find their own paths through life.

I am proud to have had Mr. Hodnett spend so much of his life in the First Congressional District of Georgia. His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this time.

FIGHTING CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be cosponsoring H.R. 9, which we will be voting on this week.

H.R. 9 reaffirms the United States' commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is long past time that we do more to fight climate change.

Fighting climate change has been a priority of mine since I got to Congress more than a decade ago. In 2007, in an era of divided government, we were able to make some progress. I was able to get two bills passed into law that address climate change. One required the Federal Government to cut energy usage by installing energy-efficient light bulbs in Federal buildings. The other created a new prize competition to encourage development of clean transportation fuel. It seemed that we were starting to take climate change seriously.

In 2009 and 2010, more steps were taken. In order to make a major break-

through, in 2009, I helped introduce the first bipartisan bill to impose a revenue-neutral carbon fee. However, in 2010, Congress failed to pass major climate legislation, and since then, we have failed to make more progress.

Today, I have renewed hope. H.R. 9 is a good first step, but much more needs to be done. I am an original cosponsor of the bipartisan Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act, which would institute a carbon fee with the revenue returned to Americans with a dividend check. This bill would bring greenhouse gas emissions down 90 percent by 2050.

I have sponsored several other climate change bills, including the Challenges & Prizes for Climate Act, which would incentivize and reward development of innovative solutions with direct benefits to the climate. These are all ways to harness American ingenuity to solve our climate crisis.

□ 1030

In doing so, by coming up with an American solution, we could build our economy and create more jobs. We know, as Americans, that we can get this done, and we must do it. Now is the time for us to act.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Utahns believe in being good stewards of our planet, leaving the Earth better than we found it.

When I served as the mayor of Provo, we pursued policies to construct LEAD-certified buildings, create more environmentally friendly transit options, and educate our residents on how they can be better stewards of the environment. We considered these efforts to be meaningful steps in the right direction.

But, imagine my surprise when I arrived in Congress and learned of the dangerous winner-take-all system of governing that has overtaken Washington, especially on issues impacting the environment.

Instead of a pragmatic approach to a positive change through small and consistent consensus, an all-or-nothing approach dominates the debate and villainizes all but the most extreme positions.

Congress is a place where ideological purity is rewarded more than results. It is easy to vote on a messaging bill that the sponsor knows will never be passed into law and then go home and take the applause from the like-minded constituents, but it is difficult to leave the echo chambers and work across the aisle with individuals who have different backgrounds than yourself and find common ground.

The most obvious example of this is the climate change debate in our country where, today, my Democratic colleagues have taken the easy path. The

bill we are voting on today has 224 Democratic sponsors and not a single Republican sponsor.

Instead of working with Republicans on our four-part approach to addressing climate change through innovation, conservation, adaptation, and preparation, we are sending a partisan bill to die in the Senate.

I attempted to work with my colleagues on this bill. I offered a good-faith amendment that would increase transparency and competition by comparing emissions produced by all the countries in the Paris Agreement. This amendment wasn't even allowed a vote by the Democratic leadership, although there was no problem allowing votes from their Democratic friends' amendments.

In fact, only three Republican amendments will be considered, and 26 Democratic amendments will be offered for debate.

It is as if my colleagues on the other side are afraid of hurting the feelings of China and Russia by pointing out that they are not pulling their weight.

I have long been a proponent for the environment, and I was proud to receive the Utah Clean Air Partnership Person of the Year award in 2017. I have championed hundreds of thousands of acres of bipartisan conservation in Utah.

I, like all Utahns, care deeply about conserving our planet and our way of life for future generations, but I cannot vote for H.R. 9 because I believe it further divides us apart, reinforcing the false narrative that all Republicans don't care about the environment because they are unwilling to get on board with an all-or-nothing, unrealistic approach to addressing climate change.

H.R. 9 completely ignores the serious and legitimate concerns about the cost and effectiveness of the Paris Agreement.

H.R. 9 ignores that President Obama's pledge to the Paris Agreement could cost the United States \$250 billion and nearly 3 million jobs in this next 6 years; and it ignores that, in the next 20 years, this commitment could cost us \$3 trillion and 6.5 million American jobs.

H.R. 9 also ignores that, because of innovation and technological improvement, the United States is already leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Since 2000, the United States has decreased annual carbon dioxide emissions by nearly 800 million tons, the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000.

H.R. 9 ignores the fact that, if the United States cut CO₂ emissions to zero, it would not even come close to offsetting the emissions coming from the rest of the world.

H.R. 9 even ignores that the Paris Agreement allows China, the Earth's largest greenhouse gas polluter, to increase their emissions through 2030 with little evidence to show that they plan to comply in the future.

I have heard over and over that the U.S. must remain in the Paris Agreement to show leadership. And I ask you: What kind of leadership leads to double-digit unemployment in rural America but lets China off the hook?

I agree that America must continue to show leadership, but let's focus on leadership that goes back to the core principles of innovation, conservation, adaptation, and preparation. This bill fails to do any of that.

Let's continue leading the world and bettering our environment, but let's not pretend that H.R. 9 is a silver bullet to our evolving world.

I hope that we can stop with the easy, cheap rhetoric that offers false promises and divides our country even further and focus on those things that make meaningful change.

HONORING RALPH VANNI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend Ralph Vanni, the senior House audio technician who retired earlier this month.

For 34 years, Ralph has been the man behind this microphone and every microphone in this Chamber. When he took his job as the House technician in 1985, Ralph was no stranger to Capitol Hill. At the age of 16, he landed an internship with the then-Senate majority leader.

After two more internships and graduating college, Ralph had a hand in nearly every corner of the Capitol building, from doorkeeper for the Sergeant at Arms to working in the Senate Cloakroom.

In his most recent role, Ralph saw six Presidents give their State of the Union speeches, but the day he has said he will never forget is running audio from that perch right up there for Pope Francis' address to this Chamber in 2015.

I remember meeting Ralph on my first day as a newly elected Member of Congress during orientation in 2013. With the Speaker's permission, we could take photos on the House floor that day, and I took a minute to take one with Ralph and some of his team and the many folks who do a wonderful job guarding this Chamber every day.

Ralph became my friend that day and has been my friend for the last 6½ years I have had the chance to serve in this great institution. I wish him the best in his retirement. And I want to thank him personally, on behalf of every Member of Congress who stands behind any microphone in this institution.

Ralph made us sound better, and we appreciate him for doing that. I wish him good luck in his retirement and thank him for all his years of service.

I am going to miss Ralph, looking up in that perch, but I am going to get to

know the folks who have replaced him so well. He has led a great generation into that seat to replace him now.

I thank Ralph Vanni.

SOLITO, SOLITA

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, innocent children shouldn't pay the price for the President's cruel immigration agenda. Steamrolling the facts and the law, he has implemented policy after failed policy, playing catch and release with his own cabinet.

As the President ratchets up his threats to close the border and cut aid to Central America, thousands of migrants are fleeing their home countries to seek refuge in the United States.

I recently met with the editors of the book "Solito, Solita"—Alone, Alone—a collection of oral histories that tells the stories of young refugees in their own words. I rise today to read excerpts from one of them, Gabriel Mendez.

His story begins in a poor, dangerous neighborhood in the capital of Honduras. He says:

When I was just a boy of 7, my cousins raped me for a long time—for a year. They raped me at the river, where they collected water—and in my own home.

... Some of my fellow students who belonged to the maras took weapons to school. I told the mareros that I didn't want to bring weapons to school. I was afraid of them. They also wanted me to bring drugs into school. I didn't want to do it, so I left that school. ... Now the maras were looking for me—to kill me. They were asking my neighbors if they knew me.

When Gabriel was 14, he convinced his mother, who was living in San Francisco, to pay a coyote \$6,000 to bring him to the United States. Gabriel recounted the horrors he encountered along the way.

... they kept us locked in a house with eight other people for a week. We kept moving. Many days passed without eating or drinking water.

We were taken to the river, where there was a raft. We crossed the river into the United States and moved to a safe house. We spent 4 nights in the desert, including the night of my 15th birthday.

... We came upon another group of people who'd been traveling 2 days ahead of us. A young man, under 18, had perished from exposure and lack of water and food. I got stuck in some barbed wire in the desert. The coyote kicked me, ripping my flesh to set me free.

... We got to Los Angeles on December 17, 2013. If we didn't pay more money, they threatened to cut off our heads and all kinds of horrible things. My mom said she'd give them another \$50, and they piled another 8 people in a van and brought us to San Francisco.

In San Francisco, Gabriel feared for years he would be sent back to Honduras. With the support of his mother and an attorney, he was eventually granted asylum.

Now he is a student at the University of California at Berkeley, with dreams of becoming a lawyer himself.

In an essay, he wrote:

My experience of childhood sexual and domestic abuse has shaped my dreams to become a lawyer, to defend victims and fight for children's rights around the world. My immigration lawyer was a role model for me because she listened to my experiences. I want to continue studying to help children feel protected by the law . . .

If we want to understand the why behind mass migration, we need to listen and learn from these stories.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to uplift these voices and use them to fix a broken immigration system. We must insist on due process for asylum seekers; we must insist on humane treatment of our families; and we must insist on aid to Central America to stem the drivers of migration.

Together, we can prevent more children from risking their lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Andrew Chaney, First and Calvary Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Your throne of grace and salvation in prayer for the men and women of this Congress and their families to be blessed with Your peace and protection.

Give them strength to rely upon Your faithfulness, always serving others with compassion.

Give them strength to be a rock and a mighty fortress when feeling crushed by an avalanche of criticism.

Give them strength to collaborate and spur each other on toward good works. As iron sharpens iron, may they sharpen one another.

Give them strength to display courage with the power of persistence in advancing American ideals, their feet closely following Your steps without turning aside. For You are their guide, their moral compass. You are the way, the truth, and the life.

Secure their leadership in Your divine will, making them an instrument of Your blessing for every American, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. ANDREW CHANEY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of introducing my friend, the Reverend Dr. Andrew Chaney, along with his wife, Christine, and my wife, Barbara, in the gallery, and the Hargis family from Springfield, Missouri, members of the First and Calvary Church.

Reverend Chaney is a third-generation minister. Reverend Chaney serves as the senior minister at the historic First and Calvary Presbyterian Church in Springfield, Missouri, a church that is a very special place for my family. Reverend Chaney serves as an important spiritual voice for us and the Springfield community.

Congress has a longstanding tradition of beginning each day in prayer. I am privileged and honored to have the opportunity to welcome Reverend Dr. Andrew Chaney to the people's House as he opened today's session in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of New York). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PAVING THE WAY FOR WOMEN IN STEM

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, is an industry comprised of physicists, chemical and biomedical engineers, and professionals creating and developing innovative technologies.

Demand for workers in these fields is high, but women remain underrep-

resented, especially in engineering and computer sciences. According to a study by the National Girls Collaborative, women make up nearly 50 percent of the overall workforce but less than 30 percent of careers in STEM.

Women have made tremendous strides in this field over the last few decades, but women's underrepresentation in STEM limits discoveries and holds back our economy. Today I want to tell Members about an outstanding woman in my district who is paving the way for women in STEM.

Aria Soha from Batavia, Illinois, works as the installation coordinator for the Short-Baseline Neutrino Program at Fermi National Laboratory. Aria was an outstanding student in math throughout school and chose to major in physics her second year of college at Carnegie Mellon University.

In college, Aria worked relentlessly to find research opportunities and got the chance to build microwave telescopes, tools to examine high-energy radio waves that are hard to observe from the ground. After graduating, Aria accepted a job at Fermi Lab, a world-class research facility we are proud of in the 14th District.

There are so many hidden figures in STEM, and I am proud to shine a bright light on the strong, smart women in the 14th District leading and making a difference in our community.

REMEMBERING FORMER SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize former Senator Richard Lugar, who passed away Sunday at the age of 87.

Senator Lugar served the State of Indiana for 36 years in Congress and was a leading voice on issues at home and abroad.

Senator Lugar was a man of strong integrity who stood by what he believed in, and Senator Lugar always was willing to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach a shared goal: bipartisanship.

In 2003, the State Department established a Kennedy-Lugar YES Abroad program, named for Senator Lugar and Senator Ted Kennedy. The program provides scholarships for students from the United States and countries with significant Muslim populations to spend 1 year in the other's country. It fosters the same goals that Senator Lugar dedicated his life to achieving: understanding, collaboration, and friendship with the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator Lugar for his legendary service. Senator Lugar leaves a long record of legislative accomplishments. I offer my condolences to his family.

May Senator Lugar rest in peace, and may we learn from the example that he set.

MADTOWN ROBOTICS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate Madera High School's robotics team for being crowned the world champions.

They are the home of the Coyotes, and this hardworking group of 15 students from my district, otherwise known as MadTown Robotics, beat out more than 400 teams not only throughout the country, but throughout the world, in a competition in Houston, Texas, in the last week. They worked long hours on this project, with each student member putting in more than 200 hours, including weekends.

The community celebrated their success last weekend with a parade through Madera and a rally at the school gym, which I participated in. I am exceptionally proud of these students, their teachers, and the faculty for their accomplishments.

Madera is a wonderful, growing area, which shows that the San Joaquin Valley is not only a world leader in agriculture, but also in innovation, for future generations across our country.

Congratulations, Madera High School.

Go, Coyotes.

MAY 1 IS THE DEADLINE FOR
DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we have failed our military and all the victims of 2018 disasters across the country.

On October 10, Tyndall Air Force Base took a direct hit from a category 5 hurricane. Over 6 months later, no disaster funding has been provided. Air Force Secretary Wilson warned us that if she did not receive supplemental funding by May 1, all new work on Tyndall Air Force Base would stop. This delays the return of base operations, impacts flight operations throughout the Air Force, and forces our airmen to work in degraded facilities.

Mr. Speaker, May 1 has come, and I stand before you today because we have failed to deliver funding, and now our military readiness is suffering. We only have until May 15 to provide funding to the Air Force before they start cutting airplane repairs.

I urge the leadership of the House and the Senate to pass a clean disaster supplemental immediately. It is necessary, and it is the right thing to do.

BUILDING BUFFALO'S
WATERFRONT

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a \$50 million Federal investment to create a parkway opened access to Buffalo's outer harbor waterfront 10 years ago. That parkway was the catalyst for new development that started with Gallagher Beach; a new State park, Wilkeson Pointe; and new parkland on the former NFTA property from terminal A and B to the Seaway Pier and beyond.

This Thursday, the Canal Corporation will announce more than \$100 million in new investments to open up 180 acres and improve access to the outer harbor lakefront of Buffalo. More Buffalo waterfront development is coming, development to move Buffalo forward with a new, exciting waterfront of possibilities.

MICROSOFT TECHSPARK

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some great news for the residents of my district, the Fifth District of Virginia.

Southern Virginia was selected as Microsoft's newest TechSpark community. The goal of the TechSpark program is to accelerate economic growth through expanding broadband connectivity, career pathways in digital transformation.

This \$5 million investment has a potential to be a game changer for southern Virginia, and this project partners perfectly with the work I have been doing in Congress providing rural broadband and increasing economic opportunities in Southside Virginia.

Private investment is always encouraged and preferred, but we also need to use private-public partnerships to expand access to broadband.

Communities in my district are in desperate need of broadband access, and this investment in South Boston will be an example of how we can encourage innovation and spur economic growth that will help families around this country.

MUELLER REPORT

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, in the last 24 hours, we have discovered that Special Counsel Robert Mueller wrote a letter to Attorney General Bill Barr saying that the Attorney General mischaracterized the Mueller report. That is an extraordinary letter.

I am now going to read into the House CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the relevant portions of that letter, which is dated March 27, 2019, from Robert Mueller to Bill Barr.

He writes: "The summary letter the Department sent to Congress and re-

leased to the public late in the afternoon of March 24 did not fully capture the context, nature, and substance of this Office's work and conclusions. We communicated that concern to the Department on the morning of March 25. There is now public confusion about critical aspects of the results of our investigation. This threatens to undermine a central purpose for which the Department appointed the Special Counsel: to assure full public confidence in the outcome of the investigations."

Bill Barr is supposed to be the attorney for all Americans. He is supposed to be the people's attorney, not Donald Trump's personal attorney. He does not understand that. He needs to resign.

MINORITY HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as we mark National Minority Health Month, and I urge my colleagues to stand with one voice as we demand universal healthcare coverage for every American, not as a privilege, but as a human right.

Your healthcare should not depend on your ZIP Code. But for far too many Americans, healthcare disparities mean higher rates of chronic illness, less access to quality care, and shorter life spans.

In the U.S. in 2019, African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans still suffer from much higher rates of diabetes, cancer, heart disease, stroke, substance abuse, infant mortality, low birth weight, HIV, and AIDS.

These deadly disparities are rooted in economic injustice, racism, and our failure, as a nation, to value and protect the health and well-being of every American equally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support full funding for lifesaving research, federally qualified health centers, and public health programs that promote prevention and healthy lifestyles.

□ 1215

REACH EVERY VETERAN IN CRISIS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is facing a crisis. Each day, 20 veterans take their own lives. That is over 7,000 veterans a year, more than the number of U.S. soldiers we lost in the entire Iraq war.

We have a moral responsibility to do more to protect those who have so courageously put their lives on the line to defend our country.

Recently, it was revealed that the Veterans Administration spent only \$1.5 million of its \$6.2 million budget toward suicide prevention media outreach in fiscal year 2018.

That is why I have introduced legislation called the Reach Every Veteran in Crisis Act, to ensure those resources are used effectively and efficiently to provide veterans with the support services they need and so richly deserve.

It is my hope that this legislation will help our veterans during their time of need and, hopefully, save the lives of our Nation's heroes.

I encourage any veteran who is facing crisis or anyone who is concerned about a loved one to call the Veterans Crisis Line: 1-800-273-8255.

PLIGHT OF PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, at a hearing examining Puerto Rico's Financial Oversight Board, I plan to stand strong with the Puerto Rican families I represent and demand to hear the board's plan for reversing Puerto Rico's plight.

At a time that families are leaving the island, schools are closing, and homes and communities destroyed by Hurricane Maria still have not been rebuilt, the fiscal board is forcing Puerto Ricans to sacrifice pensions, wages, and crucial government services.

People are hungry, using plastic tarps as roofs, and living without electricity or heat.

I toured the devastated areas earlier this year and met with families in my district whose relatives are still suffering last week.

Well over a year after Maria, less than 20 percent of the aid that the fiscal board anticipated has been delivered.

How can Puerto Rico recover while its oversight board continues to squeeze the island and President Trump continues to block disaster aid and food stamps?

Tomorrow, I will stand with our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico and demand answers to these questions.

FOUR PILLARS FOR AN INFRASTRUCTURE DEAL

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have an opportunity to create substantive, innovative, and cost-effective legislation that will bring jobs and economic growth to America through an infrastructure bill.

As co-chair of the New Democratic Coalition's Infrastructure Task Force, we are actively drafting policy priorities to be considered for a House infrastructure bill. It is important to have Americans of all sectors' voices as we do this, and last week the infrastructure listening sessions were hosted by Representatives COLIN ALLRED and MARC VEASEY in Dallas and JOE CUNNINGHAM in Charleston.

New Democrats are intensely focused on receiving and implementing forward-looking and practical ideas to help everyday Americans use infrastructure that supports job creation and advancement, multiple forms of transportation, policy proposals to mitigate climate change, and streamline bureaucracy.

It is my hope that the President and Republicans will join us as we focus on four pillars for an infrastructure deal: modernize America's infrastructure and seek new revenue, create an infrastructure bank to finance the project, create incentives for communities most in need to finance those projects through grant programs, and encourage innovation and reform through responsible regulatory streamlining and the utilization of public-private partnerships that work.

Building and renovating roads, bridges, ports, greener schools and hospitals, and broadband all need the support of Congress to advance the flow of America's goods and services. It is what we need to do to keep our dominance in the economy.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS OUR PRESENT

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, climate change isn't a question of if or even when. Climate change is not our future. It is our present.

Kids with asthma are finding it harder and harder to breathe on their walks to school or to the playground. Raging fires have reduced whole communities to ash in my home State of California. Rising seas threaten to swallow family homes on the coast. Extreme weather has devastated our country from the coast of Puerto Rico to the coast of Orange County.

So, it bears asking: What will it take for politicians to see what the American people already know to be true?

Americans are already suffering from climate change, and the threat to humankind grows every day.

In 2015, almost every country in the world recognized the climate crisis and signed the Paris Agreement. The United States led the way.

In 2017, this administration abdicated the throne of American global leadership and joined Russia, Turkey, and Iran in the cheap seats.

This administration failed to lower carbon emissions and protect the lungs, homes, and wallets of the American people.

The Climate Action Now Act demands accountability from this White House. It is an up-and-down vote on whether the Members of this body support a livable future for humankind.

PAWNS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the workers of the United States of America are tired of being pawns in this big corporate game.

President Trump came to my community and said: Don't sell your house. Don't sell your house. We are going to get these house prices back up.

And, since that time, we lost the second shift at our General Motors plant; and General Motors, on that same day that the workers were walking out, announced they are building a new factory in Mexico.

President Trump said: Don't sell your house.

A few months later, General Motors lays off the first shift. They tell the workers 2 days after Thanksgiving.

And, just a couple of days ago, a trucking company, Falcon Transport, just outside of Youngstown, Ohio, their workers get a text message—600 workers get a text message at 8:00 on a Saturday night: You lost your job.

We got bailout money for every bank that wants one. Every savings and loan, every corporation gets a tax cut to the tune of \$2.3 trillion, and no one gives a damn about the workers.

If we can bail out the corporations that have done everything wrong, we can start helping the workers who have done everything right.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying it, climate change is real, and Congress has a moral obligation to act.

The communities that I represent in Washington State are already experiencing the impacts. Coastal Tribes are in the process of trying to move to higher ground. Changing ocean chemistry is impacting our marine life and the industries that depend on it.

The Department of Defense has called it a threat multiplier that makes our world less safe.

And, today, Congress will take an important, tangible step toward addressing climate change by passing the Climate Action Now Act, a bill that reaffirms America's commitment to the Paris climate agreement and directs the administration to develop a comprehensive plan to meet the significant emission reductions that we as a Nation, and nearly every Nation in the world, committed to back in 2015.

We know that making progress is not only about protecting our environment, but also about protecting our economic interests and our national security.

The American people are not just demanding action, but leadership, to counter the impacts of climate change.

This legislation is an important first step toward meeting our long-term carbon emission goals, and I am proud to cosponsor it and vote in favor of it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTA) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 30, 2019, at 4:33 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1222.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 9, CLIMATE ACTION NOW
ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 329

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TED LIEU of California). The gentleman

from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 329. It provides for the consideration of H.R. 9 under a structured rule that makes 30 amendments in order.

It also provides for 90 minutes of general debate, with the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs controlling 60 minutes, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce controlling 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the measure we are considering today makes clear that under this Democratic majority science is once again respected here in the House of Representatives, that facts matter, and that the word of the fossil fuel lobby is not going to rule the day, because there is no debate on our side about something as basic as climate change.

The evidence is overwhelming. It is happening, Mr. Speaker, and human beings are playing a defining role.

Now, you don't have to take my word for it. You can ask virtually any scientist working in the field today, because 97 percent of all climate scientists agree that it is happening—97 percent.

There is a United Nations body charged with looking at the science here called the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Do you know what it has found? That the evidence is unequivocal.

The facts are as clear as day.

But you don't even need to read the report to know that something is happening here. Just look out your window. Once-in-a-generation hurricanes are becoming commonplace; record-breaking storms are becoming the norm; and drastic temperature swings are now just the way it is.

My district is home to more than 1,800 farms, and I visit with farmers often. Climate change isn't just an issue on their minds; it is sometimes the top issue on their minds when they are asked about the challenges that they face.

These farmers have told me about how heat waves disrupt what was once a reliable growing season and how unexpected frosts have completely wiped

out their crops. Rainfall that once ran like clockwork has given way to droughts that could wipe out their entire profits.

They don't question what is going on. They are not debating the science of whether climate change is real. They know. They know.

□ 1230

They can see it, seemingly every day as it impacts their livelihoods. I wish the Republicans took climate change as seriously. But instead of treating it as a threat, they treat it as a punch line.

A Republican Senator once brought a snowball onto the Senate floor, trying to prove that climate change isn't real because it still snows sometimes. You can't make this stuff up.

Just the other day, President Trump mocked clean energy by suggesting that windmills cause cancer. Are you kidding me? That is the President of the United States.

I won't pretend to know what goes on in the President's head, but I know this: His announcement in June 2017 that he would be pulling the United States out of the Paris climate agreement was indefensible.

This agreement set an ambitious goal of keeping warming below 2 degrees Celsius and established binding commitments for countries to meet to reduce emissions. It recognized climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution.

If the President gets his way and actually withdraws the United States, we would stand alone as one of the only nations in the world not to be part of it. Even Syria, a nation embroiled in war, announced that it would sign on.

Thankfully, we are not out of it yet, but we could be starting as early as 2020.

H.R. 9 would ensure the President wouldn't get his way by requiring him to develop a plan to meet our commitments under the Paris Agreement.

It is called the Climate Action Now Act because we can't wait, Mr. Speaker. Climate change isn't some far-off threat. It is not a problem for our great-grandchildren or even our grandchildren to solve. It is our problem. It is here today, impacting our Nation and our future.

It is not just about the weather. Climate change also negatively impacts public health and our national security. Experts have even developed a new term to describe those displaced by its destructive impacts, "American climate refugees."

This is not the time for handwringing or indecisiveness and not the time to let the fossil fuel industry that funds some campaigns outweigh the facts. It is certainly not the time for more stunts or snowballs on the floor.

This is the time to act boldly, to listen to what the scientists are telling us, and to protect our planet for future generations. That is what H.R. 9 is all about.

I ask my colleagues to let the facts rule the day once again in the people's House of Representatives. Let's support this rule and the underlying legislation and send an undeniable message that, under this majority, we value science and recognize the urgent need to act on climate change.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves on the floor, yet again, to consider a rule for a piece of legislation that is nothing more than another messaging bill against the President of the United States.

This new Democratic majority has spent nearly 20 percent—20 percent—of the time debating bills on the floor that are nonbinding messaging pieces of legislation. H.R. 9 is just another example of this majority's intent on messaging against the President and the lack of any true agenda for the American people.

The reality is that we all want clean air, clean water, and a healthy environment. Who doesn't? However, this bill isn't the solution.

Addressing environmental policy should not include extreme policies like the Green New Deal, nor should it involve binding ourselves to international agreements that put the United States at a disadvantage to its main security and economic competitors in the world, and with no regard to cost for American consumers and ratepayers.

Republicans have a better approach. We can protect our environment by promoting policies favoring clean energy, like nuclear, hydropower, natural gas, wind, solar, and carbon capture, and removing barriers to the deployment of new technologies and innovation.

The United States is already leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions through innovation and technological development. Between 2000 and 2014, in fact, the U.S. reduced emissions more than 18 percent.

We should be focused on continuing to reduce emissions, developing and exporting clean energy technologies, and making our communities more resilient, all while ensuring affordable and reliable energy prices and prioritizing the consumer and American security and prosperity.

We have serious questions concerning costs, effectiveness, and the feasibility of the U.S. commitments made by the Obama administration under the Paris Agreement 4 years ago. Even then-Secretary of State Kerry noted during the Paris negotiations that if the United States cut its CO₂ emissions to zero, it would still not offset the emissions coming from the rest of the world.

The Obama administration's commitments in Paris were made without a clear plan to meet those promises,

without a full view of the costs to American consumers, and, certainly, without a strategy that had broad bipartisan support of Congress.

If H.R. 9 were enacted into law, it would put the United States into a position where it could not enforce any other country's action and would put us at a disadvantage.

I have heard from some of my Democratic colleagues that their energy policies are good for consumers, that it creates many jobs and benefits the economy. When they argue this, they point to States like California, with their renewable energy mandates.

However, California finds itself in the precarious situation where it actually pays Arizona to take their energy. This is not good energy or economic policy.

If Democrats were serious about solving big problems for the American people, they would partner and work across the aisle to find bipartisan solutions that they knew would have a chance to pass in the U.S. Senate and be signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas, let me make a couple of points.

First of all, just so the RECORD is clear, under President Trump's policies, which are now taking effect and are now reversing some of the advances that we made under previous administrations, basically, these policies have consequences. In 2018, our emissions rose by 3.4 percent. We are going in the wrong direction.

When the gentlewoman talks about all these other alternative energy sources that are clean and green that my Republican friends support, she neglects to point out that this President hasn't seen a fossil fuel that he hasn't wanted to embrace. In fact, he wants to go back and invest more in coal, which is hard to believe, given all the scientific evidence that exists about the dangers of coal for our atmosphere.

There is no question where this President is coming from. He doesn't believe in climate change, and that is what is so shocking, that the whole world, the scientific community all over the world, has warned us time and time again that this is a real problem, and we have a President who doesn't believe it. It is stunning. It is stunning, but that is what we are dealing with.

Basically, this is an attempt to try to get us back on the right track, to take this problem, which is already having significant negative consequences in our country, and do something about it.

It is time to come together and tell the President, who doesn't believe in science, that science is real, that it is something we ought to take seriously, and that we ought to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, climate change is already wreaking economic and security havoc: deep freezes; an incredible 5 feet of water dumped on Houston, Texas, by a hurricane; in other areas, droughts, amazing wildfires, and extensive disease.

What we need is alternative energy, not Trump "alternative facts," and decisions that are based on science, not on mythology. President Trump's rejection of sound climate change facts only makes Chinese clean energy great again.

We need to lead on the road to clean green energy, not get run over. Fighting climate change is an existential challenge, but it is also an amazing economic opportunity. We can create green jobs right here with technology that is exported to the world, instead of letting our international competitors prevail.

Recommitting to the Paris climate agreement is more than bipartisan. It is joining 2,000 American businesses. It is joining 23 States. It is joining cities across America, like San Antonio and Austin, that have already pledged that they want climate action, not more nonsense and climate denying.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. It is joining 21 senior Defense officials who identify climate change action as a way to address a major national security challenge.

President Trump continues to block meaningful environmental action by clogging the corridors of power with fossil fuel industry cheerleaders. A Green New Deal is an alternative to the same old dirty deal threatening our planet with dark money, where the only thing green is that money clogging and polluting our democracy.

Climate action does bear some costs, but inaction has even greater costs. Let's embrace the simple truth that preserving the Earth is worth it. Let's embrace an America that is leading on a green economic revolution.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), my good friend and the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding and for leading on this issue for the economy of the United States of America and for hardworking families.

If you look at what getting back in the Paris accord would do, Mr. Speaker, it would wreck our economy in many different ways.

The people hardest hit by the United States getting back in the Paris accord are the very people who don't need to be hit the most, those with the lowest income in our country, because it would increase energy costs. By outside estimates, this bill, complying with the unachievable requirements that they have in this bill, would cost up to 2.7 million American jobs.

Those jobs wouldn't just evaporate, Mr. Speaker. Those jobs, ironically, if we were to get back into the Paris accord, would go to China and India because China and India, according to the accord, are exempt until 2030. They don't even have to comply.

By the way, why don't we look at the countries that are begging us to get back into the Paris accord? Not one of the countries in the entire European Union is in compliance with the unachievable targets set in the Paris accord. In fact, France, which Paris is in, is not even in compliance with the target.

Then they tell us: Hey, America, why don't you come into this thing, this disaster of an agreement that none of the countries in Europe are in compliance with?

Then you look at what it would do, again, to wreck America's economy.

Let's talk about carbon emissions. If this is really about carbon emissions, like the Green New Deal and other crazy ideas that would wreck the American economy, get rid of fossil fuels. You don't have to fly around on planes anymore. You don't have to worry about missing a flight because there wouldn't be any flights. That is how ludicrous their ideas are, yet they believe in them.

They all do this under the guise of carbon emissions. As they say on the other side, climate action does have some cost. Let's talk about that cost: \$250 billion in higher taxes, as well as lower wages for American families.

You wonder why they are rioting in the streets of France. In Paris, where the accord was signed, they are having riots over this radical idea. By the way, again, they are not even in compliance with it.

Then you look at where these jobs would go. The jobs would go to China and India, which are not only exempt, Mr. Speaker, but those countries actually emit four or five times more carbon than we do here because we have good environmental standards in America.

□ 1245

We have been decreasing our carbon emissions in America. In fact, we have decreased our carbon emissions down to the level that they were at in the year 2000.

We are doing it not by signing some radical job-killing accord; we are doing it through American ingenuity, something we have always celebrated in this country, something that we are the world leader at.

Why would we want to give that advantage away? And not just giving it away in the name of saving the planet, giving it away to countries like China and India, who are increasing carbon emissions dramatically higher than us.

This is a disaster for our economy. We need to reject this bad deal.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the words from our distinguished minority whip, but I would point out that the cost of climate inaction will far outweigh the cost associated with acting now.

According to the Fourth National Climate Assessment, by 2090, lost wages will reach \$155 billion, mortality from extreme temperatures will surpass \$140 billion, and coastal property damage will approach \$120 billion. All told, the U.S. economy could lose more than 10 percent of its GDP under the worst-case scenario.

So people can deny that this is a problem all they want, but they do so at great economic risk for our country and for other economies around the world.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Washington's First District is home to some of our Nation's most beautiful parks, mountains, and waterways, and we are already seeing the consequences of climate change:

Snowpack in the north Cascades is currently 20 to 40 percent below normal amounts;

Last year, wildfires ravaged the West Coast, resulting in poor air quality and public health issues;

Washington State just had the second driest March on record, and there is a greater likelihood of more fires through the summer.

This is why Congress must take action and pass H.R. 9. We need to be moving forward, not backward.

President Trump's statement of intent to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement is a grave mistake that would have lasting effects on our planet and our economy.

H.R. 9 is an important step forward, ensuring the United States upholds our commitments under the agreement and leads in the green economy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend and the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my very good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for yielding.

Well, we are here again, Madam Speaker, on yet another bill that isn't going to pass the Senate, isn't going to become law, and doesn't really do anything.

As they have done over and over again over the past few months, my Democratic friends seem content to bring up virtue-signaling messaging bills as a substitute for passing real bipartisan legislation to solve problems facing the American people.

Today's bill purports to force the President to return the United States

to the Paris Agreement on climate change, never mind that he hasn't actually pulled the United States from that agreement yet, nor can he until the day after the next Presidential election in 2020. But on that day, to be fair, I think he will.

Ineffective though it may be, the bill does nothing to address the serious fundamental flaws in the Paris Agreement, nor does it offer any substantial legislation to consider the problem of our own changing climate.

Instead, like many other bills the majority has offered in Congress, today's legislation is all talk, no action. It is simply another messaging bill to allow the majority to go on record in opposition to President Trump. That is not legislating.

Madam Speaker, it didn't have to be this way. We had an opportunity to improve this bill both at the committees of jurisdiction and again at the Rules Committee this week, and we could have made the bill better if we had made more amendments from both sides of the aisle in order for consideration on the floor. Legislating is better and more effective when all Members can have their ideas considered before final passage.

Making more amendments in order is a pledge that we have heard time and time again from my good friend and my good chairman, Mr. MCGOVERN, so it is unfortunate that this rule misses a perfect opportunity to have robust debate on ideas from both sides of the aisle.

At the Rules Committee Monday night, 91 amendments were proposed and considered. Of those, 45 were proposed by Democrats, 44 by Republicans, and 2 were bipartisan. Of the 44 Republican amendments, 35 had no points of order against them or any parliamentary issues, yet when the final rule was proposed and passed out of committee, it made in order 30 amendments: 1 bipartisan amendment, 26 Democratic amendments, and just 3 Republican amendments.

Is that really how the majority wants to operate going forward, 58 percent of the Democratic amendments allowed to come to the floor, but just 6 percent of the Republican amendments and just 8 percent without points of order? That is an abysmal result.

For example, my good friend RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois proposed an amendment that simply would have noted that the 2018 farm bill is relevant to achieving the goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and would have required the President to add the Committee on Agriculture to any reports he sends on this topic to the Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce Committees. This is a commonsense amendment that takes into account the role agriculture can play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, yet the amendment was blocked from consideration on the floor.

What is the harm, I ask, in debating that amendment here on the floor and

bringing our Nation's farmers into the discussion?

Dr. BURGESS, my fellow member of the Rules Committee and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, submitted two amendments that required the President to consider how carbon emission-free nuclear power and other forms of renewable energy with zero emissions, like hydropower, could contribute to meeting the United States' obligation under the Paris Agreement.

It seems logical to me that, when you are seeking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, using energy sources that are emission-free makes sense, yet the majority didn't even want to discuss that on the floor and blocked both of Dr. BURGESS' amendments. What harm was there in discussing them?

I could go on and on, but the reality is that the majority has used its power at the Rules Committee to block consideration of dozens of amendments that could have and should have been discussed on the floor.

When the Democrats took majority control in the House, they promised a more inclusive process with more minority voices heard, more Republican amendments considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me additional time.

When the Democrats took majority control of the House, they promised a more inclusive process, more minority voices heard, more Republican amendments considered. If today's action is any indication, we have a long way to go in making that promise a reality. Instead, we are moving forward with a deeply flawed bill that could and should have been improved through the amendment process.

I have been a member of the Rules Committee for a long time, including many years in the majority. It is fair to ask: How did we do when we were in the majority? Let's look at the record.

In the 115th Congress, under Republican control of the Rules Committee, 45 percent of the amendments made in order were Democratic, 38 percent were Republican, 17 percent were bipartisan. The statistics for today's rule is a far cry from the fairness of that record.

If the majority truly wants to address the environment and wants to legislate, then we can all certainly do better than the bill before us today, and we can do better than the process we saw with this bill. All Members should have an opportunity to be heard, and we should all have an opportunity to make the bill better today.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say to my ranking member, whom I have great respect for, that I think we all ways need to figure out a way to do better and to be more accommodating, and I will continue to work with him to try to do that. But I will point out for the record that the committee has made in order 30 amendments, a total of 31 pages of amendments on a 6-page bill.

I think we have a long way to go to achieve the record of closed rules that the previous Congress had, well over 100 closed rules. That broke, I think, every closed rule record in history. We certainly don't want to get there, but we need to continue to figure out ways we can be more accommodating, and he has my word that I will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for his good work and for yielding me the time.

Greenhouse gas emissions did not happen in isolation. They have widespread impact and will not be curbed without global coordination. The Obama administration understood that fact, and that is why they entered America into an international compact to curb emissions on a global scale.

When the Trump administration retreated from the Paris accord last year, it meant the effects of climate change would only get worse in my home State of Maine. In Maine, climate change isn't an abstraction, it is not a silly floor debate that has no meaning. It is a very real threat to our economy and to our way of life.

I recently met with farmers in my State who told me climate change is here now and we need real solutions to adapt and to mitigate.

I met with climate scientists from the University of Maine who told me invasive species are threatening the livelihoods of our foresters.

I also met with shellfish growers and harvesters who are grappling with the effects of ocean acidification, of extreme weather events, and of the very real fact that the Gulf of Maine is warming faster than 95 percent of the Earth's other waters.

This is real, and I don't want my grandchildren looking back and saying: "Why didn't Congress fix the problem when they could?"

H.R. 9 is the first piece of positive climate change legislation to receive a vote in the House in years. The bill will reaffirm America's commitment to fighting climate change and will put this Congress on a course to take on the climate crisis before it is too late.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my good friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that is before us today. As

Democrats in the House bring forward legislation in the name of supporting the environment and climate, I would like to talk a little bit about the process.

My good friend Chairman MCGOVERN and the Democratic majority of the House Rules Committee received a total of 91 amendments submitted for consideration on the legislation that we have before us, and as you just heard from Mr. COLE, of the 45 Democratic amendments, more than half were made in order, 26 of those; but of the 44 Republican amendments submitted for consideration, only 3—let me repeat that—3 of those were made in order.

Myself, I offered 2 of those 44 amendments. They were noncontroversial. They were ruled germane to the legislation before us by the House Parliamentarian, and all they did, simply, was recognize the clean, renewable benefits of hydropower and the clean emissions-free benefits of nuclear power, but Chairman MCGOVERN and his committee refused to allow this recognition.

So we have got to ask ourselves, Madam Speaker:

Why? Why, if we are supposedly here to debate policy affecting our environment and our climate, why would they not want to discuss the clean energy that comes from hydroelectric dams like those in my district along the Columbia and Snake Rivers?

Why would they not want to discuss the emissions-free energy produced by nuclear power plants like the Columbia Generating Station in my district in central Washington.

It is because the efforts put forward by Democrats in the House, be it the flawed Paris agreement legislation that is before us or the radical Green New Deal proposal—which, I might add, has no mention of hydropower and actually calls for the end of nuclear power in our Nation—have nothing to do with science and everything to do with politics.

The majority party, the Democrats, with these proposals, is more focused on pushing a mandated top-down system that will inevitably do nothing to help our environment.

What we should be doing, and what my Republican colleagues continue to advocate for, is focusing on the free market approach spurred by collaboration and innovation between our national laboratories, research universities, Federal partners, and the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend Mr. MCGOVERN that, when Republicans were in the majority, we made a conscientious effort on the Rules Committee to provide equitable treatment of amendments offered to legislation. With the process before us today, it is disappointing to see the chairman not following in that good faith effort, and I would urge a "no" vote.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, oh my God, just listening to the gentleman from Washington State give his remarks. He was on the Rules Committee when the Republicans were in charge last time and voted for a record number of 103 closed rules. That meant that not a single amendment, Republican or Democrat, could be made in order. Never once, never once, did I hear him express reservation about the historic closed process that the Republicans embraced.

And as far as his amendment goes, as the gentleman knows, the Paris climate agreement operates under the theory that parties should be able to satisfy their compliance plans any way they choose. There are neither preferred nor prohibited ways to reduce emissions.

Since the Paris Agreement is fuel and technology neutral, we think this bill should be too. But I just find it hard to sit here and to listen with any level of seriousness to the gentleman's complaints. When he was on the Rules Committee, they broke every record in the history of Congress being the most closed Congress in the history of our country. Can we do better? Yes, we can, and we should do better.

But I will remind the gentleman, again, that there were 30 pages of amendments made in order on a 6-page bill, a bill, by the way, that the gentleman, Mrs. LESKO, said is not a serious bill anyway. So, I am not quite sure what the messaging is here: that it is not serious or that it is serious enough where we need to have more amendments. I can't quite figure their logic out here.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his important work on this urgent bill.

It is too late to overstate the urgency of the climate crisis. It has already assumed emergency status in parts of the world, including parts of States like Florida.

The threatened withdrawal of the U.S. from the Paris climate accord should be considered an international crime. The United States is the only nation to threaten to withdraw from the agreement, but others, such as Brazil, seem willing to follow our lead.

I am encouraged, though, that in our country, even though we have record polarization today, Americans overwhelmingly want the United States to remain in the agreement. The absurdity of sealing our own fate by faking blindness to the climate catastrophe is not lost on the American people we represent. This is the most serious issue faced by the Congress of the United States in our history. We must vote for the life, not the end of the planet.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my good friend.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 9.

Madam Speaker, if we are really going to speak about what makes sense, what doesn't make sense, or what does have a relevance, let's not forget about who bears the brunt of the cost of what we are talking about. It is hardworking Americans.

I find it interesting that we talk about: Well, do you know what, you guys did stuff the last time that prevented us from getting amendments in, so we are following along with the same thing. I have great respect for the chairman of the Rules Committee, but I have to say that if the whole purpose of this is what I think it is, then I would like to go back to the actual beginning where this should have been treated as a treaty and it should have gotten the advice and consent of the Senate. Why did President Obama not do that? Obviously, he did it because he couldn't get the advice and consent of the Senate, so he decided to do it this way.

If our whole job in coming to the people's House is to defend the American people, then we need to take a real long look at what it is that we are trying to defend. This bill today is a messaging bill, there is no question about it.

If you look at the damage that could be done to the American people—I am talking about the American people now, not a philosophy that is out there, not an agenda that is out there, but I am talking about hardworking Americans: a loss of nearly 400,000 jobs—this is according to the Heritage Foundation—an average manufacturing loss of over 200,000 jobs, a total income loss of more than \$20,000 per family, a GDP loss of over \$2.5 trillion, and increases in household electricity expenditures between 13 percent and 20 percent. The biggest offenders in the world are China and India, and they aren't part of this so-called agreement.

If we are really concerned about protecting the people who sent us here to be their voice, then we ought to look at what their voice is and who bears the burden of a philosophy, a failed philosophy, that has no chance of working itself into law. We know that, and yet today we will come here, and we will rail against something that isn't really on the list of what the American people have the greatest concerns over.

The people who I represent back in Pennsylvania, they thank me every day for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act because it has reduced their utility bills.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues that the impact on our economy is astronomical if we do nothing.

We are already seeing the negative impacts on our economy because of climate change. It is hard to believe that we are having a debate on the floor of the House of Representatives where people are denying that climate change is a real threat or that our constituents somehow don't care about this issue, which they do.

And just one other thing. I want to make sure that the RECORD is clear on process. This bill went through two committee hearings—Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce—and two markups before it went to the Rules Committee where we granted a structured rule and we are having a debate here on the floor. That is called regular order. I know some of my Republican friends don't know what regular order is, because when they were in charge bills routinely came to the Rules Committee that bypassed committees of jurisdiction and then were closed up and sent to the floor with no amendments at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the distinguished chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Climate change is the greatest, the greatest, and most urgent challenge of our time and this government should never put corporate profits and those kinds of concerns ahead of the health and safety of our children and our future.

Climate change isn't just a Democratic or a Republican issue. It is an existential issue for our species on this planet.

I am hearing so many mischaracterizations of what the Paris accord is. These standards that are applied to the United States are not from the outside, not coming from across the pond. We agree to reduce carbon emissions on our own terms. Every country develops its own plan and its own program.

This issue about jobs is just ridiculous. Everyone understands that our future is not in the fossil fuel industry. The future is in the green technologies that are being developed by entrepreneurs. Young people get it. The 21st century jobs of the future are clean technologies that make sure our planet is good and that entrepreneurs can actually succeed.

The costs of not doing this right now are so enormous. We are seeing, practically every year, what are called 500-year floods. They are only supposed to happen once every 500 years, and now we are seeing State after State, in my own Midwest, under water, and it happens all the time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. What is the cost that we are bearing in all of our States and at the Federal level to mitigate the problems that are caused by climate change? And I want to just say to my colleagues: These words are on the RECORD. You might want to consider not embarrassing your children and your grandchildren and future generations of yours with making the kinds of statements you are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), my good friend.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation that is both ill-advised and misguided.

The environment in the United States isn't getting dramatically worse as those on the other side claim. We are using more while actually reducing air pollutants.

The total emissions of the six major air pollutants has dropped by 68 percent since 1970. This is a feat no other country has accomplished.

How did we do this? These milestones have been reached due to free-market innovation and technological advances only possible in a capitalistic society.

This is how to solve problems, not through disastrous plans like the Paris climate accord that imposes burdensome and costly regulations not approved by Congress. Remember that: not approved by Congress.

The accord, which was negotiated unilaterally by the Obama administration with little congressional oversight, was flawed in both process and substance. The Obama administration skipped the ratification process in the Senate and tied the American people's hands through executive power.

In fact, I offered an amendment in committee to delay this legislation until the Senate performed their constitutional duty, but the other side would rather send billions of taxpayer dollars to other countries without congressional approval. If the American people are forced to put aside their personal needs in order to help the global good, the Constitution should be followed, and the Senate should perform their proper role.

The substance of the Paris climate accord was equally flawed and would have significantly damaged the American economy. It is estimated that the Paris climate accord would result in a loss of 400,000 jobs, a total income loss of \$20,000 or more per family of four, and an aggregate gross domestic product loss of over \$2.5 trillion.

While causing harm to the U.S. economy, the accord does nothing to hold the biggest offenders of the emissions accountable, nations like Russia and China. Again, an amendment was offered in committee to hold these nations—Russia and China—to the same standards the United States would be held to and it was shot down by the other side.

We can't have effective climate policy that puts the United States at a disadvantage to its main security and economic competitors in the world. This is not an America First agenda. This legislation is more of a redistribution of wealth scheme than actual sound environmental policy.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think it is telling when former U.N. climate official Ottmar Edenhofer said regarding international climate policy, "We redistribute de facto the world's wealth by climate policy."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and defeat the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Washington Post article entitled "Trump on climate change: 'People like myself, we have very high levels of intelligence but we're not necessarily such believers.'"

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 2018]

TRUMP ON CLIMATE CHANGE: 'PEOPLE LIKE MYSELF, WE HAVE VERY HIGH LEVELS OF INTELLIGENCE BUT WE'RE NOT NECESSARILY SUCH BELIEVERS'

(By Josh Dawsey, Philip Rucker, Brady Dennis and Chris Mooney)

President Trump on Nov. 26 reacted to a major report issued Nov. 23 that said climate change will challenge the economy, environment, and human health. (The Washington Post)

President Trump on Tuesday dismissed a landmark report compiled by 13 federal agencies detailing how damage from global warming is intensifying throughout the country, saying he is not among the "believers" who see climate change as a pressing problem.

The comments were the president's most extensive yet on why he disagrees with his own government's analysis, which found that climate change poses a severe threat to the health of Americans, as well as to the country's infrastructure, economy and natural resources. The findings—unequivocal, urgent and alarming—are at odds with the Trump administration's rollback of environmental regulations and absence of any climate action policy.

"One of the problems that a lot of people like myself, we have very high levels of intelligence but we're not necessarily such believers," Trump said during a freewheeling 20-minute Oval Office interview with The Washington Post in which he was asked why he was skeptical of the dire National Climate Assessment his administration released Friday.

"As to whether or not it's man-made and whether or not the effects that you're talking about are there, I don't see it," he added.

Trump did not address the fundamental cause of climate change. The president ruffled on pollution in other parts of the world. He talked about trash in the oceans. He opined on forest management practices. But he said little about what scientists say is actually driving the warming of the planet—emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels.

"You look at our air and our water and it's right now at a record clean. But when you look at China and you look at parts of Asia

and you look at South America, and when you look at many other places in this world, including Russia, including many other places, the air is incredibly dirty, and when you're talking about an atmosphere, oceans are very small," Trump said in an apparent reference to pollution around the globe. "And it blows over and it sails over. I mean we take thousands of tons of garbage off our beaches all the time that comes over from Asia. It just flows right down the Pacific. It flows and we say, 'Where does this come from?' And it takes many people, to start off with."

Katharine Hayhoe, a climate scientist at Texas Tech University, said in an email Tuesday that the president's comments risk leaving the nation vulnerable to the ever-growing impacts of a warming planet. "Facts aren't something we need to believe to make them true—we treat them as optional at our peril," Hayhoe said. "And if we're the president of the United States, we do so at the peril of not just ourselves but the hundreds of millions of people we're responsible for."

Andrew Dessler, a professor of atmospheric sciences at Texas A&M University, struggled to find a response to the president's comments. "How can one possibly respond to this?" Dessler said when reached by email, calling the president's comments "idiotic" and saying Trump's main motivation seemed to be attacking the environmental policies of the Obama administration and criticizing political adversaries.

In his comments, Trump also seemed to invoke a theme that is common in the world of climate-change skepticism—the idea that not so long ago, scientists feared global cooling, rather than the warming that is underway today.

"If you go back and if you look at articles, they talk about global freezing," Trump said. "They talk about at some point, the planet is going to freeze to death, then it's going to die of heat exhaustion."

This may refer to an oft-cited 1975 Newsweek article titled "The Cooling World" or a 1974 Time magazine story titled "Another Ice Age?" But researchers who have reviewed this period have found that while such ideas were indeed afoot at the time, there was "no scientific consensus in the 1970s" about a global cooling trend or risk, as there is today about human-caused climate change.

In other words, scientists' understanding of where the planet is headed, and the consequences, is far more developed now than it was in the 1970s.

At present, Earth has warmed roughly one degree Celsius (1.8 degrees Fahrenheit) above late-19th-century, preindustrial levels. Multiple analyses have shown that without rapid emissions cuts—well beyond what the world is undertaking—the warming will continue and could blow past key thresholds that scientists say could lead to irrevocable climate-related catastrophes, such as more-extreme weather, the death of coral reefs and losses of major parts of planetary ice sheets.

On Tuesday, a U.N. report underscored again how the world is far off course on its promises to cut greenhouse-gas emissions. The report found that, with global emissions still increasing as of 2017, it is unlikely they will peak by 2020. Scientists have said carbon emissions must fall sharply in coming years if the world is to have a chance of avoiding the worst consequences of climate change.

Trump also made reference to recent devastating wildfires in California, which scientists say have been made more intense and deadly by climate change. But the president instead focused on how the forests that burned have been managed. Previously, he has praised Finland for spending "a lot of time on raking and cleaning" its forest floors—a notion that left the Finnish president flummoxed.

"The fire in California, where I was, if you looked at the floor, the floor of the fire, they have trees that were fallen," Trump said. "They did no forest management, no forest maintenance, and you can light—you can take a match like this and light a tree trunk when that thing is laying there for more than 14 or 15 months. And it's a massive problem in California."

"You go to other places where they have denser trees, it's more dense, where the trees are more flammable, they don't have forest fires like this because they maintain," he said. "And it was very interesting I was watching the firemen, and they were raking brush. . . . It's on fire. They're raking it, working so hard. If that was raked in the beginning, there would be nothing to catch on fire."

Trump wasn't the only administration official on Tuesday to shrug off the federal government's latest climate warnings. In a television appearance in California, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke acknowledged that fire seasons have grown longer in the state but added, "Climate change or not, it doesn't relieve you of responsibility to manage the forest."

Meanwhile, asked Tuesday about the findings of the nearly 1,700-page climate report the administration released on Black Friday, White House spokeswoman Sarah Sanders echoed her boss.

"We think that this is the most extreme version and it's not based on facts," Sanders said of the National Climate Assessment. "It's not data-driven. We'd like to see something that is more data-driven. It's based on modeling, which is extremely hard to do when you're talking about the climate. Again, our focus is on making sure we have the safest, cleanest air and water."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I do that because I want the RECORD to reflect this President's ignorance on an issue that is not only of national concern but of international concern.

In the past three annual worldwide threat assessments, the U.S. intelligence communities have cited climate change as a national security threat and a multiplier of threats that create instability, food and water shortages, refugee and population migration, and economic disruption. This is a matter that we can't ignore anymore. We need to pass this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, climate change is a crisis that demands our immediate attention. Its effects are ongoing. It will impact all of us eventually, whether through worse storms, bigger wildfires, less food and water, or conflicts over resources.

The good news is, we still have the time and ability to halt the worst effects. That is what the Paris climate agreement achieved. This landmark agreement was the first ever to unite 195 countries around the common goal of protecting our planet from the worst impacts of our own actions. That is why we must pass H.R. 9, to keep the President from pulling us out of this deal and require the administration to develop concrete plans to meet our emissions reduction targets.

Under the Paris Agreement, each country agreed to meet our own goals

to keep global temperatures from raising more than 2 degrees Celsius. Despite Trump's step backwards, I am proud that my State of California shows change can be made with commonsense steps.

Investments in important technologies like renewable energy, clean cars, and green buildings mean that California is on track to drop our emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050. Now the Federal Government must follow.

The urgency of fighting climate change cannot be in question. Neither can our commitment to the Paris Agreement. I urge passage of this bill.

□ 1315

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how many minutes I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, it has been nearly 2 years since President Trump recklessly announced the United States' withdrawal from the Paris climate accord. We are now the only country in the world not firmly behind this agreement.

There are times where we must stand alone. This is not one of them. Climate change and its impacts are an existential threat, and American leadership has an important role to play, but under the Trump administration, we are retreating from our responsibility and giving up our seat at the table.

Two years ago, more than 180 Representatives joined my resolution condemning President Trump's withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, but the Republican leadership refused to let this body vote its will. Today, that changes. That is because this House is finally reflecting the will of the American people, which, by a 5-to-1 margin, support staying in the agreement.

We need to work with the rest of the world, and the nations of the world are looking to us to lead. Staying in the Paris Agreement and developing a plan to meet emission reduction targets agreed to would be an important first step.

As this House takes action to pass H.R. 9, I hope the Senate will follow our lead and promptly take up the legislation, and I hope today's vote—this vote—represents just the first of many efforts to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and prevent a global climate disaster.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Climate change is here, and it is worth highlighting some of the impacts that are underway.

This year, we have seen record flooding in the Midwest, unprecedented wildfires in the West, and record temperatures across the country.

In Vermont—and talk about economic impacts—the ski season is getting shorter. In one study, it has noted that, even under the most optimistic climate change models, all the ski areas in southern New England will no longer be economically viable by 2040. That would be thousands of jobs melting away as a result of climate change.

We have had 16 disasters in 2017 with damage exceeding \$1 billion, spending \$306 billion on weather-related disasters that year.

Climate change is a priority for young people and local officials. It now must become a priority for Congress.

The Climate Action Now Act takes an important step in this direction by keeping us—or getting us back into the Paris climate agreement and not taken out by the action of a single person. This bill is just the start of fulfilling our obligations and our opportunity to slow climate change.

Now, some folks are fearful about the economic consequences of addressing climate change, but a confident nation faces its problems; it doesn't deny them. It is in facing these problems that we are actually going to create jobs, not lose jobs.

So, Madam Speaker, I commend Representative CASTOR for her leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as the beginning of undertaking the opportunity that we have economically to build a stronger and safer environment.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, climate change is an existential threat that requires the entire international community to solve. The Paris Agreement was a monumental achievement, rightly praised across the world and in Congress. The President's impulsive decision to pull out of the agreement was one of the most dangerous acts of his Presidency.

My district, Ventura County, knows all too well the devastating economic and human toll of climate change, which has increased the frequency and severity of deadly wildfires in our community.

Climate change is also a threat to our national security and military readiness.

I am the proud Representative of Naval Base Ventura County, and I know that climate change will increase problems with coastal corrosion at our Navy base and other U.S. military installations worldwide. In Ventura

County, the Army Corps of Engineers must replenish sand regularly or we will lose land for military exercises, and buildings on the base could literally fall into the sea.

As sea levels rise and the severity of coastal storms increase, these problems will only grow more acute. Fortunately, House Democrats have recognized these threats, and we have developed plans to address them through the creation of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, on which I proudly serve.

The Climate Action Now Act is our pledge to the world that many in the United States Congress want our Nation to be a global leader in solving this crisis. I urge my Republican colleagues to vote to protect our children's and our grandchildren's future and our national security. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the bill.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from leading public health advocates in support of H.R. 9, as well as a letter signed by many of the leading environmental organizations in support of this legislation.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned public health and medical organizations urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The bill would help ensure that the United States adheres to the science-based targets in the Paris Agreement and develops a plan to meet them, both essential steps to protecting public health from the impacts of climate change.

Climate change is a public health emergency. The science clearly shows that communities across the nation are experiencing the health impacts of climate change, including enhanced conditions for ozone and particulate air pollution, which cause asthma attacks, cardiovascular disease and premature death; increased instances of extreme heat, severe storms and other destabilizing weather patterns that disrupt people's access to essential healthcare; increased spread of vector-borne diseases; and longer and more intense allergy seasons. These threats are no longer hypothetical, and Americans across the country have experienced them firsthand.

Every American's health is at risk due to climate change, but some populations are at greater risk, including infants, children, seniors, pregnant women, low-income communities, some communities of color, people with disabilities and many people with chronic diseases. Evidence and experience shows that these populations will disproportionately bear the health impacts of climate change without concerted action to both mitigate and adapt to climate change.

The science is also clear that limiting increase in global temperatures to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius is essential. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found dramatic differences in health impacts between 1.5 and 2 degrees, including in heat-related morbidity and mortality, ozone-related mortality, and vector-borne diseases. The Paris Agreement's goals are to keep the world well under 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to further stay below 1.5 degrees.

H.R. 9 is an important step toward what must become a comprehensive set of policies

protect public health from the worst impacts of climate change. The nation urgently needs to implement strong, science-based measures to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The U.S. must also invest in health adaptation strategies to help communities address the varied health impacts they are already facing.

On behalf of the patients and communities we serve, we urge you to vote YES on H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Sincerely,

Allergy & Asthma Network, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Children's Environmental Health Network, Climate for Health, Health Care Climate Council, Health Care Without Harm, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Environmental Health Association, National Medical Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Public Health Institute.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters across the country, we urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, to ensure the U.S. meets its commitments under the Paris Agreement and to reinforce our national resolve to address climate change.

The Paris Agreement is a global response to the greatest environmental challenge of our time. It includes, for the first time, specific commitments from all major countries and a pathway for each country to strengthen its own domestic climate actions in the years ahead. United States leadership and participation was crucial in bringing the world together to act. But now, by threatening to exit the agreement, the Trump administration risks isolating itself, undermining global climate action, and weakening America's international influence on a broad array of critical foreign policy issues.

Americans are experiencing climate change here and now in a rising tide of extreme weather disasters, from hurricanes in the southeast, to wildfires in the west, to flooding right now in the country's heartland. It's no surprise that polls consistently show that concern over the climate crisis is rising across generational, geographic, and partisan lines.

Americans' personal experience is underscored by a raft of new scientific reports. Last fall the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed that climate change is already happening, and ambitious action to curb carbon pollution is needed starting now to stave off steadily worsening impacts in the U.S. and across the globe. The last four years have been the hottest on record since global measurements began in 1880, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And the National Climate Assessment—prepared by 13 federal agencies and released by the Trump Administration last year—lays out the stark reality of current climate impacts in all regions of the nation and projects how much worse they could get.

Without significant global action, the National Climate Assessment concludes: "rising temperatures, sea level rise, and changes in extreme events are expected to increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property, labor productivity, and the vitality of our communities." "[C]oastal economies and property are already at risk," especially communities disproportionately comprised of low-income and minority Americans. In short, climate change is already here in America and it's already harming Americans' lives.

Despite these dire forecasts, we can still stave off the worst effects of climate change. Congressional leadership is more important than ever, and the Climate Action Now Act will go a long way to ensure that the United States fulfills our commitments under the Paris Agreement and stays on the path to serious action on climate change.

This legislation demonstrates leadership and vision needed to tackle the climate crisis. We urge you to support the Climate Action Now Act to help make the future climate safe for our children and grandchildren and honor America's commitments to help confront this global challenge.

Signed,

Alaska Wilderness Action, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, Arizona Parks and Recreation Association, Blue Future, Bold Alliance, Chispa, Chispa Arizona, Citizens' Climate Lobby, Clean Water Action, Climate Hawks Vote, Climate Law & Policy Project, Climate Reality Project, Colorado Farm and Food Alliance, Conservation Colorado, Defend Our Future, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation, Elders Climate Action.

Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environment Colorado, Environment North Carolina, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Justice Center of Chestnut Hill United Church, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Gasp, Green The Church, GreenLatinos, Hispanic Access Foundation, Hispanic Federation, Interfaith Power & Light, Kids Climate Action Network, League of Conservation Voters, League of Women Voters of the United States, National Hispanic Medical Association, National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation.

Natural Resources Defense Council, NC League of Conservation Voters, Oxfam America, Partnership for Policy Integrity, Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, The Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah (HEAL Utah), The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Union of Concerned Scientists, Voices for Progress, World Wildlife Fund.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

The simple fact of the matter is that climate change is real, and it is creating enormous consequences for the United States. It is a threat to coastlines and property values, to public health, and to our economy.

But it is also affecting our military readiness, our national security, and it is changing the strategic environment in which our country and our troops operate. That is why I added language to the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act making it clear that Congress acknowledges climate change is a threat to our national security.

My amendment also requires the Department of Defense to assess the military bases most threatened by climate change, including an analysis of future costs of how to deal with and mitigate

those challenges. Only through sober and rigorous analysis can we recognize the true cost of climate change to American strength and capabilities.

Madam Speaker, it is absolutely imperative that we address the impacts of climate change now, and we have more work to do. This year, on the Armed Services Committee, we will continue to require the Pentagon to better assess and report on the climate threat.

Madam Speaker, the Climate Action Now Act is about honoring our global commitments. As Americans, we rise to meet our challenges; we do not hide from them. We solve problems. We develop new technologies, and we innovate to create a more sustainable world. That is our Nation's proud heritage, and that is the spirit that we should bring toward engaging this climate threat.

The Paris Agreement was crafted through the work of American negotiators with other countries around the world. It was signed by an overwhelming 174 countries, plus the European Union. This agreement represents a clear consensus to get serious and combat climate change.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. The threat is real. Time is of the essence. The time to act is now.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide additional consideration of H. Res. 109, the notorious Green New Deal.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, it is about time that the American people know where Members of Congress stand on this radical proposal of the Green New Deal, which will change nearly every aspect of Americans' lives. Even the sponsor of this legislation has requested hearings on this proposal since the Speaker and the Democratic leadership refuse to give the Green New Deal any legislative hearings. I would like to lay out some of it here.

Estimations show energy bills under the Green New Deal would spike by as much as \$3,800 per year, per family.

The resolution calls for upgrading all—all—existing buildings in the United States and constructing new buildings to achieve maximal energy efficiency, which could range between \$1.6 trillion, with a t, and \$4.2 trillion in cost.

What is the estimated total price tag for the Green New Deal? Up to \$93 trillion. That is with a t, trillion dollars.

So where is this money going to come from? The Green New Deal could

cost nearly \$65,000 per year, per household, much higher than the average family income.

We have seen the Democratic majority bring messaging bill after messaging bill to the floor. Why not this one? Why not the Green New Deal? Why not truly let the American people know where the Democrats stand on what I believe is a radical proposal that will hurt our Nation and kill jobs?

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), my good friend.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for yielding some time.

H.R. 9 is an attempt simply to force the President to reenter an ineffectual international agreement, one that pushes the United States to adopt burdensome, painful measures and hold us to a standard that no other country that is a part of the agreement has bothered to meet themselves, all to do something that we are already doing, and that is lowering greenhouse gas emissions.

But H.R. 9 is not the real agenda of our Democratic colleagues. To understand what the real Democratic Party wants to do, one need look no further than H. Res. 109, better known as the Green New Deal.

Look, people in my district are not asking where I stand or what I think about the Paris climate agreement, but they are asking, eagerly, where I stand on the Green New Deal. Everywhere I go, people are asking about it.

Last night, on a telephone townhall, several questions were asking where I stood on this. They are concerned that their Representative might support a proposal that would drastically increase their energy bills.

And businesses I talk to want to know whether or not I would support what amounts to a torrent of heavy-handed regulations.

I assure you, as I did them, that I do not. I strongly oppose the Green New Deal, but I cannot say the same for my colleagues across the aisle.

Madam Speaker, 92 Democrats have cosponsored the Green New Deal, and nearly every Democrat running for President has endorsed it. It seems clear that this really is the new policy platform for the Democratic Party.

I know that many of my Democratic colleagues disagree with me. They believe strongly in the policies of the Green New Deal, and I am sure some of their constituents would agree as well.

But I am also positive that their constituents, Democratic constituents, want to know where their Representative stands on this issue just as much as mine want to know where I stand. So let's have a vote.

But let's be frank with each other. The Speaker would not allow a recorded vote. Speaker PELOSI knows very likely that to have a vote on the Green New Deal could cost the Democrats the majority.

So, look, here is the deal. We Republicans are more than happy to go on

record with our opposition to the Green New Deal, and we are more than happy to help our Democratic colleagues go on record with their support for the Green New Deal. So help us defeat the previous question.

As my friend, Mrs. LESKO, has said, if we defeat the previous question, then we will amend the rule and enable a vote on the Green New Deal, and I hope to have support in that regard.

But I understand it may be difficult for some of my colleagues across the aisle to do so, and if they are unable to help support us on this previous question, then I have another opportunity.

□ 1330

If we do not defeat the previous question immediately following this vote series, I am going to file a discharge petition to ensure a vote on the Green New Deal. I encourage all Members here to vote against the previous question, vote against the rule, and sign the discharge petition. Let's have a vote on the Green New Deal.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we all want to protect the environment, both Republicans and Democrats, and ensure that we are leaving a better world for our children, grandchildren, and future generations.

Unfortunately, H.R. 9 is not, in my opinion, a legitimate solution. H.R. 9 is little more than a messaging bill that is intended to undermine the President and message to the Democratic base.

We do have an opportunity to get things done here, but it takes a willingness from those in power to work with us in a bipartisan fashion for a solution.

Republicans want to focus on clean and affordable energy solutions that will create stability for consumers at affordable rates. We should be working together on these solutions and on real pieces of legislation that have the ability to pass the U.S. Senate and be signed by the President.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

This is like the theater of the absurd, when I listen to my Republican colleagues. We have a bill, H.R. 9, that says that the United States should not remove itself from the Paris climate accord. I have one colleague saying that it is a messaging bill that means nothing. I have other Republican colleagues saying that if we pass this, it is the end of the world because it is going to have all these implications.

Then we get lectured to by my Republican colleagues for almost an hour

now that 30 amendments are not enough on a 6-page bill, that we need more and more amendments in order. Then, the gentleman from Georgia comes to the floor and says: I want to offer the Green New Deal, and I want to offer it under a closed rule where nobody can amend it.

I mean, you can't make this stuff up. The Republicans are saying: We don't want hearings, and we don't want markups. We want nothing. We just want to bring it to the floor under a closed rule so that nobody, Democrats or Republicans, can amend it.

I support the Green New Deal. I have some ideas to make it a little bit better. I would like to have some amendments made in order. But my Republican friends say no amendments, closed rule, shut it all down. Old habits die hard.

When the Republicans were in charge, they presided over the most closed Congress in the history of our country, and they just can't break that old habit.

Well, you know what? We want to move on a Green New Deal, but we want to do it right. We want to do hearings, and you can have some of your friends and allies who are climate-change deniers come to testify against it if you want. We will bring experts and scientists because we believe in science. We will have them come to talk about why it is important and how we can improve it.

We look forward to that, but not under a closed rule with no hearings and no markups. This is embarrassing.

Madam Speaker, the United States has a unique role to play in fighting climate change, not just because we should be leading the way on innovation or because we have the largest economy anywhere but because we played a major role in furthering this crisis.

Between 1970 and 2013, the U.S. ranked number one in total carbon emissions. We released more carbon into the atmosphere than China, Japan, or any of the other 40 global nations. That is according to the Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research. I don't think we should be turning our back on a problem that we helped create.

It isn't a radical or partisan idea. Experts consider 1988 to be the year that the science behind climate change became widely known and accepted, and that is the year when a Republican Presidential nominee, George H.W. Bush, pledged that he would fight the greenhouse effect with the "White House effect."

We have come a long way since then, Madam Speaker, and I don't mean positively. There was a time when Republicans cared about the environment, when they understood that issues like the climate crisis were something that we needed to work on in a bipartisan way. Now they have become the party of climate change deniers.

This is the challenge of our generation. It is more important than petty partisanship.

President Trump seems obsessed with dismantling anything that Barack Obama has ever done. That doesn't mean that Congress should sit idly by when it comes at the expense of the future of our planet.

With climate change, public health is at risk and our national security is endangered. The President may be unwilling to rise to the challenge, but this Democratic majority is not. Congress shouldn't let another one of his temper tantrums ruin our planet.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question, and I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and the underlying resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 329

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 109) recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 109.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—228

Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Chu, Judy
Allred	F.	Cicilline
Axne	Brindisi	Cisneros
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Bustos	Clay
Bera	Butterfield	Cleaver
Beyer	Carbajal	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cohen
Blumenauer	Case	Connolly
Blunt Rochester	Casten (IL)	Cooper
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Correa
	Castro (TX)	Costa

Courtney	Kennedy	Pocan
Cox (CA)	Khanma	Porter
Craig	Kildee	Pressley
Crist	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Crow	Kim	Quigley
Cuellar	Kind	Raskin
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Cunningham	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Davids (KS)	Kuster (NH)	Rose (NY)
Davis (CA)	Lamb	Rouda
Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Dean	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lawrence	Rush
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Ryan
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Sánchez
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Sarbanes
Demings	Levin (CA)	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lewis	Schiff
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
Doggett	Lipinski	Schrader
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schrier
F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Escobar	Lowey	Serrano
Eshoo	Luján	Sewell (AL)
Espallat	Luria	Shalala
Evans	Lynch	Sherman
Finkenauer	Malinowski	Sherrill
Fletcher	Maloney	Sires
Foster	Carolyn B.	Slotkin
Frankel	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Fudge	Matsui	Soto
Gabbard	McAdams	Spanberger
Gallego	McBath	Speier
Garamendi	McCollum	Stanton
Garcia (IL)	McEachin	Stevens
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Suozzi
Golden	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Gomez	Meeks	Takano
Gonzalez (TX)	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Gottheimer	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Green (TX)	Morelle	Tlaib
Grijalva	Moulton	Tonko
Haaland	Mucarsel-Powell	Torres (CA)
Harder (CA)	Murphy	Torres Small
Hayes	Nadler	(NM)
Heck	Napolitano	Trahan
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Trone
Hill (CA)	Neguse	Underwood
Himes	Norcross	Van Drew
Horn, Kendra S.	O'Halleran	Veasey
Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	Vela
Houlahan	Omar	Velázquez
Hoyer	Pallone	Visclosky
Huffman	Panetta	Wasserman
Jackson Lee	Pappas	Schultz
Jayapal	Pascarell	Waters
Jeffries	Payne	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Welch
Johnson (TX)	Peters	Wexton
Kaptur	Peterson	Wild
Keating	Phillips	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Aderholt	Cline	Gonzalez (OH)
Allen	Cloud	Gooden
Amash	Cole	Gosar
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Granger
Armstrong	Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)
Arrington	Comer	Graves (LA)
Babin	Conaway	Graves (MO)
Bacon	Cook	Green (TN)
Baird	Crawford	Griffith
Balderson	Crenshaw	Grothman
Banks	Curtis	Guest
Barr	Davidson (OH)	Guthrie
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Hagedorn
Biggs	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Billirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hern, Kevin
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Duncan	Hice (GA)
Brady	Dunn	Higgins (LA)
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Hill (AR)
Brooks (IN)	Estes	Holding
Buchanan	Ferguson	Hollingsworth
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Huizenga
Budd	Flores	Hunter
Burchett	Fortenberry	Hurd (TX)
Burgess	Fox (NC)	Johnson (LA)
Byrne	Fulcher	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Gaetz	Johnson (SD)
Carter (GA)	Gallagher	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Gianforte	Joyce (OH)
Chabot	Gibbs	Joyce (PA)
Cheney	Gohmert	Katko

Kelly (MS) Nunes Stefanik
 Kelly (PA) Olson Steil
 King (IA) Palazzo Steube
 King (NY) Palmer Stewart
 Kinzinger Pence Stivers
 Kustoff (TN) Posey Taylor
 LaHood Ratcliffe Thompson (PA)
 LaMalfa Reed Thornberry
 Lamborn Reschenthaler Timmons
 Latta Rice (SC) Tipton
 Lesko Riggleman Turner
 Long Roby Upton
 Loudermilk Rodgers (WA) Wagner
 Lucas Roe, David P. Walberg
 Luetkemeyer Rogers (AL) Walden
 Marchant Rogers (KY) Walker
 Marshall Rose, John W. Walorski
 Massie Rouzer Waltz
 Mast Roy Watkins
 McCarthy Rutherford Weber (TX)
 McCaul Scalise Webster (FL)
 McClintock Schweikert Wenstrup
 McHenry Scott, Austin Westerman
 McKinley Sensenbrenner Williams
 Meadows Shimkus Wilson (SC)
 Meuser Simpson Wittman
 Miller Smith (MO) Womack
 Mitchell Smith (NE) Wright
 Moolenaar Smith (NJ) Yoho
 Mooney (WV) Smucker Young
 Mullin Spano Zeldin
 Newhouse Stauber

NOT VOTING—12

Abraham Harris Rooney (FL)
 Adams Hastings Titus
 Carson (IN) Norman Vargas
 Cartwright Perry Woodall

□ 1401

Mr. STEUBE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. CURTIS, STEWART, GROTHMAN and ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ESPAILLAT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 188, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—226

Aguilar Cicilline DeGette
 Allred Cisneros DeLauro
 Axne Clark (MA) DelBene
 Barragán Clarke (NY) Delgado
 Bass Clay Demings
 Beatty Cleaver DeSaulnier
 Bera Clyburn Deutch
 Beyer Cohen Dingell
 Bishop (GA) Connolly Doggett
 Blunt Rochester Cooper Doyle, Michael
 Bonamici Correa F.
 Boyle, Brendan Costa Engel
 F. Courtney Escobar
 Brindisi Cox (CA) Eshoo
 Brown (MD) Craig Espallat
 Brownley (CA) Crist Evans
 Bustos Crow Finkenauer
 Butterfield Cuellar Fletcher
 Carbajal Cummings Foster
 Cárdenas Cunningham Frankel
 Case Davids (KS) Fudge
 Casten (IL) Davis (CA) Gabbard
 Castor (FL) Davis, Danny K. Gallego
 Castro (TX) Dean Garamendi
 Chu, Judy DeFazio García (IL)

Garcia (TX) Luján
 Golden Luria
 Gomez Lynch
 Gonzalez (TX) Malinowski
 Gottheimer Maloney,
 Green (TX) Carolyn B.
 Grijalva Maloney, Sean
 Haaland Matsui
 Harder (CA) McAdams
 Hayes McBath
 Heck McColium
 Higgins (NY) McEachin
 Hill (CA) McGovern
 Horn, Kendra S. McNeerney
 Horsford Meeks
 Houlihan Meng
 Hoyer Moore
 Huffman Morelle
 Jackson Lee Moulton
 Jayapal Mucarsel-Powell
 Jeffries Murphy
 Johnson (GA) Nadler
 Johnson (TX) Napolitano
 Kaptur Westerman
 Keating Neguse
 Kelly (IL) Norcross
 Kennedy O'Halleran
 Khanna Ocasio-Cortez
 Kildee Omar
 Kilmer Pallone
 Kim Panetta
 Kind Pappas
 Kirkpatrick Pascrell
 Krishnamoorthi Payne
 Kuster (NH) Perlmutter
 Lamb Peters
 Langevin Peterson
 Larsen (WA) Phillips
 Larson (CT) Pingree
 Lawrence Pocan
 Lawson (FL) Porter
 Lee (CA) Pressley
 Lee (NV) Price (NC)
 Levin (CA) Quigley
 Levin (MI) Raskin
 Lewis Rice (NY)
 Lieu, Ted Richmond
 Lipinski Rose (NY)
 Loeb sack Rouda
 Lofgren Roybal-Allard
 Lowenthal Ruiz
 Lowey Ruppertsberger

NAYS—188

Aderholt DesJarlais Johnson (SD)
 Allen Diaz-Balart Jordan
 Amash Duffy Joyce (OH)
 Amodei Duncan Joyce (PA)
 Armstrong Dunn Katko
 Arrington Emmer Kelly (MS)
 Babin Estes Kelly (PA)
 Bacon Ferguson King (IA)
 Baird Fitzpatrick King (NY)
 Balderson Fleischmann Kinzinger
 Banks Flores Kustoff (TN)
 Barr Fortenberry LaHood
 Bergman Foxx (NC) LaMalfa
 Biggs Fulcher Lamborn
 Bilirakis Gaetz Latta
 Bishop (UT) Gallagher Lesko
 Bost Gianforte Long
 Brady Gibbs Loudermilk
 Brooks (AL) Gohmert Lucas
 Brooks (IN) Gonzalez (OH) Luetkemeyer
 Buchanan Gooden Marshall
 Buck Gosar
 Bucshon Granger
 Budd Graves (GA)
 Burchett Graves (LA)
 Burgess Graves (MO)
 Byrne Green (TN)
 Calvert Griffith
 Carter (GA) Grothman
 Carter (TX) Guest
 Chabot Guthrie
 Cheney Hagedorn
 Cline Hartzler
 Cloud Hern, Kevin
 Cole Herrera Beutler
 Collins (GA) Hice (GA)
 Collins (NY) Hill (AR)
 Comer Holding
 Conaway Hollingsworth
 Cook Hudson
 Crawford Huizenga
 Crenshaw Hunter
 Curtis Hurd (TX)
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (LA)
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)

Rice (SC) Smith (NJ)
 Riggleman Smucker
 Roby Spano
 Rodgers (WA) Stauber
 Roe, David P. Stefanik
 Rogers (AL) Steil
 Rogers (KY) Steube
 Rose, John W. Stewart
 Rouzer Stivers
 Roy Taylor
 Rutherford Thompson (PA)
 Schweikert Thornberry
 Scott, Austin Timmons
 Sensenbrenner Tipton
 Simpson Turner
 Smith (MO) Wagner
 Smith (NE) Walberg Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham Hastings Rooney (FL)
 Adams Higgins (LA) Scalise
 Blumenauer Himes Titus
 Carson (IN) Marchant Vargas
 Cartwright Norman Woodall
 Harris Perry

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 173.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer a question of the privileges of the House previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 304

Whereas Michael Cohen testified under oath as a witness before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform on February 27, 2019;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath, “I have never asked for, nor would I accept, a pardon from President Trump”;

Whereas in truth and fact, attorney for Michael Cohen, Lanny Davis, admitted on March 6, 2019, that Cohen “directed his attorney to explore possibilities of a pardon at one point with Donald J. Trump lawyer Rudy Giuliani as well as other lawyers advising President Trump”;

Whereas in truth and fact, attorney for Michael Cohen, Michael Monico, admitted in a March 12, 2019, letter that Cohen’s testimony was inaccurate;

Whereas in truth and fact, the ex post representation by Cohen’s attorney does not annul Cohen’s intentionally false and misleading testimony;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s testimony under oath was delivered in the context of apologizing for all his criminal activities;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s denial of ever seeking a pardon contained no qualifiers about the context of his statement;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s denial of ever seeking a pardon, as uttered under oath in his testimony, was absolute and unequivocal;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen testified under oath that he and his lawyers spent hours editing his written statement submitted to the Committee on Oversight and

Reform preceding his testimony, which included the written assertion, “I have never asked for, nor would I accept, a pardon from President Trump”;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s denial in his written statement of never asking for a Presidential pardon was an unqualified assertion;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath that he “did not want to go to the White House” and he “did not want a role or title in the administration”;

Whereas in truth and fact the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York submitted to Federal court a sentencing memorandum expressing Michael Cohen’s desire to work in the White House, explaining: “during and after the campaign, Cohen privately told friends and colleagues, including in seized text messages, that he expected to be given a prominent role and title in the new administration. When that did not materialize, Cohen found a way to monetize his relationship with and access to the President”;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath on other factual matters of material significance;

Whereas Michael Cohen’s intentionally false testimony was aimed at obscuring the truth and ameliorating the extent of his own personal embarrassment;

Whereas intentionally false testimony to a committee of the House of Representatives harms the integrity of the proceedings of the House;

Whereas it is a Federal crime to provide false information to Congress and the failure to enforce this crime further undermines the integrity of the House; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the House of Representatives that providing a copy of the official transcript of the hearing of the Committee on Oversight and Reform on February 27, 2019, to the Department of Justice would aid the Attorney General’s consideration of investigation and potential prosecution of Michael Cohen’s criminal conduct: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the House of Representatives directs the chair of the Oversight and Reform Committee to submit to the Attorney General an official copy of the transcript of the hearing during which Michael Cohen testified under oath on February 27, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 183, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—226

Aguilar	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Amash	Gottheimer	Pallone
Axne	Green (TX)	Panetta
Barragán	Grijalva	Pappas
Bass	Haaland	Pascrell
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bera	Hayes	Perlmutter
Beyer	Heck	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hill (CA)	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pingree
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Porter
Brindisi	Houlahan	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Quigley
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Butterfield	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Rose (NY)
Case	Kaptur	Rouda
Casten (IL)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Rush
Cicilline	Kildee	Ryan
Cisneros	Kilmer	Sanchez
Clark (MA)	Kim	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Scanlon
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Lamb	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Schrier
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Costa	Lawrence	Serrano
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Shalala
Craig	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Crist	Levin (CA)	Sherrill
Crow	Levin (MI)	Sires
Cuellar	Lewis	Slotkin
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	Lipinski	Soto
Davids (KS)	Loebbsack	Spanberger
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Speier
Dean	Lowenthal	Stanton
DeFazio	Lowe	Stevens
DeLauro	Luján	Suozzi
DelBene	Luria	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Lynch	Takano
Demings	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Doggett	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	McAdams	Torres Small (NM)
Engel	McBath	Trahan
Escobar	McCollum	Trone
Eshoo	McEachin	Underwood
Espallat	McGovern	Van Drew
Evans	McNerney	Veasey
Finkenauser	Meeks	Vela
Fletcher	Meng	Velázquez
Foster	Moore	Visclosky
Frankel	Morelle	Wasserman
Fudge	Moulton	Schultz
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gallego	Murphy	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia (IL)	Napolitano	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Neal	Wild
Golden	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
	Norcross	Yarmuth
	O’Halloran	

NOES—183

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Allen	Buchanan	Conaway
Amodei	Buck	Cook
Arrington	Bucshon	Crawford
Babin	Budd	Crenshaw
Bacon	Burchett	Curtis
Baird	Burgess	Davidson (OH)
Balderson	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Banks	Calvert	DesJarlais
Barr	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Duffy
Biggs	Chabot	Duncan
Bilirakis	Cheney	Dunn
Bishop (UT)	Cline	Emmer
Bost	Cole	Estes
Brady	Collins (GA)	Ferguson
Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann	Kinzing	Rouzer
Flores	Kustoff (TN)	Roy
Fortenberry	LaHood	Rutherford
Fox (NC)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Fulcher	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Gaetz	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Gallagher	Lesko	Shimkus
Gianforte	Long	Simpson
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Gohmert	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Gooden	Marchant	Smucker
Gosar	Marshall	Spano
Granger	Massie	Staubert
Graves (GA)	Mast	Stefanik
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Steil
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Steube
Green (TN)	McClintock	Stewart
Griffith	McHenry	Stivers
Grothman	McKinley	Taylor
Guest	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Guthrie	Meuser	Thornberry
Hagedorn	Miller	Timmons
Hartzler	Mitchell	Tipton
Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar	Turner
Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Upton
Higgins (LA)	Mullin	Wagner
Hill (AR)	Newhouse	Walberg
Holding	Nunes	Walden
Hollingsworth	Olson	Walker
Hudson	Palazzo	Walorski
Huizenga	Palmer	Waltz
Hunter	Pence	Watkins
Hurd (TX)	Posey	Weber (TX)
Johnson (LA)	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Wenstrup
Johnson (SD)	Reschenthaler	Westerman
Jordan	Rice (SC)	Williams
Joyce (OH)	Roby	Wilson (SC)
Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)	Wittman
Katko	Roe, David P.	Womack
Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)	Wright
Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Yoho
King (NY)	Rose, John W.	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Abraham	Harris	Rooney (FL)
Adams	Hastings	Scalise
Armstrong	Hern, Kevin	Titus
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Vargas
Cartwright	King (IA)	Woodall
Cloud	Norman	Young
Davis (CA)	Perry	
DeGette	Riggleman	

□ 1426

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 174.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 174.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I spoke at the memorial service for Indiana’s former Senator Birch Byah and missed roll call votes 172 to 174. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

Roll Call 172, on the Previous Question on the Rule, H. Res. 329, vote YEA.

Roll Call 173, on H. Res. 329, vote YEA.

Roll Call 174, The Motion to Table the Green of Tennessee Privileged Resolution, H. Res. 304, vote YEA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not get to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 172, “nay” on rollcall No. 173, and “nay” on rollcall No. 174.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING
THE LIFE OF CONGRESSWOMAN
ELLEN TAUSCHER**

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness to mark the passing of a leader of exceptional courage and firm principles, our colleague and dear friend, Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher.

The presence of so many members from our California delegation is a beautiful tribute to her beautiful life. Thank you all for being here.

Ellen's passing is a great official loss to the people of California and to the Nation and a deep personal loss for all of us who are blessed to call her friend.

Our hearts break for her daughter, Katherine. Personally, it was a joy for many of us to see her expect Katherine. Katherine came. Katherine is growing up. She took such delight in being Katherine's mother.

Ellen was an extraordinary force for progress who made a difference. Her smart, strategic leadership strengthened our democratic institutions and kept America safe, and her relentless commitment to nuclear nonproliferation beautifully honored the oath we take to support and defend the Constitution and protect the American people.

Ellen was a pioneer who made history when she became the youngest ever and one of the very earliest women members of the New York Stock Exchange, where she was a powerful voice for technology, science, and innovation.

Ellen's friendship was a gift, and her legacy was one of outstanding leadership marked by deep patriotism and tireless commitment to progress.

May it be a comfort to Ellen's beloved daughter, Katherine, and her many, many loved ones that so many share their loss and pray for them at this sad time.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that Members and guests in the gallery rise to observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWALWELL of California). All present will rise to observe a moment of silence.

**REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962,
BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SUR-
VIVORS PROTECTION ACT**

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. 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, 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. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

CLIMATE ACTION NOW ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 9.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 329 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1432

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes, with Mr. BLUMENAUER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the House the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

I shouldn't need to persuade anyone in this Chamber that we desperately need to take serious action on climate change. Just look at the news. We are already seeing the consequences of our inaction: natural disasters, famines, instability, human suffering.

The time for action to avoid the worst effects of climate change is rapidly closing. We must demonstrate to the rest of the world and to future generations that we are still committed to taking on this fight.

Climate change is a national security threat that transcends borders and requires international coordination. That is why it is so critical that we work shoulder to shoulder with our friends and partners around the world.

The negotiation of the Paris Agreement was a defining moment for the future of our planet. For the first time, the countries of the world came together to face this global crisis.

At challenging times like these, the international community usually looks to the United States for leadership. So when President Trump announced his intention to withdraw from this landmark agreement, it sent an unmistakable message that America is on the retreat. It is really just shameful.

Every nation in the world has now signed on to the Paris Agreement. If we withdraw, we will be the only country unwilling to step up to this challenge.

We can—we must—do better.

The Climate Action Now Act keeps the United States in the Paris climate accord, renewing our country's pledge to address climate change head-on.

The Paris Agreement allows every country to determine its own pollution reduction targets and to develop a public plan for how to meet those targets. This bill follows that same model. It gives the executive branch total flexibility to decide what approach we need to follow and what kind of technology we need to use to reach our national targets.

H.R. 9 gives us all an opportunity to show Americans that we hear them, that we take their concerns seriously, and that we are addressing this danger that is hurting their health and safety.

Mr. Chair, it is time for Congress to put our country back on the right path to address the climate change crisis facing the world. I strongly support passage of H.R. 9, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we can all agree that the climate is changing and we need to take positive steps to address it. However, I oppose H.R. 9 because it is just a messaging bill that is dead on arrival in the Senate and that the President will veto.

I oppose H.R. 9 because, among other problems, it attempts to codify President Obama's unrealistic and unilaterally determined greenhouse gas reduction pledge under the Paris Agreement. This pledge was submitted on behalf of the United States without any notification, consultation, or role for Congress.

At a recent hearing, when we asked whether any of the witnesses agreed that President Obama should have submitted the Paris Agreement to the

Senate for ratification, all four witnesses, including the three Democrat witnesses, agreed it should have been submitted to the Senate.

In addition to not involving Congress, the Obama administration also did not seek meaningful input from private-sector stakeholders, such as energy companies.

Not only that, the administration provided no cost-benefit analysis or economic justification to rationalize its pledge—its arbitrary pledge—to cut greenhouse gases by 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025.

A recent study by the Chamber of Commerce estimates it could cost U.S. GDP \$250 billion and 2.7 million jobs by 2025. By 2040, it could cost the United States economy \$3 trillion and 6.5 million industrial sector jobs.

But the good news is that, even before the United States entered the Paris Agreement, the United States started making progress to significantly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. According to the EPA, from 1990 to 2014, U.S. greenhouse gas emissions per GDP declined by 40 percent, and we are at the lowest emissions levels since 2000.

In addition, over the last decade, U.S. greenhouse gas emissions have decreased by 14 percent, Mr. Chairman, while China's emissions doubled. Sadly, China, the world's largest greenhouse gas emitter, under this agreement, will continue to increase its emissions through 2030 under its unenforceable Paris Agreement pledge.

Other major greenhouse gas emitters, like Russia, have signed the Paris Agreement but have not ratified it.

Instead of doubling down on a pledge that Congress had no role in setting that will have a potentially catastrophic impact on the United States economy and which will do nothing, Mr. Chairman, to address China and other countries' growing emissions, we should work on bipartisan legislation to boost research, advance technologies, promote innovation, and develop real solutions.

That is why I offered an amendment calling for bipartisan solutions to address this challenge, providing a meaningful role for Congress regarding the Paris Agreement, and requiring our greenhouse gas reduction commitments to undergo a rigorous cost-benefit analysis. Sadly, this amendment failed by a party-line vote in the committee and the Rules Committee, denying it from even being debated on this House floor.

So for that, Mr. Chairman, and many other reasons, I oppose H.R. 9, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my friend on the other side of the aisle just said that all four witnesses at our April 2 hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee expressed agreement that President Obama should have submitted the

Paris accord to the Senate for ratification. I was there and chaired the hearing. I didn't hear that.

Let me tell you that, first of all, we were proud to welcome a distinguished panel of national security leaders, including former military officials. They offered detailed descriptions of the risks that climate change poses to our national security.

They talked about how climate change acts as a threat multiplier and a source of international conflict, how it makes individuals more vulnerable to recruitment by violent extremist organizations, how it is increasing great power competition and tensions in places like the Arctic, and how it is the driver of extreme weather and natural disasters that require dangerous and expensive military responses.

More to my point, there was a fleeting question about whether any witness disagreed with the statement that President Obama should have submitted the Paris Agreement to the Senate for ratification. The only response, I believe, came from one retired admiral, who simply said, "military, not political," meaning he is not the right guy to ask, nor were any of the other witnesses, so they all sat in silence.

As my colleague should know, silence is not an assent, whether it is at a congressional hearing or at a deposition or even in the exit row of an overcrowded commercial airplane. A person must give a verbal "yes" or "no" for their answer to be accepted and relied upon.

So I just want to clear the record, because what really happened is one of my colleagues posed a question to the wrong person and got no answer.

So when it comes to arguing that the Paris Agreement needed to be submitted to the Senate for ratification, my colleagues are incorrect as a matter of international law and incorrect as a matter of U.S. law. The previous President had the authority to enter into the Paris Agreement, derived from the Constitution, the Senate-approved United Nations Framework on Climate Change, and domestic law.

We all know that the vast majority of international agreements entered into by the U.S. are not approved by the Senate, and the Paris Agreement is no different.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the author of this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL of the Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise humbly as a Representative of my home State of Florida and as a patriotic American but, especially today, as a mother of two daughters and future generations because I feel the weight of our moral responsibility to address climate change.

This is a historic day here in the House of Representatives. This is the first time in 10 years that major cli-

mate legislation is being heard in the people's House.

□ 1445

H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, is where we will start by honoring America's commitment to address the climate crisis, and it is a crisis. The last time global monthly temperatures were below average was in February of 1985. That means everyone who is 34 years of age or younger has grown up in a world that has been forever altered by the change in climate.

How severe the impacts of climate change will be to us personally over time depends on the actions that we take now.

Based on the latest science from the administration's own National Climate Assessment, we have reason to worry. Seas are rising. America's heartland and farms have suffered unprecedented floods. Snowpack is shrinking, and that is bad for clean water supplies. Droughts are getting worse. Hot, humid heat waves are becoming more intense, with more days where people cannot safely work or play outside. Higher temperatures mean that pollutants, like ground-level ozone from car exhaust, will become more damaging to our health.

One-and-a-half years ago, I had to pack up my home, board up the windows and doors, pack up my most cherished belongings, and flee as Hurricane Irma, that monster hurricane, threatened the State of Florida. We were scared of a huge storm surge coming up from the Gulf of Mexico and into Tampa Bay. We were petrified.

Fortunately, we had time to get out of the way, but that isn't true for so many Americans who have suffered floods, fires, and more. They haven't been as lucky. And the risks and costs going forward are likely to be more severe.

What is necessary to combat the climate crisis is to stop carbon pollution from accumulating in the atmosphere. That requires action, urgent action, ambitious action.

Fortunately, we have made some progress in recent years in cutting carbon pollution. Thousands of businesses, houses of worship, States, and communities are taking action. Now they are demanding that we do the same.

A few years ago, there was also good news. After years of finger-pointing, the United States, China, India, Europe, and other countries, all of the countries around the world, came together and agreed to cut carbon pollution. With America's leadership and engagement, the U.S. led other nations in committing to take climate action in an international agreement called the Paris climate accord. The agreement was a breakthrough.

After years of playing the blame game, nearly every other country said, here is our plan, and each country developed its own individual plan, and America has done just that. That plan has incredible upsides.

We are creating millions of clean energy jobs right now, and they are good-paying jobs. We are saving billions of dollars on home energy bills, and businesses are saving huge amounts of money through energy efficiency. We can finally address climate injustice.

And despite what the Trump administration says, America is still in the international agreement. We have not formally withdrawn. If this bill becomes law, we never will, because America does not cut and run, America keeps its commitments, and we will recommit to doing so when we pass this bill.

My Climate Action Now bill is straightforward. It would block the administration from spending any money on withdrawal, and it would require the Trump administration to release its plan to cut carbon pollution.

Americans overwhelmingly support U.S. leadership on the climate crisis because they understand that when America leads, we win. Ask the 23 States, 300 cities, and more than 2,000 businesses who have pledged to honor the Paris goals. Now they will be joined by the House of Representatives.

Some of the fastest growing jobs in America are clean energy, engineering, green building, solar installers, and wind turbine technicians. This is just the beginning, but we have to stay on course.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. In addition to sending an important signal to clean energy, job-creating businesses, this will send an important signal to our allies across the world. We expect ambitious action from them.

I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle say, but China. Well, if the President forces a retreat here, other countries will retreat, as well. A vote against H.R. 9 is a vote to let China off the hook. This is a patriotic vote. Vote for America, vote for our future, and keep us in the climate Paris Agreement. I thank the hundreds of my colleagues who have joined this, and I thank the brave Republicans who will join us in this patriotic vote for Climate Action Now.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, not because we don't want clean water or clean air or deny a world-changing climate. H.R. 9 is a direct attack on this administration for withdrawing from the flawed agreement and is a purely political move by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The Paris Agreement requires each signatory country to determine, plan,

and regularly report on the contributions that it undertakes to mitigate global warming with no regard for American consumers; it places burdensome regulations on American businesses that are already employing environmentally friendly practices; and it places the cost of the Paris Agreement to supplement other nations on the backs of the moms, dads, and citizens of America.

In August 2016, President Obama unilaterally accepted the Paris Agreement under the United Nations climate change treaty. Rather than bringing it to this body, where it could be ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate, this was a blatant power grab by the executive branch encumbering America and future generations.

I had been opposed to President Obama's decision to circumvent congressional approval of the Paris Agreement from the beginning. It was a clear violation of the Constitution to leave Congress out of the approval process of an agreement that will have far-reaching implications on our economy and our citizens.

During the 114th Congress, I even introduced H.R. 544, expressing the sense of the House that the President should submit any binding international agreement on climate change to the Senate as a treaty. By accepting the Paris Agreement without congressional approval, the Obama administration made promises that are too expensive and too difficult and not science-based as far as the results. In fact, in a current hearing, it was stated that if the U.S. were to cut emissions to zero, it would not change global warming.

A report prepared by NERA Economic Consulting in 2017, found that meeting the commitments President Obama made could cost the U.S. economy \$3 trillion and 6.5 million industrial-sector jobs by 2040. There are serious concerns surrounding costs, effectiveness, and feasibility of U.S. commitments made under the Paris Agreement.

Greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. fell by 14 percent from 2005 to 2017, our manufacturing output increased 4 percent, and our energy consumption went down 2 percent. That is American leadership done by the private sector, not by government mandates or encumbering agreements.

The United States is already leading around the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This agreement does not address the world's largest carbon emission offenders, as you have heard—China and India. These countries are not held to any enforcement standards besides being required to provide a report to the United Nations every 5 years.

Again, the Paris Agreement ties the hands of the American consumers to pay for countries, like China and India, whose total commitment is, "We will try to reduce greenhouse gas emissions"—not do it, but we will try—while they continue to increase our

carbon footprints around the world, again at the cost of nearly \$3 trillion to the American consumer.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. China is building or planning to build over 700 coal-fired power plants around the world with one-fifth of these plants located in countries outside of China, making it virtually impossible for them to meet goals set in the Paris Agreement.

Additionally, of the 195 signatories, 13 countries have still not ratified the agreement, including Russia, Turkey, Yemen, Iraq, and Iran. Russia accounts for nearly 5 percent of the global greenhouse gas.

While I do believe that climate change should be addressed, I do not agree that forcing the President to remain in an agreement that had no oversight, cost-benefit analysis or stakeholder input is the right way to go.

As we continue to have discussions about how to address climate change, we should focus on solutions for the world body.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding, and I congratulate Representative CASTOR for her great leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is odd listening to the very same argument that we can't go forward with this because there is nothing to hold China or India to account because there are no requirements, and, at the same time, the very same document puts a huge burden on America by putting enforced requirements on us. It doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Chairman, for decades, the scientific community has understood the need to fundamentally transition everything about how we live, work, and move about this planet to protect life on Earth as we know it. We have known this for decades. And yet, knowing how destructive climate change is to our health, our safety, and our national security, President Trump decided to withdraw from the Paris Agreement and neglect, not just the fundamental responsibility to protect Americans, but an enormous economic opportunity.

I feel like I am listening to arguments from lobbyists from the horse and carriage industry against railroads, or for the buggy whip industry against paving roads because cars are such a threat.

President Trump made a huge mistake by backing away from the commitment we made in Paris. We are here today to correct that mistake and to steer our country back in the right direction.

We have a chance to propel economic growth with investments in zero net-energy buildings, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, expanded solar, wind, geothermal, solar thermal, and more. We can lead the world in creating good-paying, sustainable jobs.

There is no way that we can move fast enough or comprehensively enough to address climate change, but this is about more than that. This is about unleashing American innovation, creating American jobs, and restoring American leadership on the world stage.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. We must pass this bill and we must do it now, both for the sake of the climate, for our kids, and for our economy.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, which would prevent the President from rightfully withdrawing the United States from the Paris Agreement and codify President Obama's misguided and, frankly, over-the-top emissions reduction commitments.

There are two principles, I believe, that should guide our international agreements.

First, they should be fair and beneficial to the American people.

Second, they should not put the United States at a disadvantage vis-a-vis other nations of the world.

The Paris Agreement fails on both counts.

As already noted, if we implement the commitments made by the Obama administration as part of this agreement, it could cost the U.S. gross domestic product \$250 billion and eliminate 2.7 million jobs. That is hardly fair and beneficial to the American people.

As it is, the Paris Agreement allows countries to determine their own commitments, without regard to their emissions. Should this remain the case, the United States will forever be at a disadvantage to self-interested countries, like China and Russia, whose emissions continue to grow. Meanwhile, our emissions were the lowest in 2017 since 1992. Despite this, our commitments far outweigh those made by the worst greenhouse gas offenders.

I submitted an amendment that would have, at the very least, addressed the disadvantage of this agreement. My amendment would have changed the enacted date of H.R. 9 to whenever the Secretary of State could certify that Russia and China were making commitments equivalent to ours.

I regret that it was not made in order and that my colleagues across the aisle

denied us the opportunity to do right by the American people. H.R. 9 is an outrage, Mr. Chairman, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

□ 1500

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to remind my colleagues that the United States was once a global leader in pushing for climate action, but the current administration has largely abandoned our efforts to mitigate the effects of a warming world. As a result, our progress in reducing pollution has dwindled and is now reversing itself.

The Environmental Protection Agency's latest data shows that reductions in greenhouse gas pollution fell to just half a percent in 2017, and, according to the International Energy Agency, U.S. carbon dioxide pollution actually rose by 3.1 percent in 2018.

Think about that for a minute. At a time when the world desperately needs to decrease emissions, ours increased. In a year, where more dirty coal plants closed than almost any other year in history, our emissions increased. So this bill is absolutely important.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Back in 2003, 16 years ago, the Pentagon commissioned a report on how climate change would impact our ability to keep our country safe. Its conclusion? That we should move beyond scientific debate and treat ongoing ecological damage as a serious national security threat.

Our military and intelligence communities agree that climate change exacerbates conflict and instability. It weakens fragile governments, contributes to food and water insecurity, and perpetuates poverty.

These are threat multipliers, and they present real risk to U.S. interests around the globe, especially in areas vulnerable to extreme weather, such as the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa.

As a former CIA officer, I recognize that combating climate change is a national security imperative, and the first step in this fight is to keep our word to cooperate with our allies and partners in this battle. By staying in the Paris Agreement, we demonstrate that the United States takes our planet's fate seriously, keeps its word, and can be a steady partner in future agreements. Going forward, we must use our country's tremendous diplomatic, military, and economic strength as assets in this global fight.

Today, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation because our country cannot afford to abdicate its role of leadership.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today because the previous administration wanted to score political points before leaving office by saving the world for America's leadership on greenhouse gas emissions.

The former administration's chasing glory on foreign soils signed the Paris climate agreement, or, as folks back home call it, "the kill America's economy agreement so China can take my jobs."

The Constitution, Article II, Section 2, paragraph 2, sentence 1, says very clearly: "He shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The Paris Agreement looks, smells, and feels like a treaty.

The worst offender for climate change in the world, China, had their legislature approve the Paris Agreement. President Obama never sent that to the Senate for approval, and since the Paris Agreement was never approved, it has the same power as this blank piece of paper.

Here are some numbers, some facts:

From 2000 to 2014, America's global leadership has reduced our emissions by 18 percent.

From a study by the EIA, despite having an increase of 3.1 percent of CO₂ in 2017, we are down 14 percent from 1990 levels for CO₂.

Former Secretary of State John Kerry noted through negotiations from Paris that if America and all of the developed countries of the world cut their gas CO₂ emissions to zero, emissions for the world would take over, and we would still be in the same position.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, in conclusion, America does not need the Paris Agreement.

Russia needs the Paris Agreement; China needs the Paris agreement; India needs the Paris Agreement; the European Union needs the Paris Agreement.

We don't have to take this. We have proven to the world with technology and the free market, we can make this Earth cleaner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the families, vote for the local jobs—vote against H.R. 9.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me say, the whole world—not just the United States and not just China—needs to do more if we are to be spared from the worst damage of climate change.

Under Paris, China committed to leveling off its carbon emissions no later than 2030 and reducing its carbon intensity by 60 to 65 percent from 2005 levels by 2030. And that is a big step towards sustainability.

Meanwhile, global action on climate change has already spared public and

private-sector investments and green innovation. China has created the world's largest carbon market, pumped approximately three times as much money into renewables as we have, and surpassed the United States in terms of both the number of electric vehicles on the road and the number of publicly available charging stations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the distinguished chairwoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his tremendous leadership on this and so many issues.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. This piece of legislation is an extremely important first step in protecting our environment—major first step—and we have to move forward and do even more.

H.R. 9 ensures that the United States remains in the Paris Agreement and prohibits Federal funding to exit the agreement. It is critical that the United States takes the lead on addressing climate change on the world's stage.

Let me be clear. The Trump Administration is plugging their ears and pretending that climate change doesn't exist.

America was once a global leader in fighting climate change. It was our leadership that led so many nations to commit to climate action. Yet this administration has abandoned plans to address climate change and, instead, has weakened our leadership in the world. It is really shameful, and this needs to stop.

Climate change is an urgent matter. It creates more flooding and superstorms, threatening the safety of millions of Americans and people around the world.

People around our country and throughout the world are breathing in polluted and unhealthy air. Here in our own country, communities of color and low-income communities also, disproportionately, are impacted by the effects of climate change and have a lack of access to adequate healthcare services on top of that.

We owe it to our children and future generations to do more for the environment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 9 and "yes" on fighting climate change.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

America has long been the standard of leadership, freedom, and innovation. We do not allow other countries to take advantage of us.

While H.R. 9 has many issues, my opposition is founded in its attempt to strip our President of his constitutional executive authority and force us

to remain locked in an agreement that hurts American taxpayers.

After the Obama administration's international apology tour, it is a refreshing change to have a strong hand at the wheel. I am glad to see President Trump defending our exceptionalism instead of sacrificing our economy for the sake of other countries.

My colleagues across the aisle would have us believe that we are headed for doom within a decade, that Americans are behind the curve. In reality, we lead the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while other countries are growing emissions; yet America is paying the lion's share in the Paris Climate Accord.

American innovation and technological advancements are second to none. These are the same qualities of American excellence that made us the greatest country on this planet. We should not lower our standards and allow other nations to take advantage of us.

This poorly negotiated deal will do nothing to address the growing emissions from China and other industrial countries. It only hurts American jobs, especially the energy industry that employs hundreds of thousands of people in Oklahoma and brings high-paying jobs to my district. These are people who are hurt by the continuation of the Paris Climate accord.

I applaud President Trump's leadership on this issue and support his authority to remove us from the Paris climate accord.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of misinformation out there about the Paris Agreement, including the idea that it will hurt the U.S. economy. The Paris Agreement will cost little or nothing, and allowing climate change to proceed would certainly be very expensive indeed.

A raft of studies from environmental organizations, Citibank, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development all argue that a failure to mitigate the effects of climate change could cost the U.S. economy trillions of dollars. Citi found that investing in low-carbon energy to address climate change would save the world \$1.8 trillion through 2040, but not acting will cost an additional \$44 trillion by 2060.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I know climate change is real, and its impacts are already here. In New Jersey, we know those impacts all too well.

Superstorm Sandy sent an unprecedented storm surge up the Hudson and the Hackensack Rivers that destroyed homes, businesses, police departments,

and critical infrastructure that our neighbors are still digging out of this day.

These once-in-a-generation storms have a human toll. In 2017, the destruction and failed response to Hurricane Maria by the Trump Administration led to over 3,000 Americans dying—3,000.

The time for waiting is over. We need to act right now. Climate scientists are in universal agreement. Our planet is warming, and it will continue to inflict catastrophic devastation.

Military and intelligence experts have warned it is a national security threat. You are no longer going to educate Americans to hide their head in the sand.

We need to work together, one nation, as an international community.

The goals some have set above have been called overly ambitious. You bet they are ambitious. These are big problems, and Americans tackle big problems with big solutions.

Supporting H.R. 9 would do just that. It shows the world the United States is committed to the Paris Agreement, that we are serious about setting targets for carbon emissions reductions.

This agreement is the bare minimum we can do to prevent against the impacts of climate change.

We need to be serious about getting this right, that we are serious about preserving the world for our people, for our children, like my grandchildren and their grandchildren, Mr. Chairman, because that is who this is about.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say to my good friend from New Jersey that there are many of us on this side of the aisle who agree the climate is changing, and I think it is a question of how we get there and the solutions and innovation and technology.

I hope that—it will not move forward; it will be, obviously, vetoed—maybe we can work together in a bipartisan way on something that can reduce emissions using innovation technology. I personally think nuclear power should be examined as well.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

□ 1515

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. MCCAUL for his statements, and I agree with everything that was just stated. I have great respect for Chairman ENGEL and the bill's sponsor, Ms. CASTOR, and for their intentions and their advocacy. I look forward to working with them on this issue and many others because this is a very important issue for us to be working on, on both sides of the aisle in both the House and the Senate.

We all have constituents who want access to clean air and clean water. It is something that, whether you are representing a district in Flint, Michigan, or you are in Tampa, Florida, or the east end of Long Island, we all

want to advocate for that for our constituents.

I was concerned with the negotiation of the Paris climate deal, that there wasn't more discussion. There wasn't any discussion in Congress. There weren't hearings and votes. There wasn't enough of an analysis done of the impact on the economy.

There is a debate now over numbers. I wish it was fleshed out. What will be the impact on GDP? What will be the impact on jobs? What will be the impact on energy costs for my constituents? There are a lot of numbers that are going around that are very concerning to my constituents.

Other countries were having debates, and they were having votes publicly. In this case, this was not submitted to the United States Senate for ratification, and there was some discussion earlier about what happened at the House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting on this topic.

What I asked of the witnesses was: "Do any of the witnesses disagree with the statement that President Obama should have submitted it to the Senate for ratification?" That was the exact wording of my question.

If you look at the video of the response, no one disagreed. I asked: "Does anyone disagree?" No one disagreed. There was one person, Admiral McGinn, who specified that his role was military, not political.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

He said his role was military, not political, but nobody disagreed with that statement.

I believe it should have been submitted.

I also think it is outrageous that China and India are not doing more. They are emitters. China, in fact, won't even comply to reduce its carbon emissions until 2030. Many other countries that made commitments aren't fulfilling their commitments.

We needed a better deal for the world and other countries to step up and do more, more transparency and debates, and a vote here in Congress. That is in the best interests of all our constituents.

Hopefully, we can agree on the numbers and a process going forward, and we can work together on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, climate change is one of the greatest existential threats of our time. I am honored to serve on the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis with the leadership of the author of this bill, Representative CASTOR.

In Oregon, smoke from raging wildfires makes the air unhealthy to

breathe. Acidic oceans are threatening our fishing industries. Droughts and extreme weather patterns jeopardize the livelihoods of our farmers. Warmer water in the Columbia River is further threatening endangered salmon.

My home State of Oregon is one of the many States committed to meeting the Paris climate agreement targets, but climate change is a global crisis, which is why more than 175 countries have signed on to the agreement.

The Climate Action Now Act is a clear signal to our international allies and to the world that the United States, at least the United States House of Representatives, supports upholding our Nation's commitments to the planet. This is about U.S. leadership.

The cost of inaction on climate change is too high to wait any longer. We can protect the planet, unleash innovation, and create good jobs. This bill is an important first step.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chair ENGEL, Chair MCGOVERN, and Chair CASTOR for their leadership. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member McCAUL for yielding.

Mr. Chair, in my district in Pennsylvania, we are conservationists. But with this bill, H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, more appropriately known as the U.S. energy disadvantage act, the American people are being told yet again that Big Government is the solution to all of the people's problems. The American people know better than that, and they expect solutions, not more government.

The latest data is revealing. The U.S. is actually a global leader in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

In 2017, while global CO₂ emissions increased by 1.6 percent, the United States reduced its CO₂ emissions by more than 42 million tons, an annual reduction of 0.5 percent, the largest reduction of any country in the world.

The data also underscores that we have not seen this type of progress from other countries that are still part of the Paris Agreement. American leadership is ongoing while countries like Spain, Canada, India, South Korea, and China and the EU are all increasing their CO₂ emissions by 100 million tons and more.

If the U.S. stayed party to this agreement, it would be a huge and unnecessary drag on our economy that would be passed on to the American taxpayer. Moreover, it would not improve the situation, as most of the world is moving in the wrong direction.

The U.S. is reducing our emissions without the heavy hand of this Congress. This will continue, and it will be factual, as it will be measured.

We need to harness American talent and energies, not squander them with

bogus plans like the Green New Deal or ineffective climate agreements.

We need access to affordable, reliable, and clean energy sources, including natural gas, nuclear, oil, and clean coal. We need to empower our private sector to continue to innovate and develop new technologies. What we need is a true all-of-the-above and all-of-the-below energy plan.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to consider this and vote against this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairwoman ENGEL for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of the Climate Action Now Act written by my dear friend and the chairwoman of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, KATHY CASTOR. We are both blessed to represent the Tampa Bay region of Florida, which is the most economically vulnerable to climate change in the world.

For the people back home, this isn't a partisan issue. It is real. It is happening. It threatens our environment, our quality of life, and our economy.

I know there are friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle struggling with this issue, and I want to offer encouragement: Do not wait for the next 1,000-year flood to hit your district or the next freak Category 5 hurricane that explodes over warming seas right before landfall. Do not wait for the next drought-fueled firestorm to destroy one of your towns or for rising sea levels to flood the streets when it rains during high tide, as it does in parts of my district.

The time to act is yesterday. Please vote "yes."

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 9, more appropriately named the U.S. energy disadvantage act.

The bill attempts to lock us into a bad deal. While the United States is continuing to lower its emissions and to lead the world through technological innovation, other countries around the world are not meeting even their targets. Some aren't making targets. Those countries came up with targets on their own, and they still aren't living up to them.

Staying in the Paris Agreement would raise energy prices and slow economic growth without curbing emissions in a meaningful, global fashion.

Mr. Chair, we are not the ones who are polluting the air and the water. We are cleaning it up. We are doing it as a result of doing the right thing. Yet, Mr. Chair, today, the ones that are polluting greatest are doing nothing other than just being told to think up something by 2030.

Mr. Chair, our President did the right thing. We should do the same. We need

to get to work on legislating, not political messaging.

The American people sent us here to work on solutions to healthcare, infrastructure, education, the economy, and much more. Let's get to work on that, and let's encourage the nations of the world to do the right thing and get involved in doing what the United States has done already and, by the way, will continue to do.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this bill. We all should.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When President Trump announced plans to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris climate agreement in 2017, hundreds of businesses from all over the country immediately responded that it was a mistake and that they would redouble their own efforts to cut emissions.

In a separate declaration a few days later, a group called We Are Still In said that, despite Trump, they continue to support climate action. They argued that compliance with the Paris Agreement would open markets and generate jobs.

Today, We Are Still In is comprised of over 3,500 leaders, including Governors, mayors, universities, and over 1,800 companies working together to uphold America's promise to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Included in the coalition are some of the country's most successful companies, and I think you will recognize the names: Adobe, Amazon, Apple, Belkin, Ben & Jerry's, Campbell's, Chobani, Citi, DuPont, eBay, Gap, Google, The Hartford, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, Johnson & Johnson, Levi Strauss, Lyft, Mars, McDonald's, MGM Resorts International, Microsoft, and I can go on and on.

The Paris Agreement will not on its own solve our global warming problems, but it does present business and investors with a historic opportunity by signaling a new global consensus that the transition to a clean energy economy is underway.

The argument that the Paris Agreement is somehow antibusiness or will hurt our economy just doesn't hold water. So I encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to listen to American businesses and treat climate change as both the threat and opportunity that it is.

Mr. Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the overwhelming majority of scientists in the world, not just in the United States, believe that climate change is one of the major crises confronting the global community.

We went to Paris, and the world community got together and adopted an agreement that was voluntary in its implementation. No sovereignty was

given up by any nation. They said that scientists say we have a crisis and that we need to respond to it.

My friend from Michigan who spoke earlier, Mr. WALBERG, said that we ought to be focused on education, housing, healthcare, and job creation. He is right, but to ignore this problem is dangerous and unacceptable.

Climate change is perhaps one of the greatest threats we face as a nation and as a planet. Those who deny it do so at great peril to the health, security, and economic prosperity of our country.

H.R. 9 will not solve climate change. The first step in any journey does not get you there. But without it, you get nowhere.

House Democrats are laying down a marker today that we are committed to tackling this challenge with the seriousness it deserves.

Recognizing and combating climate change must be a global effort. This legislation prohibits the Trump administration from using any funds to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.

I tell my friends in the House that I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans support that proposition, as do the citizens of the world.

□ 1530

We have been the leader of the free world. Withdrawing from an agreement that was voluntarily entered into by over 170 nations shrugs off the mantle of leadership, moral and intellectual. If the United States withdraws, then we will be the only nation in the world not to be part of this historic agreement which embraces the goals previously set by our country—joined by the contribution of other nations—to reduce carbon pollution, promote technological innovation, and help avoid the most catastrophic consequences of climate change.

If we ignore the challenges of climate change, then we will also close ourselves off to opportunities to take the lead in the race to develop and deploy cleaner and more efficient technologies, which would create jobs and grow businesses and be a boon to our economy.

So I would suggest to my colleagues that those who argue against this bill argue not for economic progress, not for the creation of jobs, but exactly the opposite, and they deny the future: the future of the economy, the future of our health, the future of our environment, and the future of our children.

America, if it is to be great, must not sit on the sidelines and shrug like Atlas in confronting the rest of the world. We must act on climate change.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my dear friend, the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ENGEL, for his leadership and his strong voice on behalf of what is an international issue. It is an issue for us, but it is an international issue.

I want to thank, as well, my dear friend, Representative KATHY CASTOR,

for her leadership as chair of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and for introducing H.R. 9.

I also want to thank Chairman PALLONE and the Energy and Commerce Committee for their leadership.

There have been over 30 hearings on this issue. All concluded we must have a concerted effort to address climate change, and House Democrats will continue to do our part. But this ought to be a bipartisan vote. Every citizen—Republican, Democrat, Independent, and nonaffiliated—are going to be affected if we do not deal with climate change, and their children as well.

I look forward to bringing to the floor future legislation from our committees which seeks to tackle the climate crisis with substantive proposals, but I urge my colleagues: Let's take this first step. Let's say that we are not going to withdraw from the rest of the world. Let's say we are going to continue to lead on an issue that there is a global consensus on that we must deal with climate change. Take this step. Assert America's leadership.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished leader for his statement.

I, too, wish this were a bipartisan bill. I do. I wish it were a bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, as the ranking member of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, I found out about this from the press, not from the chairman of the committee. I found out from the press about this bill. That is not how you pursue bipartisan legislation. If there were a true attempt and a true desire to do bipartisan legislation, certainly this would have been handled differently.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman, I fully agree that the climate is changing. I agree that humans are contributing to that change. I agree that there is something that we need to do about this, and we need to be aggressive.

As we heard from scientists just yesterday in the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, they have confirmed to us that the United States can eliminate all emissions, and we are still going to see warming. We are not going to see changes in the temperature if we eliminate all of our emissions.

Mr. Chairman, China, right now, is the top emitter. They are emitting 80 percent more than the United States. As a matter of fact, Greenpeace found last year they are actually increasing their emissions. Here we are, the United States, for about the last 20 years, the largest absolute reduction in emissions of any country in the world.

The Paris accord is fundamentally flawed. It is not the solution. We can eliminate all of our emissions, Mr. Chairman, and you are going to have countries like China that are allowed, under the Paris accords, to come in and more than replace all of our emissions

reductions. That doesn't make sense, and it is not fair. This coming from a country that has already stolen trillions of dollars in intellectual property and cost this country millions of jobs.

Let me say it again: Climate change is real, and we need to take action.

This agreement is fundamentally flawed. It benefits China.

Of course other countries agree. It is on the back of the United States, the nation that spends more money on climate change science and more money on climate change technology than any other country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fundamentally flawed. This whole agreement is fundamentally flawed. China has an entirely different metric to measure their emissions reduction than the United States, and they don't even have to reduce a single degree of emissions until after 2030.

Mr. Chairman, this is a flawed bill, and I urge rejection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, which preserves our Nation's commitment to the Paris Agreement and keeps our promise to the American people to take meaningful action on climate change.

The Paris Agreement paved the way for our Nation to develop a robust plan for cutting emissions which both threaten public health and contribute to global climate change. Part of this plan was to clean up the transportation sector, now the largest single source of emissions in the country.

My home State of California was critical in the effort to establish more stringent vehicle emissions standards. When the administration irresponsibly chose to abandon part of this plan by rolling back Obama-era vehicle emissions standards, I introduced legislation that would protect these standards and the benefits that they ultimately bring to our communities.

I am pleased to see so many of my congressional colleagues join me in proposing meaningful solutions to combat climate change, but we must do more. We must act together as a nation to lead the way.

Our Nation cannot afford to cede its international leadership. By not participating in the Paris Agreement, we risk irreversible damage to our planet and endanger the American people.

I think about my grandchildren, Anna and Robby. It is their future I am thinking about. They will be greatly impacted if we don't do something now.

Tackling climate change is and always has been my top priority. We must act now to mitigate the effects of climate change before it is too late. I have spent the last decade helping lead on this effort, and I am immensely pleased to be able to support the Climate Action Now Act on the floor today.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, let's be clear. We must have a global approach to the climate crisis, but giving a pass to countries like China and India subverts that process. Look at their record. Since 2001, there has been a 290 percent increase in emissions; India, 235. We have got a negative 16. We are reducing that.

So because of their miserable record of curtailing greenhouse gases, we still, in America, across the country, in rural areas, are going to face droughts, wildfires, and sea level rise. Because of India and China, experts are saying that Miami, Florida, and Baltimore are still going to flood.

So let's be honest. The Paris accord is really nothing more about political theater than actually addressing climate change.

Instead, we should have an agreement that is enforceable with legally binding targets and specific financial support that provides for liability or compensation for damages that could be caused and an understanding that global communities are still fossil fuel driven.

America should not unilaterally transform our energy policies while gambling that other nations will voluntarily—and I underscore that, voluntarily—reduce their emissions. History and past agreements indicate other nations are not following the lead of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” on H.R. 9.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to start off by saying that I respect the chairman. I respect his point of view, and I respect the arguments that have been made on this floor. I believe they are genuine. I believe that most Members of this Chamber agree that climate change is real and that climate change presents a risk.

I sat down with a scientist from NASA, which is in my home State. We talked about the data. He said: I am not a policymaker. Here is the data. Here is what is going to happen if we do nothing.

But I think, as the majority leader said, H.R. 9 does not solve this problem.

You have heard from my side of the aisle very genuine arguments about the cost to the economy, the fact that we have reduced our emissions but countries like China and India have doubled theirs. We want to get something done to solve this crisis, and I admit it is a crisis.

This bill is a messaging bill. It is a feel-good bill. It won't get through the Senate. It will be vetoed by the White House. I submit to all those listening to this debate that when that happens,

we work on something real, that is bipartisan.

We heard the ranking member from the new House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis say that he found out about this bill in the press. That is no way to lead a bipartisan effort in the Congress.

So when this fails, and it will, I submit we go back to the drawing board and do things that we know do work, and that is let's work on innovation, clean energy technologies, and, yes, nuclear power.

We are showing we are being a leader reducing our emissions while other countries are not. Let's lead by example. Let's come back with some real legislation that is going to make a difference, reduce emissions, and get us out of this crisis.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say that I am very glad that the Foreign Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over this bill.

I would also like to note for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we have three additional Members who intended to cosponsor H.R. 9, Congresswoman KAPTUR, Congresswoman GABBARD, and Congresswoman UNDERWOOD.

Let me also say that I include in the RECORD 9 letters in support of H.R. 9. Specifically, I have letters from a group of four dozen environmental organizations led by Oxfam; the Sierra Club; the Union of Concerned Scientists and others; the League of Conservation Voters; The Wilderness Society; EDF Action, which is an advocacy partner of the Environmental Defense Fund; BlueGreen Alliance, which is a coalition of the Nation's largest labor unions and environmental groups; the United Steelworkers; E2, which is a nonpartisan group of environmental entrepreneurs from across the country; Ceres and its BICEP Network, which is the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy; the We Are Still In coalition, which is made up of over 3,750 U.S. businesses, cities, States, Tribes, colleges, universities, investors, faith groups, cultural institutions, and healthcare organizations; the NAACP; leading public health and medical organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and the Allergy & Asthma Network; and the American College of Physicians.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters across the country, we urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, to ensure the U.S. meets its commitments under the Paris Agreement and to reinforce our national resolve to address climate change.

The Paris Agreement is a global response to the greatest environmental challenge of our time. It includes, for the first time, specific commitments from all major countries and a pathway for each country to strengthen its own domestic climate actions in the years ahead. United States leadership and

participation was crucial in bringing the world together to act. But now, by threatening to exit the agreement, the Trump administration risks isolating itself, undermining global climate action, and weakening America's international influence on a broad array of critical foreign policy issues.

Americans are experiencing climate change here and now in a rising tide of extreme weather disasters, from hurricanes in the southeast, to wildfires in the west, to flooding right now in the country's heartland. It's no surprise that polls consistently show that concern over the climate crisis is rising across generational, geographic, and partisan lines.

Americans' personal experience is underscored by a raft of new scientific reports. Last fall the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed that climate change is already happening, and ambitious action to curb carbon pollution is needed starting now to stave off steadily worsening impacts in the U.S. and across the globe. The last four years have been the hottest on record since global measurements began in 1880, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And the National Climate Assessment—prepared by 13 federal agencies and released by the Trump Administration last year—lays out the stark reality of current climate impacts in all regions of the nation and projects how much worse they could get.

Without significant global action, the National Climate Assessment concludes: "rising temperatures, sea level rise, and changes in extreme events are expected to increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property, labor productivity, and the vitality of our communities." "[C]oastal economies and property are already at risk," especially communities disproportionately comprised of low-income and minority Americans. In short, climate change is already here in America and it's already harming Americans' lives.

Despite these dire forecasts, we can still stave off the worst effects of climate change. Congressional leadership is more important than ever, and the Climate Action Now Act will go a long way to ensure that the United States fulfills our commitments under the Paris Agreement and stays on the path to serious action on climate change.

This legislation demonstrates leadership and vision needed to tackle the climate crisis. We urge you to support the Climate Action Now Act to help make the future climate safe for our children and grandchildren and honor America's commitments to help confront this global challenge.

Signed,

Alaska Wilderness Action, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, Arizona Parks and Recreation Association, Blue Future, Bold Alliance, Chispa, Chispa Arizona, Citizens' Climate Lobby, Clean Water Action, Climate Hawks Vote, Climate Law & Policy Project.

Climate Reality Project, Colorado Farm and Food Alliance, Conservation Colorado, Defend Our Future, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation, Elders Climate Action, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America.

Environment Colorado, Environment North Carolina, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Justice Center of Chestnut Hill United Church, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Gasp, Green The Church, GreenLatinos, Hispanic Access Foundation, Hispanic Federation.

Interfaith Power & Light, Kids Climate Action Network, League of Conservation Voters,

League of Women Voters of the United States, National Hispanic Medical Association, National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, NC League of Conservation Voters, Oxfam America.

Partnership for Policy Integrity, Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, The Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah (HEAL Utah), The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Union of Concerned Scientists, Voices for Progress, World Wildlife Fund.

LCV,

April 26, 2019.

Re Support H.R. 9, Climate Action Now Act.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

We write in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. This important legislation honors America's commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement, recognizes the urgency of tackling climate change, and lays the groundwork for further action.

Climate change is already having devastating impacts on communities across the country and the world. More extreme storms, record-breaking floods, and raging wildfires are hurting our families and even taking people's lives. It is unacceptable that these impacts and the burden of toxic pollution hit lower income, communities of color, and Indigenous peoples first and worst. Poll after poll shows that an overwhelming majority of voters—across ideological lines—want strong action on clean energy and climate solutions.

H.R. 9 is a strong rebuke of the Trump Administration's denial of the climate crisis, efforts to undermine progress, and ill-conceived decision to become the only country in the world to reject the landmark Paris Climate Agreement. In response to this utter failure of leadership, governors, mayors, universities, businesses, faith leaders, and investors are stepping up to support climate action to meet this agreement.

This momentum is only growing. Just this year, six new governors have joined the U.S. Climate Alliance, bringing the total to 23 states and territories committed to meeting the Paris Climate Agreement's goals. New Mexico Governor Lujan Grisham signed into law legislation that moves the state's electricity to 100% carbon free by 2045. Governors Walz (MN), Evers (WI), and Mills (ME) have all announced plans to move their state to 100% clean energy. After passing both chambers unanimously, Nevada Governor Sisolak signed into law legislation moving the state to 50% renewable energy by 2030. The Washington state legislature just passed a 100% clean energy bill, the Maryland legislature passed a 50% clean energy bill by 2030, and a comprehensive 100% clean energy package has been introduced in Illinois.

After eight years of the Republican leadership in the U.S. House taking us backwards in the fight against climate change, we are thrilled to see this important first step in the right direction and LCV urges you to SUPPORT H.R. 9. We will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2019 Scorecard. If you need more information, please

call my office and ask to speak with a member of our government relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,
April 2, 2019.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,

Chair, House Committee on Energy & Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,

Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy & Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE, RANKING MEMBER WALDEN, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY & COMMERCE: On behalf of The Wilderness Society's over one million members and supporters, I write in support of H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act. This legislation would take a necessary and welcome step to reestablish the United States as a global leader and to tackle climate change at the scale required to avert the worst impacts of this crisis. The Wilderness Society urges you to vote for H.R. 9 when it is marked up in committee later this week.

Climate change represents the greatest threat facing our public lands and the communities that depend on them, from America's thawing Arctic to regions devastated by extreme drought and wildfire. President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change was a misguided step back from the kind of leadership the world expects of America. By deliberately undermining the global agreement and reversing policies to address U.S. emissions, President Trump has moved the United States and the world in the wrong direction at precisely the moment we need accelerated progress. H.R. 9 represents a much-needed step to confront the climate crisis by taking steps to prevent formal withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and requiring the Administration to develop a plan to meet national greenhouse gas targets.

The Wilderness Society believes that our 640 million acres of public lands can and must play a prominent role in addressing climate change in a comprehensive, sustainable and equitable way. We have a significant opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel energy development on public lands, which currently accounts for more than 20% of all U.S. emissions, and support responsibly-sited renewable energy projects. We must also protect large, connected landscapes, including our forests, deserts and other wild places that can help species adapt, store carbon, and provide natural infrastructure to safeguard communities from intensifying storms and extreme weather events. H.R. 9 takes an important first step in establishing a framework that allows for our public lands to be part of the climate solution, and no longer a significant contributor to the United States' carbon footprint.

The Wilderness Society looks forward to seeing passage of this bill, without amendment, as a first step in solving the climate crisis, and we welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to make public lands part of our national solution to climate change.

Sincerely,

DREW MCCONVILLE,
Senior Managing Director of Government Relations, The Wilderness Society.

[From EDF Action]

H.R. 9: THE CLIMATE ACTION NOW ACT

The Climate Action Now Act is a much-needed step toward reasserting American global leadership in the fight to solve climate change.

This bill gives Congress the opportunity to take common sense action against one of our country's most dangerous threats.

We need immediate action to reduce climate pollution and move our country toward 100% clean energy across the economy by 2050.

Taking action on climate change is necessary to:

- Protect our health and our kids' future,
- Strengthen the U.S. economy through innovation and investment,
- Protect against trillions of dollars in damages,
- Allow America to lead the next technological and energy revolution.

WHAT IS THE PARIS AGREEMENT?

In 2015 in a historic breakthrough, virtually every country in the world came together and committed to addressing climate change by reducing emissions. The announcement, known as Paris Agreement, allows each country to make its own plan to fight pollution.

A recommitment to the goals of the Paris Agreement would show the world that America takes its promise to cut pollution seriously, encourage other nations to honor their climate pledges as well, and give America a stronger voice in ongoing climate negotiations.

AMERICANS SUPPORT CLIMATE ACTION

The Trump administration has surrendered American leadership in the fight against climate change, isolating our country, and ignoring two-thirds of Americans who support climate action.

Recommitting to the Paris Agreement goals follows the lead of the over 3,500 elected officials, and tribal, university, businesses, and faith leaders, representing millions of Americans, who have pledged to continue to support climate action.

BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE,

April 30, 2019.

Re BlueGreen Alliance Supports H.R. 9, Climate Action Now Act.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a coalition of the nation's largest labor unions and environmental groups, collectively representing millions of members and supporters, we write to express the BlueGreen Alliance's support for H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

The United States' adoption of the Paris Agreement was an historic step to lead in the fight against global climate change. The Trump Administration's stated intention to withdraw from this agreement is a mistake with dire consequences for the United States and the rest of the world. The effects of climate change are already being felt in communities across the country in the form of more frequent and severe extreme weather events, wildfires, droughts, and rising sea levels.

Removing the United States from the Agreement would be an abdication of our nation's responsibility to the world and to future generations to lead in the fight against climate change. Our country can and should lead the world in driving the significant economic growth and job creation that can result from clean energy technologies and infrastructure required to reduce climate change-driving pollution. The Paris Agreement holds all countries accountable for

their emissions, and is a critical tool at our disposal to create a level playing field for U.S.-based manufacturing in the race against our global economic competitors to build the clean technologies of the future.

America is currently meeting the challenge of making our energy, transportation, and other systems cleaner and more efficient. We have already begun putting millions of people to work in jobs designing, manufacturing, and installing the clean energy technology and infrastructure needed to reduce the pollution that is driving climate change. At the same time, we must ensure that the jobs we're building in new clean technologies are quality, family-sustaining jobs. Additionally, we must address the challenges of this transition to ensure that no communities or workers are left behind by making available the tools and resources for workers to transition to new, good jobs and for communities to diversify their local and regional economies and create new opportunities.

Ultimately, we have everything we need to meet our commitment made in the Paris Agreement. American innovation has the potential to lead the world in solving our environmental problems while creating good jobs for workers.

The Climate Action Now Act recognizes this reality and would block President Trump's dangerous threat to remove the United States from the Paris Agreement and require the Administration to create a plan that demonstrates how the U.S. will go about meeting our commitments for climate change mitigation. By addressing climate change the right way—with investments in infrastructure and job training, and developing technologies of the future—our country can lead the world in driving the significant economic growth and job creation that comes from the design, manufacturing, and installation of the clean energy economy. For these reasons, BlueGreen Alliance urges Congress to swiftly pass this legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL WILLIAMS,
Interim Co-Executive Director,
BlueGreen Alliance.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,

April 2, 2019.

Re United Steelworkers support H.R. 9, Climate Action Now Act.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), we urge you to support the Climate Action Now Act (H.R. 9). This simple and straightforward legislation prevents the Trump Administration from withdrawing from the Paris Agreement and requires a plan for the United States to meet its emissions targets.

In our union's 1990 report titled *Our Children's World*, we stated that, "[Climate change] may be the single greatest problem we face." The situation has become more urgent, and for many years the United States has been a leader in innovation and technology to combat this crisis.

The Paris Agreement is an ambitious, non-binding, and transparent achievement in the global fight against climate change. The President's 2017 announcement of his intent to withdraw was reckless and opposed by labor, environmental, and business leaders. Withdrawal would be an inexcusable blow to the U.S. economy, as the diplomatic and trade impacts would be felt for years.

We applaud the House Democratic Leadership for introducing H.R. 9 to reverse this Administration's decision. We urge all mem-

bers to support the Climate Action Now Act (H.R. 9).

Sincerely,

LEO W. GERARD,
International President.

APRIL 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,

Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: We are members of the Leaders Circle of the largest coalition ever assembled for climate action in the United States, and are among the over 3,750 U.S. businesses, cities, states, tribes, colleges and universities, investors, faith groups, cultural institutions, and health care organizations who declared "We Are Still In" the Paris Agreement and the fight against climate change.

Since We Are Still In launched two years ago, more and more American leaders have stepped forward to declare their support for the global solution to climate change. Our 3,750 signatories come from all fifty states, represent half of the U.S. population and over half of the U.S. economy.

In that time, the science around climate change has only become increasingly clear. Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change detailed the dire global consequences of allowing global temperature increases to exceed 2.7° F/1.5° C. Similarly, the National Climate Assessment detailed that the impacts of climate change are already impacting every place and walk of life in the United States. Our future is at stake.

For these reasons, we endorse H.R. 9: Climate Action Now Act, which advances our commitment to address climate change and support the Paris Agreement, and hope that leaders from both sides will choose to stand behind the legislation. It is in America's best interest to improve our global leadership and reputation on this issue by honoring our contribution to the Paris Agreement.

For our part, we will continue our commitment to tackling climate change by reducing our emissions and working together for a broad transformation of the U.S. economy. We look forward to welcoming strong, smart, national policies to address the climate challenge while unleashing substantial economic and public health benefits.

Sincerely,

Bishop Marc Andrus, The Episcopal Church; Richard Beam, Chief Environmental Officer, Providence St Joseph Health; Mayor Jim Brainard, City of Cannel, Indiana; Alison Brown, President and CEO, Science Museum of Minnesota; President Michael Crow, Arizona State University; President David Finegold, Chatham University; President Dianne Harrison, California State University—Northridge; Mayor Keith A. James, City of West Palm Beach, Florida; President Mark Mitsui, Portland Community College; President Fawn Sharp, Quinault Indian Nation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, April 26, 2019.

Re NAACP Strong support for H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support and vote in favor of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The earth's climate is now changing faster than at any point in

the history of modern civilization, primarily as a result of human activities, and as the effects of climate change intensify, so too will the stark differences in consequences experienced by the privileged and the disadvantaged. Low-income populations and in America people of color will suffer more dire repercussions because of climate change.

From Hurricane Katrina in 2005, to the more recent flooding in Houston due to Hurricane Harvey in 2017, as well as numerous other weather-related catastrophes including heat waves, hurricanes, cyclones, and floods we have witnessed the inconceivable loss of life and property that can be caused by more dangerous weather systems. The increased ferocity of these storms is but one result of climate change, yet it perhaps offers us the best insight into its disparate impact. Low income Americans and racial and ethnic minorities have fewer resources with which they can prepare for, defend against, or use to clean up after a disaster.

While H.R. 9 does not offer the resources which are necessary to defend against a crisis situation, it does make it less likely that we will be faced with catastrophes on the scale to which we are growing sadly increasingly accustomed. Specifically, H.R. 9 would require that the United States remain a partner in and part of the 2016 Paris agreement on climate change. The United States was once a global leader in pushing for climate action, but we have recently lost our way. As a result, our progress and that of some other nations in reducing emissions has dwindled and is now reversing itself.

There is not time to waste: we need to take decisive action to address this increasing problem while we still can. It is not an understatement to say that our future depends upon it. Please support and vote for H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, and urge your colleagues in the other body, as well, as the President, to take the threat of climate change seriously. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at my office.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP Washington Bureau and
Senior Vice President for Policy and
Advocacy.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned public health and medical organizations urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The bill would help ensure that the United States adheres to the science-based targets in the Paris Agreement and develops a plan to meet them, both essential steps to protecting public health from the impacts of climate change.

Climate change is a public health emergency. The science clearly shows that communities across the nation are experiencing the health impacts of climate change, including enhanced conditions for ozone and particulate air pollution, which cause asthma attacks, cardiovascular disease and premature death; increased instances of extreme heat, severe storms and other destabilizing weather patterns that disrupt people's access to essential healthcare; increased spread of vector-borne diseases; and longer and more intense allergy seasons. These threats are no longer hypothetical, and Americans across the country have experienced them firsthand.

Every American's health is at risk due to climate change, but some populations are at greater risk, including infants, children, seniors, pregnant women, low-income communities, some communities of color, people with disabilities and many people with chronic diseases. Evidence and experience shows that these populations will disproportionately

bear the health impacts of climate change without concerted action to both mitigate and adapt to climate change.

The science is also clear that limiting increase in global temperatures to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius is essential. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found dramatic differences in health impacts between 1.5 and 2 degrees, including in heat-related morbidity and mortality, ozone-related mortality, and vector-borne diseases. The Paris Agreement's goals are to keep the world well under 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to further stay below 1.5 degrees.

H.R. 9 is an important step toward what must become a comprehensive set of policies protect public health from the worst impacts of climate change. The nation urgently needs to implement strong, science-based measures to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The U.S. must also invest in health adaptation strategies to help communities address the varied health impacts they are already facing.

On behalf of the patients and communities we serve, we urge you to vote YES on H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Sincerely,

Allergy & Asthma Network, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Children's Environmental Health Network, Climate for Health, Health Care Climate Council, Health Care Without Harm.

National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Environmental Health Association, National Medical Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Public Health Institute.

□ 1545

Mr. ENGEL. I think that it is very clear to say that this is a broad-based bill, and I do hope that we will pass it. We have the ability to work together to do it.

I thank the ranking member for his offer to work together. We have a tradition of doing that on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and we will do it again.

But climate change, global warming, is a factor. We can put our heads in the sand like an ostrich and pretend it is not there, but it is there and it is big; and if we don't do something about it soon, we are all going to pay the price in the future.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote for this important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement is unjustified and, I believe, dangerous. It abdicates U.S. leadership on climate action and puts the health and safety of our communities at great risk. It also jeopardizes our national and economic security.

We can't live in the past. China, the EU, and others are moving towards a low-carbon economy, building solar panels, wind turbines, and cornering the market on renewable industries.

We can and should be a leader in that transition so that our industries, our

workers, and our communities benefit from the new opportunities created.

The United States has always been at the forefront in the creation of new technologies and new jobs; but, rather than leading right now, President Trump and his administration are simply sticking their heads in the sand, acting like this is the 19th century.

We have to be future oriented, not live in the past, or we will simply be left behind.

The President is actually making the climate crisis worse. The Trump administration gutted regulations to control methane pollution from the oil and gas sector, rolled back stronger fuel efficiency standards for vehicles, and illegally blocked improved appliance efficiency standards.

These actions led to a rise in greenhouse gas emissions last year.

Now, back in my district, I want you to understand, this is not a partisan issue. Everyone sees the harm climate change is doing to our shoreline, our oceans, and the health and well-being of our residents.

States and local governments are taking action on climate change. They are concerned about the health of their constituents, asthmatics who are negatively impacted by dirty air, cancers that are aggravated by increased toxicity.

I have a lot of Republican mayors and county and State legislators, and I don't know one of those Republican mayors or elected officials who thinks that the Federal Government should withdraw from climate action.

It is the cost of inaction that is really painful. We have all seen them. In 2017, the United States experienced 16 natural disasters with costs totaling \$360 billion. Superstorm Sandy hit my district very hard.

But I want to say that we still have time to avoid a deeper climate crisis, while strengthening and modernizing our economy at the same time, and H.R. 9 is an important step in that regard.

So—please—I call on my colleagues, I beg my colleagues, let's take this opportunity to prevent the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and, at the same time, call upon this administration to come up with ways of achieving the goal of the Paris Agreement.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, today is, unfortunately, more about the politics of climate change than actually rolling up our sleeves and getting to work on American solutions.

Climate change is real, but addressing climate change should not involve binding ourselves to international agreements that put United States workers and jobs at a disadvantage to our main competitors around the world and with no regard to the cost for American consumers and ratepayers.

We should have a serious, solutions-oriented discussion about how to address climate change risks through

American innovation, American conservation, and preparation.

But we all know that long-term, sustainable policy is best developed through a thoughtful, logical, and strong bipartisan process. That is the approach we have taken over the last several Congresses as Republicans and one I think we should continue in this Congress.

In fact, in the last Congress, Republicans worked with Democrats to remove regulatory barriers to new technological advances in power generation, from hydropower to small modular nuclear, from tax policies that actually encourage carbon capture and storage to reforms of the Nation's electric grid.

There are many bipartisan policies Congress could further pursue to accelerate innovation and to create industrial, electrical, and technological infrastructure that actually will enable cleaner energy systems for the future; such as, furthering advanced nuclear reactor technologies, easing the permitting of clean-energy infrastructure, and modernizing our electric grid.

We need to do all of those, Mr. Chairman.

We can also look to better management of our Federal forests to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfires, which choke the communities, like those in my home State of Oregon, with smoke and fill our atmosphere with untold pollutants.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that sustainably managing our Federal forests—in fact, all forests—will create the longest sustained carbon mitigation benefit. Those are the findings of the U.N. IPCC.

But H.R. 9, it just does not represent that kind of bipartisan policy that we should be considering today. This bill is being considered, frankly, without the benefit of regular order in any committee of jurisdiction. It has no companion in the United States Senate.

H.R. 9 represents the Democrats' reflexive response to the President's June 1, 2017, announcement that the U.S. would withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

Now, the Obama administration's commitments in Paris were made without a clear plan to even meet those provisions, without a full view of the costs to American consumers, and certainly without a strategy that had broad bipartisan support from Congress.

Further, H.R. 9's unquestioning focus on U.S. domestic action ignores the evidence that the bulk of the future global emissions growth will be in China, it will be in India and the rest of the developing world.

If implemented, it would lock in the United States to expensive commitments that will harm consumers; our communities; and, frankly, our economic security.

Republicans offered a number of amendments to debate these matters,

but, unfortunately, most of those amendments were rejected by Democrats.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are serious about reducing emissions and addressing other climate change risks, and doing so quickly, they would acknowledge the reality of global energy needs. They would acknowledge that the United States is reducing greenhouse gas emissions through innovation and through technological development, frankly, better than any country on the planet.

That is what we are doing as Americans. That is what we do. We innovate. We lead. And we are doing that in emissions reduction; we are doing that with new energy technologies; and that is where we should be focused as a Congress to incentivize those going forward.

Now, instead of spending a week of precious legislative time talking about a bill that, frankly, has little teeth, will never move in the Senate, would get vetoed by the President if it ever got to his desk, we could be legislating on how to ease the overly burdensome hydropower licensing process.

The Northwest is a great place for hydroelectricity. We know a lot about it, and it has zero carbon emissions.

Or we could be passing bills that support nuclear energy. You look at the small modular nuclear technologies that are on the cusp of an energy future for baseload power, and you understand just what that could be, with no emissions.

We could either do that through licensing reform or through these advanced technologies.

Let's focus on the new technology necessary for future energy systems, for future transportation systems, for advances in manufacturing and industry to emit fewer greenhouse gases. That is what we should be doing.

Let's work together on the bills that are going to lead to ribbon-cutting ceremonies for new energy infrastructure or to an American getting a new, well-paid job in the energy industry.

That infrastructure could be a wind farm. It could be a natural gas pipeline. That new job could be as a solar installer, or it could be a nuclear engineer.

I am not talking about picking winners and losers here when it comes to energy, the environment, or the climate. I am talking about unleashing American innovators to do what they do best, and that is develop new and better technologies that benefit consumers, benefit the environment, and benefit the good, old United States of America.

So we should reject H.R. 9 and focus on realistic solutions to prepare for the future and on policies that work for the American public.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee,

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me 2 minutes.

We are here today to talk about a global problem that demands a global solution. Since the Industrial Revolution, a significant amount of carbon has been building up in the atmosphere; and, until just recently, the United States was the number one emitter of carbon pollution.

As China ramped up its emissions, we lost that dubious title, but we are still dumping massive amounts of carbon into the atmosphere.

This carbon in the atmosphere has caused energy to accumulate in the oceans and the skies, and that is now causing changes in our environment. And these changes will continue to grow.

The global solution we need is one that the United States actually had a hand in crafting. We led the efforts in the development and adoption of the Paris climate accord; but now, because of this administration's decision, we are telling the world to do as we say, not as we do.

The Paris climate accord is one of the most comprehensive deals to date and is a worldwide agreement to begin reducing carbon emissions. It is the important first step in the battle to stop the dangerous spiral of climate change.

If we retreat from the Paris accord, we are condemning future generations to a world filled with catastrophic climate change and conflict.

H.R. 9 will help heal this rift by putting us in alignment with the rest of the global community and holding us to standards that we helped put in place.

My Republican colleagues say they believe in climate change but have always refused action.

The Paris climate agreement is action. Let's get with the program.

The United States has led by example, so, today, I inform my colleagues: Adopt H.R. 9. Don't make us the past villain for future generations.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, put simply, this legislation forces President Trump's hand to carry out the goals of his predecessor, but this administration was elected to tackle our energy issues differently, our environmental issues differently.

Americans asked for this change in direction. And we got that last Congress, where Republicans worked with this administration to find creative ways to streamline the development and use of all of our energy sources and technologies.

We examined grid modification issues, looked at ways to encourage the creation and adoption of advanced nuclear energy, along with creative ways to encourage new coal and natural gas technologies.

We looked at how market forces are driving new energy technologies and

how the Federal Government can play a supportive role in that advancement, not pick winners and losers.

I worry that today's legislation could bring us back to a prescriptive approach to our Federal energy policy. It could cause significant ratepayer hikes on families and small businesses in eastern and southeastern Ohio who simply cannot absorb higher electric bills.

H.R. 9 was rushed through our committees. The Energy and Commerce Committee held no hearings on it, but simply a full committee markup. Members had no time to debate it—only vote.

E&C Democrat leadership even expressed frustration over the expedited pace of this bill.

Because of these reasons and the issues raised by my colleagues, I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 9.

□ 1600

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, that is laid before this House now for final consideration.

“The Earth's climate is now changing faster than at any point in the history of modern civilization.” This is a direct quote from the Fourth National Climate Assessment issued by our top scientists from across 13 government agencies.

Sea levels are rising; average temperatures are warming; ice is disappearing; and extreme weather is intensifying and becoming more frequent. And we know that in this Chamber, because we are dealing with the consequences of the hurricanes, the fires, too often because of our constituents that are being hurt.

We know this is affecting the lives of growing numbers of Americans all across the country. And even as I stand here, right now, we have floods in my district.

Climate change is an urgent, existential threat we all face, and bold action is demanded at this moment. We have to act together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans.

We don't change treaties. We don't change things because we have had a change in who has been elected President. We respect that office. The consequences of inaction are real, and not only are future generations put at risk each day if we do nothing, so are we.

This begins by ensuring America honors its commitment under the Paris Agreement. Withdrawing is not the answer.

The Climate Action Now Act would simply prevent the United States from using Federal dollars to withdraw from the Paris Agreement; and calls on the President to develop and make public a plan for how the United States will

meet its nationally-determined contributions submitted to the world in 2015.

The bill is technology-neutral, so the President has the flexibility to set climate policies and marshal renewable forms of energy. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, President Trump has made clear what climate action he doesn't like. He doesn't like the Paris Agreement, which contemplated that every nation in the world would set a target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

He doesn't like the Clean Power Plan, which encouraged each State to create its own strategy to lower greenhouse gas emissions. And he doesn't like the CAFE standards that required automakers to lower emissions from cars and trucks.

Now, last month, the President's own EPA administrator came to the Energy and Commerce Committee, and he testified, and he agreed that climate change is happening, and that it is driven largely by human activity.

So the question is, what climate action does President Trump support? And that is the point of the Climate Action Now Act, which simply invites the President to tell us his strategy.

Now, there are many options, many bipartisan options, many mentioned by my colleague from Oregon, Mr. WALDEN. These are increasing research into energy storage technologies, pricing carbon, incentivizing more renewable energy, requiring or incentivizing energy efficiency, easing regulation for developing renewables, developing carbon capture and negative emissions technology, or investing in resiliency and more.

And we don't even need the President to draft new ideas. We have got existing bills from the last Congress and from this Congress we have assembled into The Climate Playbook, which you can find right on my Congressional website.

Mr. President, we get that you don't like President Obama's climate action ideas. Now tell us your climate action plans.

I encourage each of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in making that request to President Trump by supporting and passing H.R. 9. Congress has a Climate Playbook.

Mr. President, tell us yours.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SABLAN). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) to speak on this matter.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I am probably going to be a little different than some of the folks you are

going to have come speak from our side. I actually, though, like the goal that we agreed to, or the President agreed to in 2015.

I believe it is an abdication, though, of our responsibility to actually build what the plan is—we will call it the smorgasbord of options out there—because, if you think about it, once again, it is Congress passing the buck saying, well, here's the goal; let someone else take the blows of it.

So if we are going to have an honest conversation, let's say I am a State that uses heating oil. Heating oil is functionally filthy. Okay. Are you willing to encourage that community, that State, to allow more natural gas extraction, more pipelines so we can actually hit the numbers? Or is it easier passing it on to the White House to let them take the slings and arrows of what it takes policy-wise?

If you actually look at the reality, 2015, the year that President Obama agreed to this, that year, every functioning benefit from all of the solar that was adopted in 2015 was removed because of the amount of nuclear that went offline that year. Are we ready here to step up and say, hey, if we want baseload, clean, non-CO₂, non-greenhouse emitting, we are going to step up and get this nuclear back online, because it is a type—just that 1 year of the number of nuclear facilities that closed equaled every solar panel in the country that was added.

Are we willing to continue to do as we did in Ways and Means last year, moving forward with carbon sequestration tax credits?

Turns out there is some new amazing technology of mining CO₂ right out of the air. There is a utility scale, industrial scale facility going up in Canada now that has broken the Holy Grail on the code on how to do it. These are pro-growth policies that we, as this body, should be adopting, not passing it off to the bureaucracy and the administration to make the hard choices.

Understand, we did some math a couple of years ago that, if we would do a pipeline loop in West Texas to capture methane flare-off, capture that gas and make it—utilize it, it had a huge effect in getting us, like right now, that last 13 points of gap that we have to get in the next 7 years.

How many of my brothers and sisters on the other side are ready to stand up and promote more natural gas, more pipelines, more tax credit mechanisms for carbon sequestration? Those are policy decisions. That is our job here in the House.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the chairman of our Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership as chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Certainly, as chair of the Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, I understand the prioritization that we need to make as a House with climate change. We are doing it with this caucus, with the Democratic Caucus. We have languished without a policy or hearings in the committee for quite some time and, finally, the Democrats are showing their forcefulness.

Global problems require global cooperation, and we accept this as a given when it comes to countless security, health, and economic challenges. And climate change will impact all of these areas, and more.

But global climate action will not succeed without America at the table, leading by example. Other nations understand this, as do thousands of United States cities, businesses, universities, and nonprofit organizations.

That is why the “We Are Still In” campaign was formed, and why its many members support this bill. The contributions of subnational actors can achieve two-thirds of our 2025 national commitment, but we need Federal action to fill the gap.

President Trump has made it clear that he does not appreciate the previous administration’s policies to achieve America’s Paris target. Therefore, Mr. President, we have a very fair question of you. What is your plan?

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taken the opposite approach, throwing up their hands and saying this bill is a waste of time because the President would veto it.

I could not disagree more. This vote will show the American people and the international community who in Washington understands and acknowledges the threat of climate change; who recognizes the importance of building global cooperation to address it; and who will work to enact the policies that will result in a safer, healthier planet, a planet that will be safer for future generations.

Based on the President’s statements, the answer is clearly, not him. And the clock is ticking.

I hope next time we are on the floor, we will be debating concrete solutions that will lead to meaningful emissions reductions and accelerate the clean energy transition. We can start that process today by stating in clear and resounding fashion: We Are Still in. Support this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, at the heart of America’s economic prosperity and unrivaled security is an abundant, affordable and reliable supply of domestic energy.

The lion’s share of America’s energy supply, nearly 90 percent, comes from fossil energy resources, and the hardworking energy producers of West Texas are leading the way. This is thanks to the great American work ethic, entrepreneurial spirit, and drive for innovation.

In the Permian Basin in West Texas, we went from producing a million barrels of oil a day in 2012 to four million today, and we are on a path to producing 8 million barrels a day within just a few years.

The blessings of these natural resources have allowed us to become the most powerful and prosperous nation on the face of the planet. It has allowed us to build the largest middle class in the world; helped us to produce the new technologies and innovations that have improved the quality of life and given us the highest standard of living in the world.

It has been the lifeblood of this land of opportunity, where we now have more jobs than we actually have people to fill them.

Having an abundant supply of energy doesn’t just fuel this economy. It also is an overwhelming advantage in terms of national security. Energy independence gives us choices that many nations would be envious of. It allows us to export that same freedom to our allies and to democracies around the world.

Forcing our President to stay in this terrible deal would undermine many of those advantages, and it would penalize the American people, and cost hundreds of billions of dollars. It would cost us millions of jobs.

At best, the Paris Agreement is a feel-good-do-nothing political window dressing, at best. At worst, it is a tax on the middle and working class. It is a millstone around the neck of our job creators. And it is a gift to our enemies, and we must oppose it.

It would punish the American people. It would punish our children and their future in this country.

Look, I want responsible stewardship of the environment, like everybody in this Chamber. And I want clean water and clean air for my kids. But I also want them to grow up in the safest, strongest, freest nation in the world.

The irony of this discussion is that the United States is leading this debate. We are leading in our actions.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALDEN. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARRINGTON. The irony is the innovations and technology that created the shale revolution have already resulted in significant reduction in carbon. Since 2000, the U.S. has led the way by cutting emissions by almost 20 percent.

We need policies that are not hostile to America’s main source of energy. Instead, we should put forth solutions that encourage the continued development of all energy resources, while setting high and responsible standards for environmental quality and human health. And we should carry out this mission in partnership, not in hostility, in partnership with States and industry.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire about how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

□ 1615

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. I am a proud cosponsor of the bill and a longtime supporter of the Paris climate accord.

With the Northwest on catastrophic fire alert every year, everyone out west knows full well that climate change is a real and serious threat that needs addressing.

To that end, we cannot abdicate the United States’ very serious responsibility to lead the world in curbing the effects of climate change. That is why I have strongly opposed the President’s reckless decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, which has seriously damaged U.S. credibility on the world stage.

The Paris Agreement stresses the dire importance of international cooperation in combating the climate crisis. We must work together with countries around the world if we are to achieve any sort of meaningful dent in greenhouse gas emissions.

I am proud that my State of Oregon remains committed to the goals of the Paris Agreement, but one State’s efforts cannot combat climate change alone. We need the Climate Action Now Act to keep the entire country committed to the Paris Agreement.

I urge support for the bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don’t believe we have any other speakers on our side, so I will conclude my comments and then be happy to hear from the chairman of the committee.

I think we have had a good debate here, a thorough debate, and at the end of the day, it is important to remember America is actually leading, through new innovation and technology in the energy sector, the reduction in emissions. Again, we are leading as a country.

You look at other countries, competitors of ours like China, wouldn’t have to begin making reductions until 2030, so they can keep adding emissions-spewing power plants. They could do all kinds of things until 2030. Meanwhile, we are supposed to shut down our economy in a lot of ways if you go down certain paths.

We don’t think we should take that bargain. We don’t think we have to take that bargain. Instead, Republicans believe we should continue to rely on our great innovators in America to develop even new technologies to reduce emissions and produce power like we have done in the energy sector, as my friend from Texas described.

And like my friend from Arizona described, there are companies around

the world that are figuring out how to remove carbon from the atmosphere and use it for another purpose. Republicans led the effort on tax credits to say let's incent you to put carbon into other use or into the ground, and we will even give you a bigger incentive to put it in the ground.

We should be doing more in the area of advanced battery research, like is being done at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory across the river from Oregon, and get to where we can harness the renewable intermittent power sources to more firm power; and the same with streamlining hydro, with pump storage.

There is a lot we can do working together to make sure we have a safe, secure, reliable grid that is adequate to make all this seamlessly work together because, at the end of the day, we want to make sure we don't have riots in the streets because you have driven up costs too high, like they are having in France today. We want to make sure that we are creating the jobs and technology here, because if somebody is going to lead this effort internationally, it should be us.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is going nowhere after this vote today, and I would urge opposition.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the last two speakers, and it just seems that they are trying to invent something that doesn't exist.

They talk about jobs. They talk about innovation. They talk about the freedom to let people do what they want, but what is really happening here is the Trump administration is actually trying to force the old ways, saying, well, okay, maybe coal is not as competitive as it used to be, but we will find a way to make it competitive. We will find a way to say that fossil fuels have a future where they can be used even more so.

Government policy has to lead innovation. That is what it is all about. What we are seeing is that our competitors like China, for example, realize that renewables are the future. They realize that the fossil fuels and continued use of coal, for example, are actually polluting the environment, so they are taking the lead and they are creating innovative technologies, and they are creating the jobs that go along with it.

A few years ago, if I can use my home State of New Jersey, when Governor Christie was first elected, a Republican Governor in New Jersey, he started out by saying that he was going to have wind turbines built in New Jersey. He was going to have us manufacture solar panels. He was going to have us be the renewable center for the country. Then, very quickly after that, when he decided to run for President, he

dropped all that and actually pulled out of RGGI, our regional agreement.

And what happens? The other States or the other countries, they start developing these new technologies, and they then corner the market on things like wind turbines or solar panels. More and more of those are being manufactured in China and then shipped over here. So we lose the competitive edge that we would have had through innovation that is essentially driven by good government policy. Then what happens is we lose the jobs and our economy falls behind.

You know, the same thing is true with climate disasters. My district was more impacted by Superstorm Sandy than any other district in the country. What happens? You know, we lose jobs. Our tourism economy was destroyed in the summer because there was so much damage and destruction. People lost their jobs; they had to look elsewhere; their income was reduced.

So this notion that somehow if you do nothing or if you withdraw from international agreements because of your fear of the future, that this is going to help you, help your economy, help your jobs, it is not true. It is, in fact, just the opposite.

I don't want our country to fall behind. I don't want us to look towards 19th century solutions while other countries are looking towards 21st century innovations. We can't be like an ostrich where we just put our head in the sand and we assume that everything is going to be the same in the future. That is simply not the case.

I don't care whether it is the European Union. I don't care whether it is Japan, China, or India. They understand where the future is. They understand that these new technologies have to be fostered at the Federal level, the same way they are being fostered at the State and the local level.

So let us not kid ourselves and think that somehow actions in Washington don't make a difference. They do. One of the purposes of government is trying to find ways to innovate and create jobs for the future and not rely on the past, and that is all we are saying.

So we have to send a message with H.R. 9: Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement is not good for this country; it is not good for our jobs; it is not good for our economy.

Please support this bill. Let us be on the right path again.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Congressman MOULTON of Massachusetts and Congresswoman HAYES of Connecticut, and express my appreciation to them for their assistance and support.

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment improves the bill by adding a finding which emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in responding to the global challenges facing the international community.

The Paris Climate Accord was an example of the international leadership, commitment,

and resolve that defeated fascism, created NATO, the European Union, the Marshall Plan, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and most importantly, preserved peace and freedom for the last 75 years.

Collective international action is also needed to combat growing international challenges such as terrorism, human trafficking, and black-market sales of illegal weapons, drugs, and tobacco.

No one country can solve these problems on its own, and this amendment emphasizes the importance of collective international action.

The landmark Paris Climate Accord was established to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future.

This also brings all nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects, with enhanced support to assist developing countries to do so.

And in these efforts, we promote the importance of continued international cooperation that has sustained the global community through epidemics, famines, and natural disasters.

A collective of rational actors acting in a selfless manner to achieve a rational result such as this requires leadership and systemic reasoning.

Without this type of collective action and selfless resolve, we leave ourselves vulnerable to a Tragedy of Commons.

When countries act solely in their best interests without regard to combatting international threats, everyone suffers.

That is why a great person and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, so eloquently said: "We are stronger together."

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment reflects this important insight.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The Paris Agreement codified what many across the world already knew must be done to meaningfully address our most serious environmental challenge: climate change. Four years ago, 190 countries came together to make a commitment. Now, however, the United States stands alone in its intent to withdraw from it.

Establishing a commitment to action, not for some, but for all countries, is the first step towards limiting the worst effects of a changing climate. Scientific reports like the Fourth National Climate Assessment and the IPCC's Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 Degrees, both released at the end of last year, summarized 50 years of scientific evidence. These reports concluded that every bit of warming matters, for our economies, for our families, and for public health.

I cosponsored H.R. 9 because it represents a simple, bold, and achievable goal. It lays out common-sense steps that will lead to a healthier environment, because acting on climate change is not only an environmental imperative, but a public health and economic one as well.

Without action, climate change will be costly. With the right signals from the federal government, however, addressing climate change can also lead to business opportunities. This

bill sends a signal to the private sector that a stable framework for action will be put in place, enabling private actors to invest, innovate, and inspire further action.

It promotes the transition to a clean economy. And perhaps, most importantly, it sends a strong and much needed signal to the rest of the world about the seriousness of the United States in addressing climate change. It restores meaningful international engagement.

The United States has been a leader in global initiatives on climate solutions before and should be again. This Congress my colleagues and I have worked to re-establish the U.S.'s climate leadership. On the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, we have held hearings examining the findings of major climate reports, discussing the warming, deoxygenation, and acidification of our oceans, and how our interconnected energy and water systems are stressed by a changing climate. The House Science Committee has marked up four bipartisan bills that address ocean acidification, as well as the Energy and Water Research Integration Act, which I reintroduced with my colleague and Ranking Member of the House Science Committee, Mr. LUCAS. It instructs the Department of Energy to incorporate the consideration of water use and treatment into all of its relevant research, development, and demonstration programs. We hope to continue the momentum of discussion and action on climate change, and urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the following letters of support for H.R. 9.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, Congress will soon vote on legislation that would compel the Trump administration to honor and plan for meeting the United States' commitment under the Paris Agreement. We, the undersigned members of E2 (Environmental Entrepreneurs), strongly urge you to vote in support of this bill to ensure that we continue to focus on actions to protect our climate and grow our economy.

E2 is a national, nonpartisan group of business leaders who advocate for smart policies that are good for the economy and good for the environment. Our members have founded or funded more than 2,500 companies, created more than 600,000 jobs, and manage more than \$100 billion in venture and private equity capital.

As business leaders, investors and professionals from every sector of the economy who live or do business in every state, we understand the enormous economic promise that can arise if the United States leads on this issue and stays a party to the Paris Agreement.

Thanks in part to federal leadership, more than 3 million Americans now work in clean energy and vehicles jobs. These are residents of every state who go to work every day installing solar panels on homes and commercial buildings, manufacturing wind turbines, and making our homes, schools, vehicles and offices more efficient. By honoring our obligations in the Paris Agreement, America can continue to drive demand for innovative technologies and industries that grow our economy and create jobs.

Studies show that delivering on the Paris Agreement would unlock at least \$19 trillion in economic growth globally. The international clean energy market is already worth an astounding \$1.4 trillion a year—and set to grow, with America's share pegged at \$200 billion annually. This economic activity could fuel an additional \$26 billion in GDP

growth in the United States alone by 2020, which would also provide greater opportunities for U.S. businesses to lead in emerging clean economy markets.

The Paris Agreement is good for American businesses and its workers. Ensuring that we maintain our obligations under this historic agreement is a chance to ensure America leads in clean energy, agriculture, transportation, infrastructure, technology and other sectors instead of falling behind our overseas competitors.

We urge you to vote in favor of legislation that keeps the United States in the Paris Agreement and creates a plan for meeting our nation's commitments.

Sincerely,

382 E2 BUSINESS MEMBERS AND SUPPORTERS

Dan Abrams (California), President/CEO, Wynkoop Properties; Clifford Adams (New York), Managing Director, Coady Diemar Partners; Hartwig Adan, Google; Milo Aguilar (Illinois), Consultant, Sumac Consulting; Shauna Alexander (Oregon), Vice President, Sustainability Stumptown Coffee Roasters; Annick Anttil (Michigan), Assistant Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering, Michigan State University.

Trevor Anderson (California), Policy Manager, Climate Action Reserve; Emily Applegate (Colorado), Senior Manager, Business Funding & Incentives, Business Investments, OEDIT; Esteban Arenas; Gerald L. Armes, Principal Engineer, Aurastar; Anne Arquit Niederberger (California), VP, Market Development, Enverve; John Atherton (Pennsylvania); Michael Atkins (California), Communications and Impact Manager, Friends of the Los Angeles River; Betsy Aubrey (California); Marta Badon (Louisiana); Ravi Bajaj (California); Claire Baldwin (California); Jay Baldwin (California), Partner, Wind River Capital Partners, LLC.

Fred Bamber (California), Managing Director, Spartina LLC; Tom Bartley (California), Founder/VP Sales & Marketing, Proensis; Caroline Bauhaus (California), Education Consultant, Equity & Access; Mark Bauhaus (California), Partner, Just Business; Keir Beadling (California), CEO and Co-Founder, Mavericks Surf Ventures; Michael Bean (Ohio), Facility Manager, Third Federal Savings & Loan; Jacob Bean-Watson (Oregon); Natalie Bearbower (Illinois).

Josh Beck (Pennsylvania), General Manager, BCI Technology Investments; Karen Begin (California), Development Director, Environment, San Diego Habitat for Humanity; Thatcher Bell (New York), CoVentures; Dave Belote (Virginia), Managing Partner & CEO, DARE Strategies LLC; Jeff Bennett (Colorado), Founder, Big Kid Science; Lisa Bennett (Colorado); Karin Berardo (California), Founder, SIREs Advisors (Also Board Member, CleanPath); Seth Berkman (Massachusetts), Energy Market Analyst, SourceOne; Elliot Berman, CEO, Solar Energy Corp.

Eric Berman (Washington), President and Co-Chair, E8 Angels; Luann Berman (Washington); Aron Bernstein (Massachusetts), Professor of Physics, MIT; Marcella Bernstein (California); Stuart Bernstein (California), Founding Member, Sustainable Capital LLC; Doug Berry (Pennsylvania), President & CEO Solar Renewable Energy LLC; Phil Beyl, Co-Director, GBD Architects; Jan Birenbaum (California); Larry Birenbaum (California), Former SVP, Cisco Systems.

Mari Bishop (Illinois), CLEAResult; Maureen Blanc (California), Director, CHARGE ACROSS TOWN; Philip Blumenthal (North Carolina); Darren Booth (Colorado), Director, Renewable Energy Integration, GreenPowerU; Dara Bortman (Pennsylvania), Senior Vice President of Marketing and Sales, Exact Solar; Mark

Bortman (Pennsylvania), Owner, Exact Solar; David Bowen (California), Consultant; Bill Boyk (Oregon), CEO/Founder, GyroVolts by Ameristar Solar, LLC; Diane Boyk (Oregon); Mickle Bragg, Product Manager, Geotech Environmental Equipment, Inc.; George Brandt (California).

Alice Brown (Massachusetts), Director of Planning, Boston Harbor Now; Beth Brummitt (California), President, Brummitt Energy Associates, Inc.; Barbara Brenner Buder (California); Jim Bunch (California), Chairman, Green Chamber; Kyle Burkybile (Illinois), Administrative Lead, Franklin Energy; Adriane Busby (Colorado), Staff Attorney, Ryley Carlock Applewhite; Richard Bush (California), Chairman, Identity Engines; Vince Calvano (Colorado), Attorney & Business Owner, Vincent P. Calvano, LLC; Paul Campbell (Illinois), Director, Sears Holding Corp.

Bill Capp (Florida), Founder, Grid Storage Consulting; Jacqueline Capp, DDS (Florida), Owner, JHC Studio; Patrick Carberry (Colorado); Jim Cassidy (Colorado); Shaandiin Cedar, Sales and Marketing Assistant, GreenBiz; Suzanne Charle, Journalist, Freelance; John Cleveland (New Hampshire), Executive Director, Green Ribbon Commission; Michelle Cleveland (New Hampshire); Carole Connell (Oregon), City Planner, Connell PC Associates Inc.; Martha Conway (California) Valerie Corbett (New York); President, Intelligreen Partners.

D. Rafael Coven (Pennsylvania), SVP Bus Dev, PaceControls; Jane Cuddehe (New York), Broker Associate, Coldwell Banker Devonshire; Michael Cuddehe (New York), Principal, Strategic Global Advisors, LLC; Greg Curhan (California), President and CEO, Merriman Curhan; Mary Ann Cusenza (California), Independent Consultant for high tech and cleantech companies; Joseph Dalum (Wisconsin), Odyne; Diane Dandeneau (Colorado), CEO, IPower Alliance; David Danielson, Managing Director, Breakthrough Energy Ventures.

Chris Davis, VP Smart Cities, Cimcon Lighting Inc.; Michael Davis, Vice President, Bergmeyer; Bart Deamer (California), Treasurer, ODC Dance; Patty Debenham (California), Managing Director, Ocean Enterprise, Environmental Defense Fund; Rick DeGolia (California), Executive Chairman, Cimbale, Inc.; Michael Delapa (California), DeLapa Consulting; Sheila Dennis (Massachusetts), Director, Principal Gifts, Harvard Divinity School; Sally DeSipio (Oregon), Creative consultant and climate activist, Self-employed.

James Dice (Colorado), Vice President, Sitton Energy Solutions; Scott Dietzen (California), Chairman, Pure Storage; Christopher Dillon (Illinois), President, Campbell Coyle; Sean Donaghy (Massachusetts), Energy Management Analyst, Mass DOT; Mark Doughty (Massachusetts), President & CEO, Thoughtforms Corporation; James Doyle (North Carolina); Teresa Dupuis (Michigan), Patricia Durham (California); Robert Earley (New York), Principal, Armor Capital; Mike Eckhart, Managing Director, Citigroup, Inc.; Stanley Ellert (Colorado); Lloyd Elam, Auditor, Impact.

Ellington Ellis (Michigan), President, Ellington Management Group; Blake Enyart (Colorado), Lab Manager, University of Colorado; Bob Epstein (California), Co-Founder, Sybase, New Resource Bank, Environmental Entrepreneurs; Helen Fairman; Chris Farrington (Oregon), Co-Found, Voxity Video Productions; Jerry Feitelson (California), CEO, Agribody Technologies, Inc.; Anne Feldhusen (California), Consultant, Green Business, Technology Marketing; Boris Feldman (California), Base Energy; Brett Feldman; Jason Fike.

Barry Fitzgerald (California), Founder, Hidden Compass Consulting; Kevin

Fitzwilliam (Louisiana), Regional Account Manager, Joule Energy; Vanessa Flores (Illinois), Sustainability and Property Operations Manager, ACE Hardware; Suzanne Foster Porter; (Colorado), Principal, Kannah Consulting; Andrew Foy (Oregon), MBA Candidate, Lundquist College of Business.

Karen Francis (California), CEO, Academix Direct, Inc.; Richard Frankel (California), Co-Founder, Rocket Fuel; Corey Friedman (Illinois), Principal, CF Financial LLC; Micah Fuchs (Illinois), Business Development Director, Dynamic Energy; Linda Gerber (Oregon), Principal Consultant, Linda Gerber Consulting Services; Gerry Glaser (California); Barbara Glynn (California), Glynn Capital; John Glynn (California), CEO, Glynn Capital; Nancy Gail Goebner (California), Owner, Gardenpeach Place; Susan Goldhor (Massachusetts), Biologist, C.A.R.S.

Ken Goldsholl (California), CEO, x.o.ware, Inc.; Nancy Goldsholl (California); Wes Goldstein (California), Senior Partner, Hobbs & Towne, Inc. Keith Good (Pennsylvania) Belmont Solar; Alan Gordon; Todd Gossett (Virginia); Joan Green (California), Trustee, J.C. Krauskopf GCLA Trust; Connie Greenfield (Connecticut); Stewart Greenfield (Connecticut), Chairman, Alternative Investment Group; Michael Greis (Massachusetts), Principal, Riverbend Advisors; Kat Gridley (Colorado), Founder, Atolla Energy.

Lynn Griffith, Director of Operations, Building Performance Institute; Rachel Griffith (Washington); Abby Gritter; Barbara Gross (Oregon), Winegrower, Cooper Mountain Vineyards; Marianna Grossman (California), Founder and Managing Partner, Minerva Ventures; Isaac Hacker (Oregon), Key Account Manager, QOS Energy; Lauren Hafford (Colorado), Mechanical Eng; Reed Hamilton (California), Owner, Grass Valley Grains; Kate Hammarback (Oregon), Principal, Occam Advisors; Doug Hammer (California), Senior Counsel, Shartsis Friese LLP; Lisa Harding.

Berl Hartman (Massachusetts), E2 New England Chapter Director, Hartman Consulting; Hyman Hartman (Massachusetts), Research Scientist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Carol Hazenfield (California), Communications Coach; Sheryl Heckmann (California); Ward Hendon (New York), Business Advisor, Independent Consultant; Karen Hennessey, Eastern Regional Director, Nexant; Tom Henry (Massachusetts).

Len Hering (California), I Love A Clean San Diego; Kathi Hess (Ohio); Renate Heinrich; James Higgins (California), Partner, Lakeside Enterprises; Jill Tate Higgins (California), General Partner, Lakeside Enterprises; John Hopkins (District of Columbia), Vice President—Energy & Infrastructure, Astris Finance LLC; Reuben Howard Jr (Colorado); Robin Hruska (Washington); Paige Humecki (Illinois), Analyst, Smart Energy, AECOM; Ari Isaak (California), Founder and CEO, Evari GIS Consulting, Inc.; Erica Jackson (Pennsylvania), Community Outreach and Communications Specialist, FracTracker Alliance.

Ed Jaros (Massachusetts), Jarson Corporation; Corinna Jess (Illinois), Director, Consulting Services & Trade Missions, GACC Midwest; Lars Johansson (Washington), Manager, E8 Fund; Michael Johnson-Chase (New York), Blogger, Carbonstories.org; Charlene Kabenell (California), Former Vice President, Oracle Corporation; Derry Kabenell (California), Former Executive Vice President, Oracle Corporation; Jerome Kalur (Montana), Attorney at Law.

Christopher Kaneb (Massachusetts), Principal, Catamount Management Corporation; Nancy Kaplan, Manager of Workforce Development, BPI; Stephanie Katsaros (Illinois), Business Owner, Bright Beat; Steven Keleti (Massachusetts); Brett KenCairn (Colorado),

Senior Climate & Sustainability Coordinator, City of Boulder, CO; Gavriella Keyles (California), Manager, Stakeholder Engagement, Future 500; John Kibler; Peter Kirby (Massachusetts), Board Director, Governance Committee Chair, Plaxall, Inc.; David Kirkpatrick (North Carolina), Managing Director and Co-founder, SJF Ventures; Joseph Kiss (Pennsylvania), Owner, Kiss Electric.

Bill Kissinger (California), Bingham McCutchen LLP; Virginia Klausmeier (California), CEO, Sylvatex; Charly Kleissner (California), Co-Founder & Investor, KL Felicitas Foundation; Lisa Kleissner (California), Co-Founder, KL Felicitas Foundation; Charles Knowled (California), Executive Director, Wildlife Conservation Network; Stephanie Knowles (California); Christian Koch, Business Development Driver, Levin Energy Partners; Ari Kornelis (Michigan), Graduate Research Assistant, Michigan State University.

Chip Krauskopf (California), VP Business Development, Aditazz; Pete Krull (North Carolina), CEO and Director of Investments, Earth Equity Advisors, LLC; Brice Leconte (Virginia), Founder, iUnit; Stephanie Leconte (Virginia); Nicole Lederer (California), Chair and Co-Founder, Environmental Entrepreneurs; Grey Lee (Massachusetts); Andrew Legge (California), Havelock Wool; Regina Leung; Steve Lichtenberg (California); Mike Lingle (Illinois), CEO, Eta Vision; Pyramyth Liu (California), COO, Hanergy; Charles Lord (Massachusetts), Principal, RENEW Energy Partners.

Olivia Loria (Colorado); Tracy Lyons (California); Fred Maas (California), Pacific EcoCompanies, LLC; Henrik Mader (Michigan), Energy Planner, Southeast Michigan Municipal Energy Planning Project, Ecoworks; Cliff Majersik (District of Columbia), Institute for Market Transformation; Theron Makley; Theron Makley (Colorado), Marketing Director, Panasonic; Lori Malloy (New York); Timon Malloy (New York); Mayela Manasjan (California), Chief Environmental Optimist, The Manasjan Consultancy.

Jessie Mansperger (Massachusetts), Program Launch Manager, Engie Services US; Heather March Takle (Massachusetts), Principal, 2ndPath Energy; William Marshall (Virginia); Jim Martin-Schramm (Iowa), Professor, Luther College DG Projects; James Marvin (Massachusetts), Regional Manager, North America East & Canada, Expeditors International of Washington Inc.; Joanna Marvin (Massachusetts), Owner, Federal Consulting Solutions; Steve Masters (Pennsylvania), President, JustLaws.

Richard Mattocks (New York), Principal, Environomics LLC; Camilla McCalmont (California), Tom McCalmont (California), President, McCalmont Engineering; Michael McElroy (Massachusetts), Gilbert Butler Professor of Environmental Studies, Harvard University; Doug McGarrah, Partner, Foley Hoag; John McGarry (Washington), Investor; Dennis McGinn, Senior Advisor, Customer First Renewables; Patricia McGuigan (California), Senior Vice President, Cornish and Carey Commercial.

Milton McIntyre (Ohio), President, Peak Electric Inc.; David Mendels, (Massachusetts), Board Member, Resilient Coders; Mike Mercer (Oregon), Principal, M Mercer Consulting; Quinn Middleton Antus (Colorado), Head of Operations, Campfire Labs; David Miller (Massachusetts), Executive Managing Director, Clean Energy Venture Group; Karen Miller (Massachusetts), President, Belly Shmooze; Malcolm Miller (Michigan), Director of Business Development, Walker Miller Energy Services; John Montgomery (California), President, Lex Ultima.

Joseph Morinville (Pennsylvania), President, EIS Solar; Kevin Morse (Colorado, Vice

President, Lever Energy Finance; Sherry Morse (California), Principal Designer, Sherry Morse Interiors; Ning Mosberger-Tang (Colorado), President, Ovonni Ventures LLC; Sam Mumford (Oregon), MBA Candidate, Lundquist College of Business; Emilie Munger Ogden (California), Leonard Nagy, systems analyst, ARCADIS; Jim Nail (Massachusetts), Principal Analyst, Forrester Research.

Alison Nash (Massachusetts), Architect, DiMella Shaffer Associates, Inc.; Carl Nettleton (California), President, Nettleton Strategies LLC; Franklin Neubauer, Principal, Core Metrics; Armand Neukermans (California), Founder, Xros; Al Nierenberg (Massachusetts), President, Evergreen Consulting & Training; Tori Nourafchan (California); Julia Novy-Hildsey (Oregon); Graham Noyes (California); Managing Attorney, Noyes Law Corporation; Anne O'Grady (California); Standish O'Grady (California), Managing Director, Granite Ventures, LLC; Doug Ogden (California), CEO, North Ridge Investment Management; Barry Olafson (California), CEO, Protabit, LLC; Larry Orr (California), General Partner, Trinity Ventures; Michael Brian Orr (Washington), Senior Computer Scientist, Adobe Systems; Jack Oswald (California), CEO, SynGest Inc.

Julie Parish (California), The Parish Fund; Will Parish (California); Robin Park (California), Principal, RXP Energy, Inc.; Richard Parker (Illinois); Katherine Peretick (Michigan), Director of Engineering, NRStor, Inc; Linda Perrine (Oregon), Owner, Honor Earth Farm; Brandon Pieczynski (Illinois), Energy and Sustainability, Pangea Real Estate; Milton Pinsky (Illinois), Chairman, Banner Real Estate Group, LLC; Scott Piper (Illinois), Owner/Architect, SPM Architects; Brad Pnazeck (Michigan), Senior Development Manager, Trade Wind Energy; Michael D Ramage (Washington), President/CEO, Asemblon Inc.

Megan Rast (Colorado), Corporate Sustainability Professional; James Rehrmann; Emily Reichert (Massachusetts), CEO & Executive Director, Greentown Labs; Camila Restrepo (Colorado), Project Manager, Intellex; Theo Revlock (California), Principal, Q Architecture; David Ringer (Michigan), Cedar Springs Brewing; Tom Rinker (Delaware), President, Cape Henlopen Consulting, Inc.; Jonathan Roberts (Illinois), Director of Development, Solstage.

Liz Robinson (Pennsylvania); Helda Rodriguea (Florida), President, NovaCharge; David Rosenheim (California), Founder and CEO, JobsWithImpact; Jackie Rosenheim (California), David Rosenstein (California), President, Intex Solutions; Bill Rosenzweig (California), IdeaGarden; Joan Rossetti (Massachusetts), Chair, Environmental Affairs Committee of the Prudential Center Residents' Association; Amy Roth (California); Scott Rotman (New Jersey), Senior Project Manager, Matrix New World Engineering; Jacqueline Royce (Massachusetts), Independent Scholar; Karen Rucker (Colorado), President, ByHandConsulting; Michael Rucker (Colorado), CEO, Scout Clean Energy.

Julie Rudick (California); Stuart Rudick (California), Partner, Mindful Investors, LLC; Meg Ruxton (California), Partnerships Manager, Charge Across Town; Randy Salim; Paul Salinger (California), VP, Marketing, Oracle; Mel Samaroo (Illinois), Civil Engineer, Borrego Solar Systems, Inc.; Cristine Sanchez (New York); Gonzalo Sanchez, Offshore Wind Development Intern, EDP Renewables North America; Frank Sandoval (Colorado) Principal, Pajarito Technologies.

Kate Sandrini (California), Amy Santullo (California), California Clean Tech Open, Downtown College Prep Scholarship Committee; Michael Santullo (California), Co-

Founder and Board Member, California Clean Tech Open; Jan Schalkwijk (California), Investment Adviser, JPS Global Investments; David Schwartz (California), Tom Sciacca (Massachusetts), Co-founder, Intelligent Energy Systems; Brad Seaman (Colorado), Director of Project Finance, Scout Clean Energy; Lt Gen (ret) Noman Seip (Virginia), Owner, NS Solutions, LLC; Anneke Seley (California), CEO, ALIO Inc.; Christopher Senger (Illinois), Owner, Penguin Energy Services LLC; Joel Serface (Colorado), Managing Director, Catalyze.

Douglas Shackelford (District of Columbia), Managing Partner, Exseleration; Jigar Shah (California), Co-founder and President, Generate Capital; Cathleen Shattuck (Washington), Creative Director, evluma; Rebecca Shaw (California), World Wildlife Fund; Scott Sidlow, Plan Review Coordinator, TopBuild Home Services; Greg Simon (California); Barbara Simons (California), Research Staff Member, Retired, IBM Research; Divya Singh (California), Project Finance Associate, Cypress Creek Renewables; Ian Skor (Colorado), Co-Founder, Sandbox Solar.

Joshua Skov (Oregon), Industry Mentor and Instructor, University of Oregon, Lundquist College of Business; Jon Slingerup (California), Chairman and CEO, American Global Logistics; Brian Smith (Texas), Founder and Managing Partner & Investor, Clean Energy Catalyst; Michael Smith (California), Founder, Adaptation Research; Patrick Smith (New York), New Mobility Policy Analyst, NYC Department of Transportation; Richard Smith, Doctor; Ethan Soloviev (New York); Roger Sorkin (Massachusetts), Executive Producer, American Resilience Project; Rachel Stern (California), Senior Environmental Specialist, Port of San Diego.

Naomi Stone (California), CEO and President, MugenKioku Corporation; Eric Strid (Washington), Co-Founder and Retired CEO, Cascade Microtech; Robert Sullivan (Illinois), Dean, UCSD; Mark Sylvia (Massachusetts), Managing Director, Blue Wave Ezgi Takmaz (Illinois), Energy, Energy Resources Center; Russ Teall (California), President and Founder, Biodico; Trey Teall (California), VP Operations, Biodico; Andrew Thomaidis (Colorado), Consultant; Todd Thorner (District of Columbia).

Carlad Thronson (California), CEO, Forefront Communications; Robert Thronson (California), VP Business Development, Vigilant; Leslie Tidwell (California), Ian Todreas (Massachusetts), Vice President, ERG; Colin Tomkins-Bergh (Colorado), Strategic Business Development Manager, FoodMaven; John Tourtelotte (Massachusetts), Managing Director, Rivermoor Energy; Elisa Townshend (Colorado), Ian Tran (Michigan), Special Projects Strategist, AGI Construction Solutions; Todd Travaille (Nebraska), Owner/President, USA Insulation.

Doug Trimbach (North Carolina), Vice President and Director, Lighting Services, Energy Optimizers, USA; Patricia Trumbull (California), Terry Trumbull (California), Trumbull Law Firm; Zach Tucker (Missouri), Founder, Good Meets World; Bill Unger (California), Partner Emeritus, Mayfield Fund; Amy Van Beek (Iowa), Co-Founder, Designer, Ideal Energy, Inc.; Troy Van Beek (Iowa), President, Renewable Energy Expert, Ideal Energy, Inc.; Lorna Vander Ploeg (California); Mark Vander Ploeg (California), Retired, Investment Banker.

John Vernacchia (Pennsylvania), Segment Manager, Alternative Energy, Eaton Corporation; Ariana Vito (California), Sustainability Analyst/EV Program Coordinator, City of Santa Monica; Puja Vohra (Massachusetts), Owner, consultant, Green Elements LLC; Dan Von Seggern (Washington),

Staff Attorney, The Center for Environmental Law & Policy; David Walls; David Watson (California), Director & Investor, Ultra Capital; Dave Welch (California), President, Infina Corporation; Heidi Welch (California).

Ian Welch (California) Jordan Wildish (Washington), Research Analyst, Earth Economics; Tony Williams (Colorado), Engineering PM, USPS; Bruce Wilson (Pennsylvania), Owner Bruce Wilson Contracting; Tonia Wisman (California); Andrea Wittchen (Pennsylvania), Principal, iSpring; Sarah Wolbert (Minnesota) Architect, Piece Work Design; Gary Wolff (California), Founder, 3E Engineering; Garrett Wong (California), Sr. Sustainability Analyst, City of Santa Monica.

Bryndis Woods (Massachusetts), Researcher, Applied Economics Clinic; Christopher Woodward (Massachusetts), Vice President, Credit Research, Breckinridge Capital Advisors; HansJorg Wyss (Massachusetts); Leila Yassa (Massachusetts); Denny Young (California); Mark Yuschak (New Jersey); Instructor, Thomas Shortman; Peter Zahn (California), President and Director, Moxie Foundation; Rosamund Zander (Massachusetts), Chairman, Independent Design Center for the Environment.

CERES,

April 26, 2019.

Re H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, on behalf of the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (BICEP) network, a 51 company coalition of major American businesses representing many sectors across the U.S. economy, I write to respectfully request that you vote in support of H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act, which would ensure that the United States does not withdraw from the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement. As you know, H.R. 9 will be brought up for consideration the week of April 29th.

As a network of major businesses based throughout the United States and around the world, BICEP sees international engagement and maintaining U.S. commitments under the Paris Climate Agreement as critical to our continued economic success. Climate change is a global problem and requires a global solution. The United States cannot solve the climate problem on its own, which is why a strong international framework is required to assure that other countries also meet their commitments, reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, and do so in a transparent and verifiable manner.

Every nation in the world has signed on to the Paris Agreement, which creates a structure for countries to submit non-binding, voluntary targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions. Only one, the United States, has announced its intent to withdraw. Since the development of this global agreement, the understanding of the impacts of global warming has only become more clear. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—the world's foremost body of climate scientists, has released its 2018 IPCC 1.5 Report, which details the consequences of allowing average global temperature increases to exceed 2.7 F /1.5 C. Additionally, the most recent U.S. National Climate Assessment report projects the impacts that American industry and communities will face (and are already facing) from climate change-related impacts.

Days after the administration's June 2017 announcement of its intent to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, many BICEP members joined other sectors of the U.S. economy, including states, cities, universities, faith groups, healthcare systems, and others to declare that "We Are Still In." The now 3,750+ signatories to We

Are Still In include members from all 50 states and represent \$9.46 trillion of the American economy—demonstrating significant real economy support for U.S. participation in the Paris Climate Agreement.

Remaining in the Paris Climate Agreement is essential for the U.S. to retain a seat at the table, contribute in a positive manner to international negotiations, and reflect the deep ambition among U.S. businesses to fight climate change and protect from the worst economic impacts associated with a warming world.

As companies across the United States, BICEP recognizes that a zero-carbon economy is necessary to achieve long-term climate goals and are taking steps in their own operations to accelerate this transition. However, domestic and international policy structures are critical to drive change at the scale and speed necessary to reflect our latest understanding of the science. Maintaining our participation in the Paris Agreement is one such policy structure that the U.S. should retain.

On behalf of the businesses in our BICEP network, I respectfully request that you vote in support of H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act when it comes up for a vote.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I am happy to connect further on this issue and answer any questions you may have. Please do not hesitate to follow up.

Sincerely,

ANNE L. KELLY,

Vice President, Government Relations.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS,
LEADING INTERNAL MEDICINE, IMPROVING LIVES,

Washington, DC, May 1, 2019.

Hon. KATHY CASTOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. CASTOR: On behalf of the American College of Physicians (ACP), I am writing to express our strong support for the Climate Action Now Act (H.R. 9), which directs the United States to uphold its commitment to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. We applaud your leadership in introducing this legislation and urge its quick passage in the U.S. House of Representatives today. ACP is deeply concerned about the negative impact that climate change is having on public health and patients, and that these effects will worsen without immediate action. This is an important issue for the medical community and patients, and we all need to be part of finding a solution.

The American College of Physicians is the largest medical specialty organization and the second largest physician group in the United States. ACP members include 154,000 internal medicine physicians (internists), related subspecialists, and medical students. Internal medicine physicians are specialists who apply scientific knowledge and clinical expertise to the diagnosis, treatment, and compassionate care of adults across the spectrum from health to complex illness.

Because physicians are on the front lines of patient care, they are witnessing—here and now—the harmful health effects that climate change can and does have on the human body. These harmful effects include: higher rates of respiratory and heat-related illness, increased prevalence of vector-borne and waterborne diseases, food and water insecurity, and malnutrition, as outlined in ACP's 2016 position paper, "Climate Change and Health," published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine*. People who are elderly, sick, or poor are especially vulnerable to these potential consequences. As climate change worsens, an increase in global temperature and frequency of heat waves will raise the risk of heat exhaustion. Asthma

and other chronic lung conditions will be exacerbated by increased particulate matter and ground-level ozone in the atmosphere. Exposure to infectious disease from vectors such as ticks and mosquitoes, which carry the harmful Zika virus, has and will continue to escalate.

Physicians, both individually and collectively, are encouraged to advocate for climate change adaptation and mitigation policies and communicate about the health co-benefits of addressing climate change in objective, simple language to their community and policymakers. For its part, the American College of Physicians is committed to working with lawmakers, its international chapters and with other professional membership and public health organizations within the United States and globally to pursue the policies recommended in its position paper. ACP is a founding member of the Medical Society Consortium on Climate and Health, which brings together 22 medical associations representing approximately 550,000 clinical practitioners. Just two days ago on Monday of this week, I joined my colleagues from the Consortium to educate members of Congress about how climate change affects health and the need to take action now. In addition, ACP was pleased to submit its perspective and recommendations on climate change to the House Resources Committee earlier this year.

Your legislation represents a vital step in the fight against climate change, and in maintaining this nation's role as a leader in combatting the harmful impact of climate change. H.R. 9 prohibits the use of funds to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement and requires the President to develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement.

A global effort is required to reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and address the health impact of climate change. The United States must commit to taking both a leadership and collaborative role in developing, implementing, and ensuring the success of such a global effort and in reducing its own contributions to greenhouse gas emissions. For this reason, ACP remains strongly opposed to the United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. Climate change adaptation strategies must be established, and mitigation measures, like switching to clean, renewable energy and promoting active transportation, must be adopted.

ACP looks forward to continuing to work with you in your leadership role on this critical issue. We stand ready to serve as a resource for you and other lawmakers in helping to communicate the harmful impacts of climate change on the public's health.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. MCLEAN, MD, FACP,

President.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands, whom I represent, are on the front line of climate change. In the past year, back-to-back typhoons struck our islands. Lives were lost. We suffered hundreds of millions in damage.

No single weather event can be attributed to climate change. But science tells us that global warming means more frequent and more intense storms of the kind that hit the Marianas.

And we know the sudden increase in intensity of one of those storms, Super Typhoon Yutu, just before landfall in the Marianas, is characteristic of a new normal caused by higher atmospheric temperatures and warmer

ocean waters. We saw the same acceleration of force as Hurricane Michael came ashore in the Gulf last year.

Today, Congress has an opportunity to act to slow climate change and reduce the disasters being caused. We can vote to return the United States to the company of nations that is working to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with the Paris Agreement of 2015. I support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

There are those who argue it is too expensive to lower carbon pollution of our planet's atmosphere. I point to the disaster supplemental appropriation bills this House will take up shortly and previously passed in January. If we are willing to spend billions to repair the impact of climate change on communities around our nation, should we not be willing to spend to prevent that damage in the first place? Would that not be wise?

I make this plea especially for people in the Marianas and other Pacific islands. We are increasingly battered by storms. As sea levels rise, our islands are disappearing. And the coral reefs that protect our coasts and give us nourishment are dying before our eyes.

We are the front line of the consequences, yet had little to do with the decades of carbon pollution that are causing this destruction. Nevertheless, we in the islands are willing to transform, just as our nation as a whole must transform to reduce carbon emissions and protect our safety in the decades ahead.

A yes vote on H.R. 9 is an important first step.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Climate Action Now Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In Paris, on December 12, 2015, parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) reached a landmark agreement to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future.

(2) The Paris Agreement's central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

(3) The Paris Agreement requires all parties to put forward their best efforts through nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and to strengthen these efforts in the years ahead.

(4) The Paris Agreement further requires each party to update its nationally determined contribution every 5 years, with each successive nationally determined contribution representing a progression beyond the previous nationally determined contribution, and reflecting the party's highest possible ambition.

(5) The United States communicated its nationally determined contribution to

achieve an economy-wide target of reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 level in 2025 and to make best efforts to reduce its emissions by 28 percent.

(6) A number of existing laws, regulations, and other mandatory measures in the United States are relevant to achieving this target, including the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140).

(7) On June 1, 2017, President Trump announced his intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, which would leave the United States as the only UNFCCC member state that is not a signatory to the Paris Agreement.

(8) Under the terms of the Paris Agreement, the earliest possible effective withdrawal date by the United States is November 4, 2020. However, the United States is still obligated to maintain certain commitments under the Paris Agreement, such as continuing to report its emissions to the United Nations.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ADVANCE THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE PARIS AGREEMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement.

SEC. 4. PLAN FOR THE UNITED STATES TO MEET ITS NATIONALLY DETERMINED CONTRIBUTION UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement that describes—

(1) how the United States will achieve an economy-wide target of reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 level by 2025; and

(2) how the United States will use the Paris Agreement's transparency provisions to confirm that other parties to the Agreement with major economies are fulfilling their announced contributions to the Agreement.

(b) UPDATES TO PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public an updated plan under subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

SEC. 5. PARIS AGREEMENT DEFINED.

In this Act, the term "Paris Agreement" means the decision by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's 21st Conference of Parties in Paris, France, adopted December 12, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-42. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report,

shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ESPAILLAT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

(3) The Paris Agreement acknowledges that all "Parties should, when taking action to address climate change, respect, promote and consider their respective obligations on human rights, the right to health, the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, migrants, children, persons with disabilities and people in vulnerable situations and the right to development, as well as gender equality, empowerment of women and intergenerational equity".

(4) The Paris Agreement notes the importance of "climate justice" when mitigating and adapting to climate change and recognizes "the need for an effective and progressive response to the urgent threat of climate change".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today lays before this House a very simple fact, an undeniable fact: Communities of color across this great Nation and, in fact, across the world are least responsible for climate change. They contribute far less to the carbon footprint of the world; they don't drive as many cars; in fact, they most often take public transportation. So they contribute less to climate change, and yet they suffer the most harm from its impact.

The most vulnerable among us, from my home in Washington Heights, in Harlem and the northwest Bronx communities and around the world, are all experiencing greater impacts and stand to suffer even more.

At home, I see it in the worsening of asthma rates among African American and Latinx children when parents come to my office looking for help for ballooning healthcare costs that they cannot afford.

I see it with seniors who have an array of respiratory diseases, in many cases contributing to long illnesses, if not death.

I see it in Central America, where extreme drought endangers livelihoods and has led to violence and outward migration.

I see it in the Caribbean and even here in the United States, where cli-

mate change has increased the magnitude and frequency of hurricanes, affecting millions who do not have the capacity to prepare for worsening storms and have barely recovered from one before the next one hits.

I see it in southern Africa and in south Asia and in small island developing states, where climate change affects food scarcity and access to clean water, damaging public health and increasing political instability and regional violence.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States and around the world, climate change has an unequal impact on communities of color because it compounds existing injustices of racial and economic disparities. This is fundamentally unjust, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment that I bring before you today is a very simple amendment, one that says that poor communities that are very often communities of color suffer disproportionately from climate change, although they do not contribute more to that ill.

My amendment makes it clear that the Paris Agreement seeks to address issues of environmental justice and the disparate impact climate change is having and will continue to have on vulnerable communities and people of color.

If adopted, I believe it will send a strong message, a very strong message that, with this bill, the United States of America's commitment to remain in the Paris climate agreement also means our agreement to address environmental injustices.

When it comes to mitigating climate change, we cannot forget disenfranchised communities. We cannot forget indigenous communities. We cannot forget low-income communities. We cannot forget climate refugees, and we cannot forget the children who will bear this burden when we are all gone.

In every piece of legislation on climate change considered by this House, in every bill on environmental issues we pass, and at every hearing that we hold regarding this important matter, we must ensure that issues of environmental justice are equally addressed and that the disenfranchised communities and communities of color are heard, because, again, Mr. Chairman, they contribute far less to the carbon footprint, they contribute far less to climate change, and yet they suffer tremendously. So this is, fundamentally, an injustice.

Mr. PALLONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESPAILLAT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I just want to say, on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support this amendment. It is a good amendment.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Mr. ESPAILLAT for working with the committees to make changes to his amendment.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I will close once the gentleman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman ENGEL and the leadership, Chairman PALLONE, for working with me to advance this important issue.

I want to, further, thank my colleagues who have cosponsored this amendment and are similarly dedicated to advancing environmental justice: Congress Members MCEACHIN, OMAR, JAYAPAL, PRESSLEY, CARBAJAL, CISNEROS, and MOORE.

Finally, I want to thank many other groups in my district that continue to advocate day in and day out for environmental justice, a strong and diverse coalition that I am proud to represent.

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

□ 1630

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, let me first say, like everyone in this Chamber, I support human rights and climate justice, but this amendment really does nothing to reduce our emissions. We should debate bipartisan solutions, such as boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, add the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement further requires that parties "should strengthen their cooperation on enhancing action on adaptation, taking into account the Cancun Adaptation Framework", which includes "measures to enhance understanding, coordination and cooperation with regard to climate change induced displacement, migration and planned relocation, where appropriate, at the national, regional and international levels".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

My amendment includes findings recognizing the importance of the Paris climate agreement's task force addressing the impact of climate change on displacement and the global refugee crisis.

The United States is responsible for nearly a third of the excess carbon dioxide in the atmosphere today and, thus, bears more responsibility for the climate crisis than any other country. But the climate crisis is a major contributing factor of yet another devastating crisis we are facing today: the global refugee crisis.

In 2017, more than 60 percent of the internal displacements in the world was a result not of conflict but of natural disasters. Since 2008, an average of 24 million people has been displaced by catastrophic weather disasters each year.

Within three of the most vulnerable regions of the world—sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America—143 million people could be displaced by climate change impacts by 2050.

We do not need to look that far from home to know this. At least 400,000 residents of New Orleans were displaced by Hurricane Katrina for at least a few days, and many were displaced permanently. A disproportionate number of them were Black Americans.

We saw it happen last year in Puerto Rico when 3,000 people died because of Hurricane Maria and our current administration failed to help them recover.

At a time when climate change is making droughts and famines worse, making conflicts fiercer and repression more brutal, our country is resettling historically low numbers of refugees. The United States should be offering protection and support to climate change refugees. Instead, we have capped the number of refugees that we resettle to only 30,000 people next year.

Citizens of some of the countries that have been hit hardest by climate change, including Yemen, Iran, and Somalia, are currently subject to an arbitrary and racist Muslim ban. We cannot be willing to turn our backs on those suffering because of the effects of global catastrophes.

We have to acknowledge that this tragedy is not going to go away any time soon. As food security, drinking water, and energy supplies become scarcer, more and more families are going to be forced to leave their homes.

Countries that are responsible for perpetuating the climate crisis, like the United States, should rise as leaders in offering protection and refuge for displaced communities. It is our duty, as one of the richest countries in the world, to support the Paris Agreement

and its task force on the impact of climate change on displacement and the global refugee crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment. I met today with U.N. officials on the refugee crisis. I have been to the camps in Jordan and Turkey, so I agree with the premise of this amendment. But, again, it does nothing to reduce our emissions.

We should be debating, I think, bipartisan solutions, such as boosting research, technology, and innovation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 25, strike “and”.

Page 8, line 5, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 8, after line 5, insert the following:

(3) how the United States may use multilateral and bilateral diplomatic tools, in addition to the expert committee established under Article 15 of the Paris Agreement, to encourage and assist other parties to the Agreement to fulfill their announced contributions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 9.

Inaction on climate change will lead to the demise of the human species. Science is not a partisan issue, and the science in this case is crystal clear: Climate change is happening, and we, as humans, are causing it.

The amendment that I am offering today would require the President to include in the administration's strategy how the United States will be able to use all the diplomatic tools available to help our partners around the world meet their own goals.

It is simple. Their success is our success; their failure is our failure. We all

share the same planet, the same environment, and the same atmosphere. We cannot fight this alone. We have to be in this fight with every tool available to us, and that includes our diplomacy.

My amendment recognizes the leadership role that our country can and should play in addressing global climate change. This administration has taken a back seat to facing one of our most pressing national security threats, and this amendment puts us back in the global arena, leading this vital charge.

Some naysayers and doubters have expressed concern that developing countries are and will take advantage of the Paris Agreement, placing the burden of addressing climate change on the U.S. This is misleading. The agreement requires all parties to develop their own plans to reduce carbon emissions. Rather than retreat from that effort, we should lead it.

I serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Just today, Ranking Member McCAUL said that we have always been leaders on the global stage, and when we are not involved, we leave a power vacuum. This applies militarily and diplomatically with respect to humanitarian aid and in the case of climate action as well.

The best way for us to secure the safety and health of our planet is for us to be an aggressive leader in the fight against climate change. Pulling out of the Paris Agreement would send a resounding message to the international community that the United States is not in this fight to save this planet, and that is unacceptable.

Let us be clear: The fight to stop climate change is not just a fight to save our environment. It is a fight for our economy. It is a fight for the health of everyone and for social justice. It is a fight for national security. And, yes, it is a fight for our children, for our future generations, and for humanity.

I introduced this amendment because the threat is too grave for us, as a country, to be doing the bare minimum as laid out in the Paris Agreement. We must also work aggressively with each country to combat climate change at every turn. Inaction is a death sentence for us all.

We have the opportunity before us to stand up for our fellow Americans and brothers and sisters around the world. I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress would agree: This country we call home and this planet we call home are worth fighting for.

I served our country in the Air Force. I believe in this country, and I believe it is worth fighting for.

Yes, climate change poses one of, if not the, gravest existential threats to our country, but its threats are not insurmountable.

Just 2 days ago, Pennsylvania became the 24th State to join the U.S. Climate Alliance, committing to work toward cutting greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Paris Agreement. We in Pennsylvania are still in.

I am proud of our Commonwealth for joining this fight for our country. We in Pennsylvania know America is worth it.

Mr. Chairman, to vote for my amendment is to commit to our necessary leadership on climate change. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I will close after the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman PALLONE, Chairman ENGEL, and Ranking Member McCAUL for all of their leadership and guidance on this very, very important issue.

I also thank the members of my community who have brought me here to serve in this way. This issue couldn't be more fundamental to our existence in my community, our Commonwealth, our country, and our planet.

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

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, for quoting me. I do think we should lead as a nation in the world. I support the United States leading the world on the international challenges we face. But, again, this amendment has nothing to do with reducing our emissions.

We should be a leader on the bipartisan approach to solutions to this crisis, like boosting research, innovation, and technologies.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall produce a report that examines the effect of the Paris Agreement on clean energy job development in rural communities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ms. CASTOR for her tireless leadership on this landmark legislation.

Nearly 2 years ago, the United States ceded global leadership when President Trump announced plans to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, a sweeping accord amongst the overwhelming majority of nation-states to curb carbon pollution and mitigate the damaging effects of climate change.

The Climate Action Now Act reverses this misguided decision by ensuring that America honors its commitments to the Paris Agreement and prevents any taxpayer dollars from being used to take any action to advance the United States' withdrawal from the agreement.

I am proud to support this legislation and to offer an amendment that would require the President to produce a report examining how rejoining the Paris Agreement will bolster clean energy job creation in rural communities.

Contrary to the claims that have been made here today by my colleagues across the aisle, we have seen the positive impacts across my district and across New Hampshire that the deployment of clean energy can have on our communities, both for our economy and our environment.

Our rural communities are home to some of the hardest working Americans who are committed to securing good-paying jobs to support themselves and their families. Clean energy jobs are good-paying jobs.

□ 1645

In New Hampshire, a clean energy job pays 50 percent more than the State's median wage.

Rejoining the Paris climate agreement will spur a new clean energy economy that weans America off fossil fuels from countries that do not share our values, protects our environment by reducing carbon pollution, and creates good paying jobs.

My amendment is straightforward. If we are going to rejoin the Paris Agreement, we must ensure that rural communities benefit from the subsequent job creation and manufacturing. My amendment would create a framework for how rural America can thrive and combat climate change.

We know that rural communities face unique economic challenges, and it is imperative that they are not left behind as we move toward the 21st century clean energy economy.

We also know that rural communities can lead the clean energy revolution, and I am very proud to represent five communities that have made a commitment to use 100 percent renewable energy by 2030: Concord, Keene, Plainfield, Hanover, and Cornish.

I am proud and pleased to offer this amendment with my colleague, Congressman CHRIS PAPPAS, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

vote "yes" on the amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we support this amendment. It is an excellent amendment.

I want to thank Ms. KUSTER for working with the committees to make some changes to her amendment.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I will close after the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee chair. I want to thank Ms. CASTOR for her leadership on this issue, and I want to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help us to create good jobs in our rural communities.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a chance to come down during the debate on the underlying bill, and the committee, of course, raised this issue.

The hope is that the President is going to sign a bill to go back into an agreement that he already decided to get out of. So, when the statement is made—it only reverses the President's action if the President signs the bill. The President is not going to sign this bill.

So why are we here? Why are we spending a whole week? I understand we need to get this climate debate off our chest and eventually move forward, and I hope we will do that in a bipartisan manner.

As to the amendment that we are debating here, not bad, I think, trying to understand the green jobs that will occur. But I think those of us from fossil fuel areas, coal mining areas, marginal oil, well, we would probably like to see an evaluation of job losses that could occur as part of this.

They are going to tout the job creation. Let's look at the areas—and they touted rural America. Let's look at the areas where coal mines will close, coal-fired power plants will close, and the economic impact that will be impacted there.

We are pretty excited about working with the Energy and Commerce Committee on, as is, I think, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, conservation, innovation, adaptation. Our focus is going to be: Let's affect the carbon dioxide emissions without raising energy costs and slowing the economic activity.

I think we have one of the best economies that I have ever served in, and we do have an increase in carbon dioxide this last year because the economic activity is so great.

So if you believe that, which is true, the reverse would be, if you delay and raise energy costs, you could really hurt economic growth.

Mr. Chair, I ask for a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 4, add the following subsection:

(d) STATE AND LOCAL ACTIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit States and cities from taking more ambitious actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions than the actions described in the plan developed and updated under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

My grandsons' generation will remember President Trump's decision to leave the Paris Agreement as the day that he condemned them to a world of manmade devastation.

Today, we have a chance to change that. Which side do we want to be on, the side of future generations or the side of those who would profit at their expense?

H.R. 9 mandates that the United States Government honor the commitments we made in the Paris Agreement.

We also need to protect the rights of cities and States to go above and beyond to meet the unique strains climate change puts on their regions.

For example, California has committed to source 100 percent of its electricity from renewable sources by 2045. This is necessary, considering the toll climate change has taken on California, including historic droughts, deadly fires, and terrible flooding.

Despite this, President Trump has tried to make it harder for California to regulate its own greenhouse emissions. I have offered an amendment to

H.R. 9 that would stop President Trump from using the plan mandated in this act to limit cities and States like California from taking more ambitious action to reduce greenhouse emissions.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I will close after my colleague yields back her time.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

I would like to point out that oftentimes the opposition party talks about States' rights, but when it comes to fighting for climate, cleaning up our air and our water, making sure that people can combat a climate crisis, then: Do you know what? We are going to get involved. We are going to stop these States from doing something that they have been doing.

California is a leader in combating climate change—a leader. We have reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and we are on target to implement a lot of our top goals: 100 percent renewable energy and carbon neutrality by 2045, zero-emission vehicles, and curbing greenhouse gas emissions.

I also, when I was in the State legislature, passed a law that said that more of the money from greenhouse gas emission fees must go to the most disadvantaged and the most impacted communities of climate change. That means that not only are we reducing our carbon footprint, but we are also giving resources directly back to these communities.

So let's not get in the way. Let's not stop California's progress, because it is a leader for not only the country, but the world.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I stand today as a cosponsor of this important amendment offered by my colleague and fellow Californian, Representative TORRES.

Our State and many others across the country are showing the world how to take meaningful steps to meet our Paris climate agreement commitments.

While the current administration continues to do everything in its power to prioritize industry conflicts of interest over the sustainability and future of our planet, I am proud of the forward-thinking work being done in our cities, like the ones in my district, in Orange County, and States like the one I call home, California. These important efforts must not be prohibited.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, if we don't take an aggressive step to deal with this problem, our grandchildren and their grandchildren will pay the price.

A United States Government report found that our economy will lose over \$1 trillion dollars by the end of this century due to climate change. Clean energy is an investment, not only for our communities, but for future generations.

California has over 500,000 jobs created within the clean energy sector. That is about 10 times the number of coal jobs nationwide. This amendment ensures that California's progress and commitment will not be sabotaged.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for offering this critical legislation.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Listen, in the transmission world, other than Texas, no State is alone. California is in the Western interconnect. So we have great support for States' rights, but decisions made by California will affect Nevada and will affect Arizona.

For example, we have seen how decisions in some areas actually benefit the fossil energy in other areas, such as support of fossil and nuclear power in Arizona for California's electricity requirements.

The basic underlying amendment really does nothing to address things that we would like to support—conservation, innovation, adaption—trying to, in a bipartisan approach, address the real issue, which is how do we reduce carbon dioxide emissions in a way that protects the economy, grows the economy. We also feel that our citizens are better served when they have good paying jobs and they are working versus a risk of not doing that if you move down an unchecked path.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) Article 8 of the Paris Agreement states that “Parties recognize the importance of averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events”, such as sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, and flooding.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, since 1950, the sea level in south Florida has risen 8 inches and it is only speeding up. By 2030, the sea level in south Florida is projected to rise up to 12 inches, and by the end of the century, perhaps 80 inches. If we continue to do nothing on climate change, my community, and, in fact, my district, will disappear.

We have a moral obligation to mitigate and adapt immediately, as we are already seeing the effects of climate change and sea level rise.

That is why I was so heartened when the international community came together to sign the Paris Agreement, and that is why I was so devastated when this administration announced the United States' withdrawal.

The Paris Agreement strengthens the international response to climate change adaptation, mitigation, and capacity building. It is our best, collective effort to combat climate change.

The withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and the failure to act on climate is a mistake with global implications and catastrophic consequences for my south Florida community.

I am proud to support H.R. 9 because it rejects the decision to withdraw from Paris and requires the President to develop a plan to meet the United States' commitment under the agreement.

My amendment strengthens the bill because it makes clear that addressing climate change means addressing its effects that are ravaging our coastal communities, sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, and flooding.

My region's drinking water is seriously threatened as the sea rises and the saltwater reaches further inland and gets dangerously close to our fragile aquifer.

In south Florida, it no longer takes a strong hurricane to flood our streets. They now flood just from a particularly high tide, such as the king tides. In fact, tidal flooding has become three times as common in south Florida in just the past 19 years, causing so-called sunny-day flooding. We simply cannot wait.

Coastal communities around the world, including my south Florida community, are counting on us. I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I represent a coastal district, so the threat of worsening sea level rise is especially important to me, so I am glad my colleague from Florida offered this amendment.

It is a good amendment and speaking on behalf of the Energy and Commerce

Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support its adoption.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I will close after the gentlewoman closes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I have completed my statement. This is absolutely critical to my south Florida community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say, I agree with the premise of this amendment. Addressing sea level rise is a serious issue as well as saltwater intrusion and flooding.

I am a member of the House Oceans Caucus, but, again, it does not reduce our emissions. It is not, to me, germane to the underlying bill.

I think we should debate, once again, bipartisan solutions on boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to produce a report that examines the potential impacts of a withdrawal by the United States from the Paris Agreement on the global economic competitiveness of the United States economy and on workers in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to follow the previous discussion that was taking place under Mrs. TORRES' amendment, having spent a long time in California on air regulation as an appointee to the California Air Resources Board by three Governors—Republicans and Democrats—where we worked in a bipartisan fashion under Federal regulation in the Clean Air Act, and California regulation, first to improve the air quality for Californians, but other States that followed us under the U.S. Clean Air

Act, on criteria pollutants, but now to do it on carbon.

So my amendment would direct the administration to work with the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate the negative economic impacts to the United States' global competitiveness and to our workforce by leaving the Paris treaty.

Our experience in California has been, by transitioning to renewables and alternative fuels, one of the best arguments—of course, secondary to saving the planet, in my view—is the economic benefit. So, I hear and I respect some of the conversations and perspectives from people from different parts of the country, but that has not been our experience.

Our experience has been that we passed a bill in 2006 that I was involved with in the legislature that called for the California Air Resources Board to drop CO₂ emissions by 2020 to 1990 levels. We were told by industry that there was no way we could do that. We are actually on track to do that.

In fact, the last Governor, Governor Brown, signed legislation to decrease our CO₂ levels and, again, directed the California Air Resources Board to implement a strategy to do that in regulations to 40 percent by 2030.

On the renewable side, we went to 33-1/3 percent, a third of our renewables by 2020 on the stationary source side, and the industry came when I was in the legislature and said: We can't do this. We want your help.

We went through with it, and, in fact, we did it. So now there is legislation saying that by 2030, we should decrease it or only have 50 percent renewables.

So what has that done to the economy? Our economy is the fifth largest in the world. We get more venture capital in the United States for renewables and alternative fuels than the total, combined research investment in venture capital in the other 49 States.

We get half of the venture capital in total in the whole country into California, and it continues to provide for transition and new jobs. Many of our workforce are transitioning from fossil fuel to renewables.

When we get mass-produced electric cars—and I am fearful that my grandchildren will drive Chinese electric cars—but we know that our car companies are transitioning and being somewhat successful and we hope that they will continue to be, as General Motors has indicated it would. It is in our best interest to continue this movement.

My hope is that we would work collectively with the people who are being displaced, whether they are coal miners in West Virginia, or refinery workers in the four refineries in my county, to make sure that they don't lose out as the new economy takes over. The world benefits and the economy benefits. So that is the purpose of this amendment.

I do want to say that right now, 3.3 million Americans now work in clean energy jobs; 2.3 million different jobs

are energy efficient; and 318,000 jobs are in California. The World Bank has an analysis that says the Paris accord will contribute \$23 trillion to the world economy.

So on the basis of that and the fact that there are three times more jobs in the renewable and alternative fuel right now in the world than there are in the fossil fuel industry, I think that my colleagues should support this amendment so that we get the facts from the National Academy of Sciences, and the administration can see that what we are supporting not only benefits the planet and public health, but it benefits the economy and the future of American competitiveness.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, let me say first to the gentleman from California, that I appreciate the Californians and the California tech companies expanding to my home city of Austin, Texas, but I find this amendment contrary to the premise of this bill, which prohibits withdrawing from the U.S. Paris Agreement. In fact, it withdraws funding.

So for that reason, I am in opposition to it, and, again, I think, as the gentleman stated, we should be advancing—if this bill doesn't make it through the Senate, doesn't get signed into law—advancing the clean energy technologies I think both of our States want to advance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ms. JACKSON LEE, I speak in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, add the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement is an example of multilateral, international cooperation needed to overcome challenges facing the international community, such as reducing emissions, promoting economic growth, and deploying clean energy technologies.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I am offering this amendment on behalf of myself, Congress-

woman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Congressman MOULTON of Massachusetts, and Congresswoman HAYES of Connecticut, and I express my appreciation to them for their assistance and support.

This amendment improves the bill by adding a finding which emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in responding to the global challenges facing the international community.

Mr. Chair, the Paris climate accord was an example of the international leadership commitment and resolve that defeated fascism, created NATO, the European Union, the Marshall Plan, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and most importantly, preserved peace and freedom for the last 75 years.

Collective international action is also needed to combat growing international challenges such as terrorism, human trafficking, and black-market sales of illegal weapons, drugs, and tobacco.

No one country can solve these problems on its own, and this amendment emphasizes the importance of collective international action.

The landmark Paris climate accord was established to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable, low-carbon future. This also brings all Nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects with enhanced support to assist developing countries to do so.

In these efforts, we promote the importance of continued international cooperation that has sustained the global community through epidemics, famines, and natural disasters.

Mr. Chairman, a collection of rational actors acting in a selfless manner to achieve a rational result, such as this, requires leadership and systematic reasoning. Without this type of collective action and selfless resolve, we leave ourselves vulnerable to a tragedy of the commons.

When countries act solely in their own best interests without regard to combating international threats, everyone suffers. That is why a great person and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton so eloquently said, "We are stronger together."

The Jackson Lee-Moulton-Hayes amendment reflects this important insight by Mrs. Clinton, and I urge support of this amendment.

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

□ 1715

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment, but I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I will close once the gentleman from New Jersey yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee for yielding me time.

The Paris Agreement will still stand with or without the U.S. not meeting our commitment, and it doesn't hurt the Paris Agreement, it just hurts the U.S. diplomatically and economically. So it is so critical that we use this opportunity to express to the world and to express to our own Nation that climate change is a priority for this Congress.

Beyond the diplomatic consequences around the world, a decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement hurts Americans right here at home. The U.S. is in the midst of a major transition to clean energy. As consumers demand access to cleaner energy and cleaner air, prices for renewables are falling across the board. With the market forces increasing favoring renewables, dirty energy is no longer a smart investment.

So I want to thank my colleague, KATHY CASTOR, and I want to thank the members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee for continuing to stand strong and stand firm in our commitment to the American people, because ceding the leadership role on the global stage means losing economic opportunities in the global clean energy economy, hurting American workers and businesses.

As we talk about the international framework, we see China, India, and other countries would lead if America does not.

This decision is just another bad Trump deal for the United States of America. It won't bring the coal industry back, and it cedes ground to creating renewable energy jobs that put Americans to work.

This is the new industrial revolution of the 21st century. Let us not cede our leadership to others around the globe but let us lead them. Let us provide the technology that the world will utilize to make sure that we save and preserve this planet, not only for our generation, but generations to come.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, I am not opposed to this amendment. I think the international community should reduce emissions. I think the issue is that the international community is not living up to the expectations of this agreement, particularly China and India. While we have reduced emissions by 14 percent, they have doubled their emissions, and they have until 2030 to reduce any emissions. That is why fundamentally I think this is a flawed agreement.

But I am not opposed to an international consensus to reduce emissions. I don't think this is the right way to do it.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment on behalf of myself, Congressman MOULTON of Massachusetts and Congresswoman HAYES of Connecticut, and express my appreciation to them for their assistance and support.

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment improves the bill by adding a finding which emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in responding to the global challenges facing the international community.

The Paris Climate Accord was an example of the international leadership, commitment, and resolve that defeated fascism, created NATO, the European Union, the Marshall Plan, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and most importantly, preserved peace and freedom for the last 75 years.

Collective international action is also needed to combat growing international challenges such as terrorism, human trafficking, and black-market sales of illegal weapons, drugs, and tobacco.

No one country can solve these problems on its own, and this amendment emphasizes the importance of collective international action.

The landmark Paris Climate Accord was established to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future.

This also brings all nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects, with enhanced support to assist developing countries to do so.

And in these efforts, we promote the importance of continued international cooperation that has sustained the global community through epidemics, famines, and natural disasters.

A collective of rational actors acting in a selfless manner to achieve a rational result such as this requires leadership and systemic reasoning.

Without this type of collective action and selfless resolve, we leave ourselves vulnerable to a Tragedy of Commons.

When countries act solely in their best interests without regard to combatting international threats, everyone suffers.

That is why a great person and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, so eloquently said: "We are stronger together."

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment reflects this important insight.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement is a treaty and should be treated as a treaty. Therefore, before any action can be taken to execute the goals in the Paris Agreement, the Senate should approve a resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Paris Agreement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment ensuring the constitutionality of the Paris Agreement. The previous administration refused to abide by the Constitution and called this an agreement, not a treaty, despite the agreement having an impact on every American.

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."

My amendment simply states that the Paris Agreement is a treaty, and before anything can be implemented to abide by the agreement, it should be submitted to the Senate for approval.

My good friend from Virginia, Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH, said it best yesterday in our Special Order when he eloquently stated: "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. And 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."

Many radical environmental groups are saying the Paris Agreement does not need to go to the Senate, that the agreement reiterates obligations already contained in article 4 of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, or the UNFCCC. This is completely a falsehood.

The Congressional Research Service has already proven them wrong.

Let me quote the CRS: "The George H.W. Bush administration stated that Article 4.2 of the UNFCCC, which commits the parties to, inter alia, adopt national policies and, accordingly, mitigate climate change by limiting GHG emissions did not require any new implementing legislation nor

added regulatory programs.' Perhaps, most importantly, it stated that an amendment or future agreement under the UNFCCC to adopt targets and timetables for emissions reductions would be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent."

Furthermore, in a subsequent report, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations wrote:

"A decision by the conference of parties 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. The committee notes further that a decision by the executive branch to reinterpret the convention to apply legally binding targets and timetables for reducing emissions of greenhouse gases to the United States would alter the 'shared understanding' of the convention between the Senate and the executive branch and would therefore require the Senate's advice and consent."

The previous administration purposely ignored the will of Congress by refusing to send the Paris Agreement to the Senate. I often hear Members from both sides of the aisle lament about executive overreach.

Here we have a clear case of the executive branch telling Congress it doesn't matter.

If Congress refuses to exercise its constitutional authority and not demand the Paris Agreement to be sent to the Senate, then this body is telling future Presidents that there are no checks and balances.

Madam Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment that preserves the constitutional checks and balance, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. NORTON). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I strongly support this amendment. It has been the thrust of our argument.

I support the U.S. Constitution Article I authority. This process circumvented that. I do believe it required Senate ratification. But not only that, the President didn't even consult with the Congress. There was not one hearing on this during the Obama administration and therefore circumventing the American people. For that reason, I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I will finish that up.

The State Department has a Circular 175, and there are ten opportunities

that tell us whether they are an agreement or whether they are a treaty.

So let me highlight just four or five of these.

Number one, the extent to which the agreement involves commitments or risks affecting the nation as a whole.

This obviously impacts everybody across this country, therefore, ratification by the Senate.

Whether the agreement is intended to affect State laws.

This will bind all State laws, because they have to fulfill the ratification based on that activity. So, therefore, it, once again, has to be a treaty.

Whether the agreement can be given effect without the enactment of subsequent legislation by the Congress.

This agreement obligates U.S. taxpayer funds to the Green Climate Fund, which is a slush fund, but it still obligates those applications and that money to that fund. Therefore, it must be fulfilled by a treaty.

Madam Chair, I ask Members to adopt my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we have heard this argument over and over again. The Republicans said the same thing in the markup before the Energy and Commerce Committee, but these Republican arguments are not going to change the facts.

The fact is the Paris Agreement itself is not a treaty. It is an agreement under an existing treaty, and that is the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, that is UNFCCC, pronounced UNF triple C, and that was signed by President George H.W. Bush and approved by both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate in 1992.

There is no requirement for the Senate to approve subsidiary agreements around already approved treaties.

In fact, the vast majority of international agreements to which the United States is a party are not treaties. According to the Congressional Research Service, more than 90 percent of international legal agreements which the United States supports are agreements that do not require Senate ratification.

Now, President Obama did not have to submit the Paris Agreement to the Senate for ratification for two reasons: first, because the emissions targets are not legally binding; and, second, because the legally binding commitments, which are almost entirely procedural, generally either elaborate or repeat obligations under the UNFCCC.

It is also not true that an agreement with any legally binding provisions must be ratified by the Senate. There are many ways in which the United States can enter into international agreements with legally binding commitments.

As I previously mentioned, the vast majority of international agreements the United States enters into are not

approved by the Senate. Using examples of that, we have the U.S.-Canada Air Quality Agreement, the Minamata Convention on Mercury, and the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution.

Arguments that the GOP are using, that the Paris Agreement needs to be ratified are disingenuous. They are, frankly, trying to avoid climate action at all costs. I really find it unfortunate that rather than arguing on the merits, that they use these arguments about ratification that are simply disingenuous.

For those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 3 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that strikes section 3 of the bill. Section 3 prohibits the use of funds to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement. My amendment ensures any decision made on the Paris Agreement will be based on the merits, not politics.

I have said this before, and I will say it again: Either the Paris Agreement is a treaty, or it is not. If it is not a treaty, then the current administration may independently terminate the agreement without congressional approval, as the previous administration entered into the agreement without congressional approval.

Makes sense, right?

What one administration does by executive action can be undone by the next administration by executive action.

If the Paris Agreement is not an agreement entered into by the United States by executive action and con-

stitutes a treaty, then it should be presented to the Senate and put on the floor for a two-thirds vote per Article II, Section 2 of our Constitution.

□ 1730

For the last several years, Democratic Members have crowed at the top of their lungs about none of the funds provisions and forced the U.S. Senate to agree to only take up appropriation bills if they don't include political riders. Riders have not been included in the final appropriations bills signed into law as a result.

Well, folks, section 3 is a political, none-of-the-funds rider, whose sole ability is to try and prevent the administration from doing something they currently have the authority to do. The hypocrisy here is outrageous, and this amendment should pass based on that precedent utilized over the last several years alone.

We have heard folks on the other side of the aisle claim we need to stay in the Paris Agreement in order to protect future generations. Americans for Tax Reform estimates the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 6.5 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our GDP 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.

How does killing 6.5 to 31.6 million jobs and costing our economy more than \$3 trillion protect future generations? I don't know.

The European Climate Action Network reported that no single country in Europe is performing sufficiently to meet the Paris Agreement goals.

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

China and India, the world's two biggest polluters, have said they will not even consider reducing carbon emissions until 2030 at the earliest, while we are pledging to reduce our emissions by 26 to 28 percent by 2025.

How does tying ourselves to a non-binding agreement that puts us at a competitive disadvantage and that countries throughout the world are failing to implement protect the American people?

This is not a partisan issue, Madam Chairwoman. This is about doing what is right for America and about protecting freedom and opportunity for our children and grandchildren.

If the administration didn't already have the authority to withdraw the United States from the fundamentally flawed Paris Agreement, then there should be no reason to include the section 3 political rider being debated here today.

But since the United States Senate has failed to take up the Paris Agreement and weigh in one way or the other whether the Paris Agreement is a

treaty or not, this body should not attempt to tie the administration's hands with a political none-of-the-funds rider.

Either you are for the Constitution or you are not. Either you believe executive action can be taken to enter and leave the Paris Agreement or you don't.

I urge adoption of my amendment, which removes the politics from the bill and allows any decision made on the Paris Agreement to be based on merits, not politics.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Once again, Madam Chairwoman, this is an important application. Once again, you have to realize that we are talking about the Constitution.

The other side talks out of both sides of their mouth. They want it one way when they are in the minority, they want it the other way when they are in the majority, and they can't have that.

This is about the rule of law and about good policy. Good process builds good policy builds good politics, and that is just not what is here today.

So when we start looking at the applications here, let's make sure the American taxpayer, the American family, is treated fairly, not put at a disadvantage by the rest of the world.

Too often we have taken the short end of the stick. It is fine for us to stand up.

And, by the way, if I am not mistaken, in 2015, 2016, and 2017 we led the world in carbon emissions reductions. Yes, it is that very application of entrepreneurialism and technology that has driven that boat. Let's continue doing it that way. Let's get back to good process.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to Mr. GOSAR's amendment, which would gut the heart of the bill, the section that prevents the President from withdrawing from the Paris Agreement.

Now, the Paris Agreement sets a strong foundation for action that will accelerate the shift to a clean energy economy and put us on the path to a safer, healthier planet for generations to come. It is the most ambitious climate change agreement in history and builds upon the unprecedented participation of roughly 200 parties to the convention, including India and China, something that my Republican colleagues have wanted for many years.

It provides a framework for reducing U.S. carbon pollution, while also growing our economy. More energy-efficient appliances, buildings, and vehicles will

result in lower energy costs for consumers, all while lowering emissions of harmful air pollutants and keeping our manufacturing industries competitive in this global transition towards low carbon practices.

So, first and foremost, what H.R. 9 is doing is stopping President Trump's reckless withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, the very agreement our country was instrumental in negotiating. But this move has real diplomatic consequences, further diminishing America's credibility around the world.

Let me be clear, the Paris Agreement will still stand with or without the United States; but not meeting our commitments doesn't hurt the Paris Agreement, it just hurts the United States diplomatically and economically. Other countries, not to mention U.S. cities and States, are still moving forward on climate action, making the Trump administration only appear more isolated and irrelevant as the world moves past us.

But beyond the diplomatic consequences around the world a decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement hurts Americans at home.

The U.S. is in the midst of a major transition to clean energy. As consumers demand access to cleaner energy and cleaner air, prices for renewables are falling across the board. With market forces increasingly favoring renewables, dirty energy is no longer a smart investment.

Ceding the leadership role on the global stage means losing economic opportunities in a global clean energy economy, hurting American workers and businesses. China, India and other countries will lead if America does not.

Leaving the Paris Agreement is just another bad Trump deal for the United States. H.R. 9 is trying to prevent this bad Trump deal from becoming our reality. The Gosar amendment would all but guarantee that the United States feels the full weight of the economic and diplomatic consequences of abandoning our friends and allies.

This amendment ensures we lose the clean energy development race to China or India.

This amendment locks the United States and the world into a future of catastrophic warming that puts all of our lives and livelihoods at risk.

I said this earlier when we spoke on the bill: We cannot look backwards. We can't look back into the 19th century. We have to look forward, with new innovation, with an economy that creates more jobs.

Don't let us fall behind the rest of the world and not lead on such an important issue. It is a huge mistake. That is why we are saying in H.R. 9, in this bill, that the President should not be allowed to withdraw and should put together a plan that leads us forward toward a clean economy and meeting the Paris goals.

So, I oppose the Gosar amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in vot-

ing against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CASE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) The Paris Agreement recognizes that the ocean ecosystems covering more than 70 percent of the Earth's surface have an integral role in climate balance. Seventy percent of nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement are ocean-inclusive, and 39 Paris Agreement signatories are focused on the inclusion of ocean action in nationally determined contributions through the Because the Ocean Initiative.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 9, which would recognize the importance of the oceans to our global climate system and the international efforts under way to include our oceans in nationally determined contributions, or NDCs, under the Paris Agreement.

When we talk about the impacts of manmade climate change, we focus on the worlds of our lands and air, but we tend to forget the largest world of all, our oceans. Yet, some of the foremost negative consequences of climate change, as well as the positive vital processes that have kept our climate on an even keel until recently and can continue to do so, lie in the ocean.

We cannot forget the oceans. No climate change solutions can work if our oceans are not in the room.

The ocean covers more than 70 percent of the Earth and directly affects weather around the globe. The temperature and currents of the ocean determine storm patterns and strength.

We have seen increases in measures of intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as the number of the strongest—category 4 and 5—storms since the 1980s.

The ocean also absorbs many of the most immediate consequences of carbon pollution, buffering us from some

of its most damaging impacts. The ocean has absorbed 93 percent of the total excess heat energy taken up by greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. Additionally, the ocean is the largest sink for anthropogenic carbon dioxide, or CO₂, absorbing roughly one-third of CO₂ emissions.

The increase in temperature and carbon in the atmosphere and oceans are directly impacting communities throughout the world. According to the 2018 Fourth National Climate Assessment, or NCA, released by the U.S. Global Change Research Program, made up of 13 Federal agencies: “Human-caused carbon emissions influence ocean ecosystems through three main processes: ocean warming, acidification, and deoxygenation.”

Additionally, the NCA states: “The social, economic, and environmental systems along the coasts are being affected by climate change. Threats from sea level rise are exacerbated by dynamic processes such as high tide and storm surge flooding, erosion, waves and their effects, saltwater intrusion into coastal aquifers and elevated groundwater tables, local rainfall, river runoff, increasing water and surface air temperatures, and ocean acidification.”

In just one compelling instance of many from around the world, my State of Hawaii’s oceans and coastlines are on the front lines of dealing with the impacts of climate change in our oceans and coasts.

For example, the Honolulu tide gauge, a constant for over a century now, has measured a sea level rise of nearly half a foot since 1905.

Over 70 percent of our beaches in Hawaii are in a state of chronic erosion, likely caused by a combination of shoreline hardening and ongoing sea level rise.

The frequency of high tide flooding in Honolulu since the 1960s increased from 6 days per year to 11 per year.

We have also seen in Hawaii sea level rise impact traditional and customary practices, including fishpond maintenance, cultivation of salt, and gathering from the nearshore fisheries.

About 550 cultural sites, 38 miles of major roads, and more than \$19 billion in assets will be vulnerable to chronic flooding resulting from a 3.2-foot increase in sea level. Such widespread flooding will change the character of the islands by affecting cultural heritage and daily commerce and lifestyle, and this is chronic throughout the entire Pacific.

We also, in Hawaii, face just one example of the impacts of ocean warming, acidification, on our reefs.

We have seen globally averaged sea surface temperature increase by 1.8 percent Fahrenheit over the past 100 years.

We have seen over nearly 30 years of oceanic pH measurements, based on data collected from Station ALOHA, Hawaii, show a roughly 8.7 percent increase in ocean acidity over this time.

We have seen increased ocean acidification reduce the ability of marine organisms to build shells and other hard structures, adversely impacting coral reefs and threatening marine ecosystems.

We have seen extended periods of coral bleaching, which did not even occur first until 2014 but now are becoming much longer.

This is, again, true throughout the entire Pacific Ocean. And we are not alone, because the ocean is interconnected throughout our world, and we are a clear example of what the world is facing.

These impacts are happening all over the world and our country.

Madam Chair, 39 countries—conspicuously, not including the U.S.—have embraced the challenges and promise of our oceans in facing climate change by signing the Because the Ocean initiative, which has encouraged progress on the incorporation of the ocean in climate change policy debate, with a special focus on the inclusion of ocean action into nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement. The efforts of these countries and their partners will be invaluable as we face the crisis of climate change.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Chair, let me just say first, we all recognize the oceans’ ecosystems, 70 percent of the Earth’s surface. I am a member of the Ocean Caucus.

This really has nothing to do with reducing our emissions. It is simply a finding. We ought to be focused on bipartisan solutions and boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The President shall—

(1) in making the plan under subsection (a), and updates under subsection (b), available to the public, and before submitting such plan and updates to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) publish the plan or update, as applicable, in the Federal Register; and

(B) provide a period of at least 90 days for public comment; and

(2) after each such period for public comment, continue to make the proposed plan or update, as well as the comments received, available to the public on regulations.gov (or any successor website).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, any time Congress considers legislation that will radically change our economy, the American people deserve an opportunity to be heard first. And make no mistake, the underlying bill is a radical change to our economy, and not for the better.

My amendment is simple. Before Congress considers legislation to comply with the Paris climate agreement, let’s give the American people 90 days of public comment. That is a standard exception for legislation as big as this.

Who would dare deny our job creators, working families, farmers, coal miners, and manufacturers the opportunity to be heard?

If you support the underlying bill, then I would think you would need to hear how this agreement will impact people’s jobs and their bottom lines. No one will escape higher prices for energy, food, housing, transportation, or just about anything else. If you come from an industrial State, like my home State of Illinois, you can be especially hard hit.

According to recent studies, the Paris Agreement will devastate employment in steel, iron, cement, and oil refining by killing over 1 million jobs.

Manufacturing jobs are good jobs, and they are jobs that are multipliers, with every new steel job leading to seven additional jobs in the region in which they are created.

We just worked our tail off with the President, President Trump’s administration, to help bring nearly 2,000 jobs back, the steel jobs that were in Granite City that were lost. The underlying bill would throw these jobs right back out the window.

What about our farmers? They have faced tougher times and more uncertainty than at any other time, and this would cripple them.

Coal miners have a proud heritage in my district. They are barely hanging on, and this would be the final nail in the coffin.

All of this risk, and for what? A global climate agreement that holds America to a higher standard than China, India, and other emerging nations with bigger emissions and pollution problems?

Look, I have 11 grandchildren. I want to leave a healthier world for them. I want future generations to look back and say that we cared about the future of our planet. But we also have to worry about the people’s security in the present. We need to work together to find solutions that protect jobs and protect the planet.

So before the people's House considers the underlying bill, let's hear from the people themselves.

Support my amendment and give our constituents the opportunity to be heard on just how bad the Paris Agreement could be for them.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Let me explain. I am only claiming the time in opposition. I actually support the gentleman's amendment.

In the interest of increasing transparency and public participation in the development of the President's climate plan, I believe that Mr. BOST's amendment actually is a good one.

Speaking on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support its adoption and would accept the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for supporting the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

(9) The Paris Agreement recognizes "the fundamental priority of safeguarding food security and ending hunger, and the particular vulnerabilities of food production systems to the adverse impacts of climate change."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, my amendment adds language that recognizes the fundamental link between climate change and food security, as recognized in the Paris Agreement.

The administration's plan to leave the Paris Agreement is a betrayal of America's global leadership and threatens food security for hundreds of millions of people in the United States and around the world.

Vulnerable communities, including children, the elderly, and low-income individuals, are at a greater risk of malnutrition or chronic hunger if the

effects of climate change are not mitigated.

According to the 2018 "National Climate Assessment," climate change will lead to reduced agricultural productivity, and food production will decline in U.S. regions that experience increased frequency and duration of droughts, floods, and severe storms.

Climate change will cause irreparable damage to New York's agriculture sector, which is the dominant ag State in the Northeast.

According to the New York Climate Change Science Clearinghouse, climate change may affect food production by increased heat stress days above 90 degrees Fahrenheit, which could stress livestock and some crops; increased river flooding, which is likely to cause soil erosion, soil loss, and crop damage; and wetter springs, which could delay planting for crops and reduce yields.

These are just a few examples of how climate change may affect New York's agriculture sector.

However, climate change isn't just an American problem. It is a global problem that will cause already vulnerable communities to face increased malnutrition and chronic hunger.

According to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, chronic hunger is on the rise. The number of people facing chronic food deprivation increased to nearly 821 million in 2017 from around 804 million in 2016.

Food insecurity is already a challenge across the globe and is likely to become an even greater threat as climate change impacts agriculture production. Food insecurity can also further strain communities that are already facing challenges, from conflict to job scarcity.

The 2014 "Worldwide Threat Assessment" noted that "the lack of adequate food will be a destabilizing factor in countries important to U.S. national security."

The President's plan to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris Agreement is misguided and will contribute to food insecurity here and abroad. It is imperative the President understands the consequences of climate change for food security and ending hunger.

Again, my amendment simply recognizes the critical and inextricable link between climate change and food security, as recognized in the Paris Agreement.

I urge support for the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, we all agree with the premise of this amendment—food security, ending hunger.

Again, this amendment does nothing to reduce our emissions. We need to debate bipartisan solutions, such as boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 116-42.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 6. STUDY AND REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit a report to the Congress on the impact of the plan under subsection (a) on the United States territories, including the potential positive and negative impacts on their economies, taking into consideration their unique energy needs and systems and the climate change vulnerabilities faced by communities in these jurisdictions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak on behalf of my bipartisan amendment, Amendment No. 15. This bill will provide for a target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 level by 2025.

While I share some of my colleagues' concerns about the effectiveness of these targets and the underlying bill, I strongly believe that it is vital that Congress and the Federal Government pay particular attention to the needs of 3.5 million American citizens living in all five U.S. territories whenever it is considering and crafting policies that tackle climate risk.

My amendment will help us achieve just that. Specifically, it directs the General Accounting Office to study and submit a report to Congress on the impact of the President's plan on the U.S. territories, including the potential positive and negative implications on our economies.

In conducting this analysis, the General Accounting Office will have to consider our unique energy needs and systems and the climate risk vulnerabilities faced by communities across our islands.

U.S. territories are at the forefront of climate risks. Given our geographic location, we are particularly vulnerable to extreme weather events. Hurricanes Irma and Maria in 2017, for example, completely devastated Puerto Rico

and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Typhoon Yutu did the same last year in the Northern Mariana Islands.

□ 1800

We are also vulnerable to rising sea levels and coastal erosion. In fact, it is estimated that approximately 60 percent of Puerto Rico's beaches show some sign of erosion, negatively impacting critical infrastructure, communities, properties, and the economies and livelihoods of coastal communities across our island.

Unlike our fellow Americans in the 48 contiguous States, we are not interconnected with a national or larger power grid. Instead, we have isolated systems with limited access to cost-effective fuel sources, heavily rely on foreign petroleum imports, and face among the highest electricity rates in the Nation.

My amendment will allow the study of whether the President's plan has any impact on addressing and tackling these issues, in terms of providing us important information to ensure we are enacting the most effective policies to help territories become more resilient.

It also allows us to study whether the President's plan is a net positive for territories and ensures it does not further raise energy costs, which will be detrimental to economic growth and development.

We need to have a comprehensive understanding of how any climate policy impacts the U.S. territories and incorporates our unique energy needs and realities.

Madam Chair, this bipartisan amendment—and I thank Congresswoman PLASKETT and Congresswoman RADEWAGEN, as well as Congressman SAN NICOLAS of Guam, for being original cosponsors of this amendment—offers a sensible and simple way to achieve this. That is the reason why I thank all of them for sponsoring this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment for the U.S. territories.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I join my colleagues today to speak out on the President's intent to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement by supporting H.R. 9 and specifically in support of Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN's amendment that is before the floor right now.

The President's intent to withdraw from the climate agreement is perilous, misguided, and ignores the in-

creasingly stark reality of the impacts of climate change in our Nation as well as in the world.

Rising sea levels are already having devastating impacts on hundreds of vulnerable communities across the country and around the world.

Last week, I visited Charleston, South Carolina, and listened to the mayor of Charleston discuss how they were urgently working to heighten the seawall in Charleston directly as a consequence of drastically increasing carbon emissions, and likely related to warming sea water and the rise in sea level and volatility that has caused so much damage.

The catastrophic effects of global warming were manifested in 2017 and 2018 natural disasters, where the Nation saw unprecedented natural disasters, from the deadliest wildfires in California to the worst hurricanes that hit the East Coast and Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The vulnerability of the island territories is particularly important, as they are isolated and have specific energy issues and concerns that other places do not due to their isolation and being surrounded by and part of the ocean environment.

Madam Chair, I thank Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for her work on this amendment, which requires a report on the impact of climate change in the U.S. territories that pays particular attention and consideration to their unique energy needs and systems and the climate change vulnerabilities faced by communities in this jurisdiction.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and passage of H.R. 9.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I also thank Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN and, actually, Congresswoman PLASKETT. I was able to visit the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico during the last hurricane, and it was devastating. I appreciate the hospitality shown in difficult times.

Madam Chair, while this is a "let's do an evaluation of good and bad," versus one of the amendments we talked about earlier, I am pleased to support it.

The only caveat we would say is that we would rather have these reports done prior to making major decisions versus making a decision and then seeing how it is going to impact. But I am pleased to support it, and I thank the gentlewoman for bringing it forward.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I would inquire if the gentlewoman has any additional speakers.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Puerto Rico has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, because I have the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, let me say, this is a good amendment, and speaking on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support its adoption.

Madam Chair, I thank Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for working with the committees to make changes to her amendment. It has already been mentioned by my colleague, Mr. SHIMKUS, that she was our gracious host when we went to Puerto Rico and also to the Virgin Islands in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria, where we saw the devastation of the hurricane.

Of course, part of the reason why we as Democrats support the Paris Agreement is that we are very concerned about these severe and more severe weather conditions that are occurring because of climate change.

Madam Chair, this is a good amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to support it. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement recognizes that adaptation is a global challenge faced by all with local, subnational, national, regional and international dimensions, and that it is a key component of and makes a contribution to the long-term global response to climate change to protect people, livelihoods, and ecosystems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman PALLONE, my colleague and neighbor from New Jersey. I also thank Chairman ENGEL for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

My amendment to H.R. 9 takes language from the Paris Agreement and

recognizes that adaptation of the agreement is a key component of the global response to climate change.

Climate change is one of the defining issues of our time, and we are in a defining moment. From shifting weather patterns that threaten food production to rising sea levels that increase the risk of catastrophic flooding, the impacts of climate change are global in scope and unprecedented in scale.

Without dramatic action today, adapting to these impacts in the future will be far more difficult and costlier.

The Paris Agreement for the first time brought all nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and to adapt to its effects. The agreement chartered a new course in the global climate effort.

This amendment stands for the American leadership that was displayed throughout the development and the adoption of the Paris Agreement.

In order to bring every nation to the table, it is essential that we retain our commitment to this agreement. That is why I urge support for this amendment as well as for the underlying bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentleman has yielded back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Chair, this amendment basically attempts to state the following: Not only is climate change real and not only are there profound environmental reasons for addressing it, the Paris climate agreement was also a tremendous achievement of U.S. foreign policy. That is why we must keep it. The United States must remain in it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment, but it does not address reducing emissions. We should debate bipartisan solutions, as I stated in the past.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following new paragraph:

(9) American leadership encouraged widespread international participation in the Paris Agreement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

As we know and as we have been hearing all day, this bill that we are considering ensures that the United States honors our commitments detailed in the Paris Agreement and lays the groundwork for further action on climate change.

By including this amendment in this bill, it will then be crystal clear that it is the United States that has led and will continue to lead when it comes to influencing other nations to participate in the Paris Agreement.

Now, yes, I do admit that it was the leadership of the United States that got other nations of the world to come together and boldly declare our unified commitment to dealing with the growing climate crisis. We did that by explicitly committing ourselves to play a leadership role. We had to do that in order to attract other countries to join in the goal of limiting the temperature of our globe.

That is why the United States gave structural and directional leadership with ready greenhouse gas reduction targets and a vision for institutional design principles.

Moreover, in our efforts to entice other nations to be a part of the deal, the United States made recommendations for financing adaption, energy investment, and support for developing countries.

The U.S. then stepped up and led by example by announcing its intent to reduce carbon pollution by drastic levels, an act that underscored our role as a global leader on the issue of climate change.

It was that American ambition, that American action, that encouraged other nations around the world to set their sights and their standards higher and to be bolder on the most pressing issue that we face when it comes to climate change. As a result, we saw an unprecedented display of a global commitment to address that pressing issue.

That is why it is all the more disappointing that this administration announced its intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, an act that would make the United States, the country that pushed us and others into this agreement, the only country to reject this agreement.

□ 1815

If the United States abdicates its leadership role here, it will not only cost us influence in this agreement, it will also invite other countries to walk away from combating the climate crisis.

As Todd Stern, the former U.S. special envoy for climate change, stated at a World Resources Institute conference on May 30, "In the absence of the United States, you have a phenomenon of a fair number of countries . . . trying to pull back a little bit on some of the things that were agreed to, some of the compromises that were reached in Paris."

Madam Chair, we cannot let this happen. That is why I seek to include my amendment to H.R. 9 to strengthen this important bill, to stop the administration from advancing the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement, and to reclaim our leadership role in combating climate change and protecting our planet.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I agree with the premise that the world looks to the United States as a leader. Unfortunately, other countries are not leading—China and India, for instance.

This amendment, again, does not address reducing emissions. We need to look at leading as a nation on technology, innovation, and bipartisan solutions.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

(9) American cities, States, and businesses are stepping up and pledging to meet the Paris Agreement goals in the wake of absent and uncertain United States Federal leadership.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, this amendment recognizes that American cities, States, and businesses are stepping up and pledging to meet the Paris Agreement goals in the wake of absent

and uncertain United States Federal leadership.

While the current administration takes steps to actively undermine the position of the United States on the global stage with regard to climate change, an unprecedented coalition of American States, cities, and businesses are taking action and working to lead the United States to a low-carbon future, as affirmed by the Paris Agreement.

Cities across the country and in my home State of California are taking on the challenge of combating climate change. These cities are implementing new sustainability initiatives by targeting 100 percent renewable energy, recycling 100 percent of wastewater, and working toward net zero carbon emission goals.

As California continues to be an international leader in forward-thinking policy and environmental stewardship, we are not alone.

When describing the ongoing work and the action still needed, California Governor Jerry Brown said, "We're at the base camp of Mount Everest, and we're looking up at the long way we still have to go." That is why, without Federal leadership, States are left taking the lead.

The United States Climate Alliance, a bipartisan coalition of Governors committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the goals of the Paris Agreement, just added its 24th State this week.

I reiterate: This bipartisan coalition of Governors is committed to taking real, on-the-ground action to urgently address climate change by implementing policies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 26 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2025, tracking and reporting progress to the global community, and accelerating new and existing policies to reduce carbon pollution and promote clean energy deployment.

Businesses, large and small, are stepping up across a wide range of industries. Large corporations and small businesses alike have already taken steps to develop and deploy high-impact climate action strategies. They see opportunities in working toward a low-carbon future and support the aims of the Paris Agreement.

However, for this transition to succeed, federal governments must also lead. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of my amendment and the underlying bill. We must remain in the Paris climate agreement and work to meet our commitment for future generations. The time for action is now.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I will close after the gentleman closes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman ROUDA, of which I am a cosponsor.

It was a low point of the Trump Presidency when President Trump announced his plans to recklessly begin withdrawal of the United States from the Paris climate agreement. This was an abandonment of our global leadership.

But I took heart watching the many cities, States, and localities step forward to declare their intention to keep the emission reduction commitments of the Paris accord. These include 20 cities and villages in the 10th District that have joined the Greenest Region Compact to implement sustainability plans to reduce the risk of global climate change and mitigate its effects.

Regardless of the lack of leadership from the White House on addressing climate change, our cities continue to drive the change needed to prevent a climate disaster.

I am glad this House is finally taking action with H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. I fully support this amendment to recognize the actions of our cities and States that continue to uphold the spirit of the Paris climate agreement.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, bravo for our States and bravo for our communities. I think the only problem I have with the amendment is you seem to have to believe that the United States has to be involved in an international agreement for us to lead. We are the largest carbon reducer since 2015 in the world.

I think the Energy and Commerce Committee over the last Congress has led with bipartisan solutions that have come to the floor. That is where we need to get to eventually, instead of the "he said, she said," point fingers, "you are bad."

What can we do that gets across to the Senate? What can we do to get it to the President's desk? Moving an amendment and a bill that says, "Mr. President, you got out of the Paris accord, now sign this bill to undo what you just did," no one believes he is going to sign that.

We also know that even if he vetoes that bill, we will be able to sustain it on this side.

We look forward to doing things that we did in the last Congress. We can address carbon capture, sequestration, utilization; advanced nuclear reforms; hydropower; and clean natural gas, which has also enhanced our national security; and energy efficiency.

Republicans are willing to work with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee on conservation, things like energy efficiency, new source review, and forest management. We are willing to talk about innova-

tion, things like advanced nuclear power, as I mentioned; carbon capture, utilization, sequestration, pumped storage; battery technology through research and development; adaptation addressing the grid, adapting to the climate change issues; resiliency of our communities; genetically modified crops, if we have weather conditions or drier conditions.

There are things that we think we can move to address this debate that could get through the Senate and could get to the President's desk, but haranguing and harassing a President who has already decided to leave the accord and think he is going to sign a bill is just not going to happen. That is why I oppose this amendment.

I disagree with the basic premise of the amendment. I agree that communities are doing great things. States are leading. When you argue that States are leading, that is contrary to your argument that we have to lead. If the States and local communities are doing it, why does it take the Federal Government to do that?

We don't have to bash to work together and move a policy forward.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) Article 10 of the Paris Agreement states that "Parties, noting the importance of technology for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions under this Agreement and recognizing existing technology deployment and dissemination efforts, shall strengthen cooperative action on technology development and transfer."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I am honored to be here today to introduce my amendment to the Climate Action Now Act, which highlights the critical role of technology in the fight against climate change. The United States must continue to invest in research and development of clean energy technology in order to meet our nationally determined contributions under the Paris climate accord.

We need American leadership in the fight against climate change. The U.S. has always led in the field of research and innovation. Our laboratories and research universities are among the best in the world, and their ability to

innovate to combat the world's challenges are without parallel.

Climate change is an urgent challenge we must address, and America's scientists and technologists have always risen to this challenge. Yet, instead of fighting climate change, this administration proposed slashing the budget for climate research and renewable energy programs.

Let's take a look at the President's proposed 2020 budget for the Department of Energy. President Trump would slash the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by more than 85 percent. This is the home at the Department of Energy for supporting every kind of renewable technology that we have developed and implemented.

President Trump proposed completely zeroing out the ARPA-E budget. ARPA-E was created to incentivize researchers to develop promising research into game-changing technologies that can meet our future research needs. Since 2009, 136 of these projects have attracted billions in private follow-on funding, creating private-public partnerships and American jobs.

□ 1830

President Trump has even proposed cutting State Energy Programs, which help States implement energy efficiency in schools and government buildings, saving taxpayers money.

That is why I believe that it is so important that we now recognize and support the critical role that United States leadership in research and development can and must play in the fight against climate change.

These programs help our country develop new and improved technologies, foster entrepreneurship, urge small business growth, and create clean energy jobs.

In my home, California's 45th Congressional District, there are 5,239 renewable energy jobs and 14,140 energy efficiency jobs. That is a total of 21,622 clean jobs. Those programs filter down to our laboratories, our universities, and our entrepreneurs leading American innovation.

I am proud to say that some of the great research and development happening to combat climate change is happening in California's 45th District at the University of California, Irvine.

UC Irvine is a leader in clean technology innovation and research, helping bring our country closer to meeting the goals of the Paris climate accord.

UC Irvine is home to the Advanced Power and Energy Program and the National Fuel Cell Research Center, which focuses on developing new fuel cell technology.

UC Irvine engineers created the first power-to-gas hydrogen pipeline injection project in the country. This pipeline takes surplus energy from the school's solar panels, converts water to hydrogen and blends it with gas, which can be stored for later use. This allows

us to use clean electricity that would otherwise go to waste, helping reduce pollutants in our air.

Now is the time to harvest the innovative technologies we have while investing in improving clean technologies for tomorrow. I am proud to champion and advance research and innovation.

We need to act now and keep the commitments we made to our coastlines, our community, our country, and the world when we signed the Paris climate accord.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment. Clean energy technologies are important in my hometown of Austin.

We have a lot of clean energy in Irvine, California, a lot of clean energy, a lot of collaboration between our two States, but this is simply a finding and does not reduce our emissions.

I again would urge, since I do not think this will become law, that we work on a bipartisan solution, talking explicitly about what you are talking about. We can pass these bills out of the House; we can pass them out of the Senate; and if we can do it bipartisanship, we can get it signed into law.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

(9) "Article 8 of the Paris Agreement states that 'Parties recognize the importance of averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects

of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events' such as drought conditions and water scarcity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, my amendment would ensure that the administration takes into account the problems caused by water shortages and droughts when addressing climate change.

Climate change is no longer a threat to the future. We are experiencing the damaging consequences now globally and regionally in the United States.

According to the Government Accountability Office, climate change has already cost taxpayers over \$350 billion over the last decade.

Water scarcity and drought conditions as a result of climate change have direct economic, legal, and national security implications for our society and for our systems of governance.

In my home State of Nevada, the water supply at Lake Mead is already dangerously low and could face emergency levels as soon as next year. As our water supply continues to diminish, water prices will continue to rise for families across southern Nevada, the United States, and the world.

Under Article 8 of the Paris Agreement, parties must recognize the importance of addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including drought and increased water scarcity. And since the United States cannot leave the Paris climate accord until November 4, 2020, we are still obligated to maintain certain commitments, and that includes recognizing the fact that rising temperatures pose an imminent threat to our water supply, especially in already arid regions.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment. Drought conditions, water scarcity are important in, I know, the gentlewoman's home State, certainly important in my home State of Texas. It will be—as climate change advances, the entire continent of Africa will face drought conditions.

But, again, this is a finding. It doesn't, in and of itself, reduce the emissions, and I would again urge bipartisan solutions to advancing technologies and promoting innovation.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS) having assumed the chair, Ms. NORTON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING STATE TEACHERS OF THE YEAR

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

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 57 State teachers of the year from around the country who have convened in Washington.

These educators illuminate what is working in our education system. Their unique and important achievements fill me with pride and inspiration about what teachers can do for our communities when we put students first.

I welcome these outstanding teachers to Washington this week and to Capitol Hill this Thursday as part of a celebration of excellence.

I would like to congratulate the 2019 National Teacher of the Year, Rodney Robinson, who is a committed advocate for all his students and has made it his mission to bring a voice to the voiceless and to those who feel unseen or undervalued by their communities.

Mr. Robinson has been teaching social studies for 19 years to students at Virgie Binford Education Center inside the Richmond Juvenile Detention Center, teaching some of our Nation's most vulnerable students.

Every student deserves a high-quality, equitable education. Mr. Robinson and all these educators work every day to fulfill that promise to their students.

Equity and empowerment are at the core of Mr. Robinson's work and should also be at the core of our work here at the Federal Government.

I also want to thank the Council of Chief State School Officers, or CCSSO,

which, since 1952, has focused on excellence in public education. They are the oldest and most prestigious national honors program for teachers, and their work to celebrate and elevate the voices of teachers should be commended.

It is, likewise, our job as Members of Congress to continue to elevate the profession of teachers, elevate the voices of students, and work together to make sure their dreams are recognized.

CONGRATULATING NATE MACK ELEMENTARY ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 months ago, I spoke on this very floor to congratulate the robotics teams at Nate Mack Elementary and Greenspun Junior High School for advancing to the global robotics competition.

Today, I am proud to report back that Nate Mack Elementary robotics team is now the 2019 VEX IQ STEM Research Award World Champions. Greenspun Junior High also put up a tough fight and made it to the world finals.

I have closely followed the journey of both these robotic teams this year and even visited them. They are big sources of pride for Nevada's Third District, and we could not be more honored to have been represented by them.

So, today, I want to congratulate Nate Mack Elementary robotics team and their coach, Casey Juliano, for their well-deserved win and once again recognize Greenspun Junior High and their coach, Matt Christian, for making it to the world championships.

On behalf of Nevada's Third Congressional District, congratulations. We are proud.

WE ALL HAVE A PLACE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent terror attacks throughout the world and in our country, many people are very, very fearful.

The Nation and the Jewish community mourn another senseless attack after the shooting in California during the Passover celebration, while still grieving those lost in the attack at the Pittsburgh synagogue last year.

We stand with our Jewish brothers and sisters against the face of terror. These despicable attacks of hate have no place in our world. We all have a place in America. Hate, however, does not.

The American people have the right to pray together; they have the right to love together; and they have the right to worship together without fear.

□ 1845

HONORING THE LIFE OF JUDGE DAMON KEITH

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a civil rights icon. Judge Damon Keith passed away this past week. He said one of his mentors, Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, would say to him: When you finish Harvard law, Judge Keith, I want you to use the law as a means of social change.

Judge Keith said: That is what I am trying to do in my lifetime.

The civil rights icon was courageous. He will be sorely missed by many, but even more in his home community of the city of Detroit.

In one of his most famous cases, he said, in his opinion, that: "Democracies die behind closed doors."

And from a recent Detroit Free Press article, in 1973, Judge Keith ordered Detroit Edison to pay \$4 million to Black employees who were victims of job discrimination and ordered it to create an affirmative action program.

Some of these are just a little hint of the incredible contribution that Judge Keith had to our Nation. He will be sorely missed, but, hopefully, his legacy on civil rights and justice for all will continue on in our work here in this Chamber.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), as amended, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individual on the part of the House to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for a term expiring on December 31, 2020:

Dr. Larry M. Wortzel, Williamsburg, Virginia

STUDENT DEBT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today recognizing the amazing contribution of our Congressional Progressive Caucus in allowing many of our colleagues who are pushing bold and progressive ideas, especially around college affordability.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, college students around the

country will cross the graduation stage, accept their diplomas, and get ready to begin their careers. It will be a weekend of well-deserved celebration. Their hard work and years of study have paid off. Yet, for too many of these students, they will soon face the reality of paying the high price of their diplomas.

Too many of these students will soon come face-to-face with a mountain of debt that will take them years, often decades to pay. Today, nearly 43 million Americans, that is one in six adults, have Federal student loan debt. The Federal student loan portfolio has risen to over \$1.4 trillion.

Tomorrow's graduates will face an average of \$30,000 in debt, a crippling amount for any young person to shoulder before they have even entered the workforce. That amount of debt increases every single year. How can we expect young people in this country to choose the course of their careers, to contribute to their communities, and to plan and start their families while simultaneously allowing lenders to saddle them with loan burdens on decades-long repayment timelines?

Among borrowers of all ages with outstanding student loan debt, the median self-reported amount owed among those with less than a bachelor's degree was \$10,000. Bachelor's degree holders owe a median of \$25,000, and those with a postgraduate degree owe a median of \$45,000.

I have heard stories from students at colleges and universities throughout California's 45th Congressional District.

Merhpad and her family immigrated to the United States in 2014. After they settled in Orange County, earning a college degree became her primary goal. But without Federal financial aid programs, such as the Pell grant, she would not have been able to afford and pursue an education. Her commitment and dedication to her education inspired her parents to also attend Irvine Valley College to pursue degrees.

She uses her financial aid to afford transportation, food, healthcare, and school supplies. Because she lives with her parents, she doesn't need to spend financial aid on housing. But other students aren't so lucky.

Community colleges typically don't offer housing for their students, and with an average rent of \$1,000 to \$2,000 in Orange County, it is almost impossible to afford to live near our colleges' campuses.

Jose, a student at Saddleback College in Orange County is studying psychology and playing football. He is the eighth of 11 kids. He received a scholarship to cover his tuition and meals, but it isn't enough to help him afford housing. Jose was homeless for two semesters, sleeping in his car and at his football teammates' houses. Despite these challenges, Jose has a 3.8 GPA and he hopes to graduate from Saddleback to go on to pursue a degree in clinical psychology.

He explained, "I move forward towards graduation, believing that if I can overcome the adversities I have faced in my life, anyone can."

His persistence and dedication are inspiring. But no student should ever have to choose between getting an education and being homeless. Unfortunately, these stories are all too common. Too many students are struggling just to keep a roof over their heads.

Recently, I met with students from the University of California Irvine to discuss the challenges they are facing. One of those students was Stephanie, a first-generation student studying public health.

She completed the full college application process on her own, including applying for financial aid. She received both a Pell grant and a Cal grant, but she still has to work three part-time jobs throughout the year to afford housing and food.

She spends more than 12 hours most days in class and at her part-time jobs, fighting to ensure that she doesn't have to take on student loans, so she can go on to pursue a masters in global public health. Stephanie is not the only one facing challenges affording living expenses while in college.

Another one of those students was Deshay, a junior at UC Irvine who will soon become the first person in his family to graduate from college. Deshay left home at 17, so when he applied for financial aid a year later, he did so on his own, declaring himself as an independent.

His expected family contribution was zero. While he got the funding necessary to attend UC Irvine, the aid didn't cover all of his living needs, including groceries. Deshay had a goal when he started college. He wanted to graduate loan free. He didn't want to take out loans to pay for his living expenses and so he took on two part-time jobs. But the reality of the cost of living in Orange County soon set in.

After nearly 2 months of eating only one meal a day, Deshay was left with few choices. When he finishes college next year, he will graduate with nearly \$30,000 of debt.

Still, he is excited to graduate and to start giving back to our community. He plans to move home to Sacramento and he hopes to open a youth center modeled after Boys & Girls Clubs across the country. But Deshay is worried that he may not be able to successfully apply for the loan that he will need to start his business, in large part because of the student loan debt he carries.

College students who have fought to pursue an education, who work tirelessly toward their dreams, are being forced to put these dreams on hold. Why? Because the education necessary to achieve their dreams has left them buried in debt.

This Congress, as we work on the reauthorization of key legislation for students across this country, we need to ensure that students graduating this

weekend and in coming weeks don't have to choose between a job serving their communities or financial security or choose between putting food on the table and attending classes.

That is why I will be introducing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Student Loan Integrity and Transparency Act, along with Senators WARREN, BROWN, and UDALL. The bill does just what it says. It mandates that the Department of Education and student loan servicers share information and cooperate with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's student loan education ombudsman. That ombudsman is the number one Federal official tasked with advocating for our students who are struggling to repay loans.

It also requires the ombudsman's office be fully staffed at all times so the office can conduct the level of oversight necessary to protect student borrowers.

This is just the first step of many needed to improve student loan oversight and improve college affordability. I look forward to opportunities to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that our students have the opportunity to access an affordable college education.

Ms. TLAIIB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the student debt crisis that is holding back our students, our families, and our economy.

Last year, American's collective student loan debt surpassed \$1.5 trillion. The shackles of debt keep former students and their families from seeing the economic prosperity promised to them by their education.

More than 40 million Americans now have student debt, and the amount of debt that the average student carries is rising. Student loan balances have more than doubled real terms since 2005. Average real student loan debt per capita for individuals between the ages of 24 to 32 has risen from \$5,000 in 2005 to \$10,000 in 2014.

It is driving down home ownership rates, especially for young people. One study found that a \$1,000 increase in student loan debt causes a 1-to-2 percent drop in home ownership rates for borrowers in their late twenties and early thirties, threatening to undermine the long-term financial stability of an entire generation.

Young adults who graduate college with a student debt now have negative net worth with a median net worth of \$1,900, down from \$9,000 in 2013.

Student loan debt does not only impact young people. The number of people over 60 with student loan debt has quadrupled in the last four decades. Parents are increasingly jeopardizing their retirement to pay off loans they took out to pay for their kids' education.

The source of student debt does not affect all Americans equally. Students

of color face a higher risk of defaulting on their student loans and struggle to find jobs to pay off these loans due to discrimination in hiring practices.

First generation and immigrant college students face much higher default rates, and women own two-thirds of the \$1.4 trillion total of student debt.

The burden of this debt will be intensified postgraduation by the gender gap. It is time we started treating student debt like the national crisis it is. We need urgent action to address it. That is why I support debt free and tuition-free college and will be introducing a bill to cancel all student debt.

Our Debt-Free College Act would make debt-free college a reality for students within 5 years. We can ensure that students graduate debt free and are not at a competitive disadvantage as a result of the burden of student loan debt.

Making public 2-year and 4-year colleges free and accessible to all is essential in investing in an equitable future. It would also provide an enormous middle class stimulus that would boost economic growth, increase home purchases, and fuel a new wave of small business formation.

Student debt is not the result of bad choices or behaviors. It is the result of a system that tells the students to get an education, go to college in order to have a stable life, but then does not provide the resources so that they can afford that education.

But I believe together we can reform that system.

Ms. TLAI. Mr. Speaker, we talk about opportunity a lot in this Chamber. The opportunity to thrive, the access to get ahead in life if you worked hard. We tell our kids every day that opportunity is abundant. It is everywhere, in every corner. If you just work hard, you can have access to a tremendous amount of opportunity.

□ 1900

Yet we know now that many roadblocks exist through no fault of their own. This is why it is so critically important to talk about the college affordability issue and crisis in our country.

There are many motivations to go to school. For many first-generation college students like me, it is to help their families. Many want to give back to their community, yet many are not able to fulfill this dream because of affordability.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Michigan ranks among States in the bottom half in college attainment. Fewer than 30 percent of Michigan adults hold at least a bachelor's degree. We are closing the door on those who want to help others, whether it is their family or their broader community.

Studies show that first-generation college students go to college in order to help their families. Sixty-nine percent of them say they want to help their families compared to 39 percent of students whose parents have earned

a degree. This desire also extends to the community with 61 percent of first-generation college students wanting to give back to their communities compared to 43 percent of their non-first-generation peers.

Regarding college school loan debt, students used to think about getting good enough grades when we go to college. That is what we were focused on. Not anymore, Mr. Speaker. Students today are forced to make a decision between a degree and access to that opportunity or debt.

In 2016, 64 percent of Michigan college graduates left school with debt, an average of over \$30,000 a year, the 11th highest in the Nation. Even after factoring in grant programs, low-income families have to pay more than 70 percent of their income to cover college costs.

I want to share a story of my friend in college. It took him close to a decade because he was serving our country. He came back after serving not only as a U.S. marine but also doing civil service work for the United States Army. He came back, and all he wanted to do was become a schoolteacher, a public educator. He loves it. It is his passion.

As he sits in his classroom every single day educating our children, he has to also deal with the increase in debt, with the high cost of interest, and with all those things that now put him in a financial crisis.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that low- and middle-income households already face higher burdens. They are less likely to have family assistance and more likely to have other pressures such as a part-time job or family caretaking roles in addition to their schoolwork.

As many low-income students avoid applying to college altogether due to costs, borrowers who are tens of thousands of dollars in debt aren't able to purchase homes, start their families, obtain employment in certain fields, and save for retirement.

Student loan debt is further putting low- and middle-income students and their families into a downward spiral that leaves many worse off than they were when they started school.

This is not how it has to be. Student debt has a greater impact on low-income borrowers, as many of us know. In fact, borrowers in low- and moderate-income households face education debt that has averaged 24 percent of their income in 2010 alone. The average for all households was 6 percent.

Looking at that more deeply and really unpacking that, we also have to look at food insecurity and housing insecurity when it comes to college affordability. The current state of college affordability leaves so many students in housing insecurity as well as food insecurity.

Most college students, Mr. Speaker, attending at least half-time are not eligible for SNAP assistance unless they

work at least 20 hours per week or they work part-time in a work-study program, have young children, or meet certain other requirements. Again, they are stuck in a spiral of insecurity. However, working 20 hours a week has been shown to lengthen the time it takes to graduate, just like for one of my best friends.

Increased college costs lead to a heightened risk of dropping out as well. I have seen many, many of my friends who started with me who could not finish because they couldn't afford it.

On-campus housing comprises anywhere from 24 to 42 percent of students' total budgets. Meanwhile, the cost of off-campus housing surrounding universities tends to be higher than the standard market rate. We see that in all our districts across the Nation.

These steep costs have consequences. One survey alone found that 42 percent of their undergraduate students had experienced housing insecurity within the past year.

In many cases, housing insecurity is coupled with food insecurity. In one study, 59 percent of students at a 4-year university experienced food insecurity. What that means is not having enough to eat, just like my colleague from California talked about for a specific resident in her community who only could afford to eat once a day.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that the more college becomes unaffordable and out of reach for working- and middle-class families, the more we subject students to poverty as they try to obtain higher education.

As income inequality increases and as we see it across our Nation every single day, and college tuition and living expenses go up as well, we are creating an environment where fewer people have an opportunity to thrive, fewer people can help their families, and fewer people have the means to help their community. This should not happen in our country, and we should be working day in and day out to correct this.

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

FAIR HOUSING MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to stand here in the House of Representatives, to have the opportunity to address colleagues, friends, and the Nation. I especially thank the leadership for allowing these privileges.

I am grateful to the many people who are still here as we continue with our statements on the floor of the House. You work tirelessly, and it seems that you work endlessly, Mr. Speaker. I think it appropriate that we thank you for being here with us into the late hours as we present our floor messaging.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here tonight to announce that my dear friend and colleague, Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER, has joined me in reintroducing a resolution in recognition of Fair Housing Month.

Housing, Mr. Speaker, is a basic human right, but access is too often limited based upon race, sex, national origin, and sexual orientation. This resolution marks the 51st anniversary of the congressional passage of the Fair Housing Act, properly styled title 8 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination concerning the sale, rental, and financing of housing based upon race, national origin, religion, sex, or familial status. This year, Mr. Speaker, also marks the 31st anniversary of the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988.

More than 50 years ago on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., Dr. Martin Luther King delivered his famous “I Have a Dream” speech. It was considered, and it is still considered, one of the greatest speeches in American history.

In his speech, Dr. King called for racial equality and an end to discrimination. Passionately, he argued that all men are created equal and should be treated equally. Although that was not the case in America at that time, he believed it must be the case for America's future.

I must tell you, we have come a long way, Mr. Speaker, but we still have a great distance to go to realize the dream of Dr. King, a world where persons are judged by the content of their character, not the color of their skin. Dr. King was a very strong supporter of fair housing, and he envisioned a society free of discrimination.

I would like to speak just a moment about access to affordable housing. Each year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development releases the “Annual Homelessness Assessment Report.” This is released to Congress. It provides the best available estimates of homelessness and how it is impacting the United States.

According to the 2018 report, there were 552,830 persons experiencing homelessness in the United States on a single night in 2018.

The report also provides details on the demographics of the people experiencing homelessness. For example, for women and children in 2018, nearly 160,000 children and youth experienced homelessness, representing nearly 30 percent of the total persons who are in a state of homelessness. Over 216,000 women and girls experienced homelessness, or 40 percent of the total persons who experienced homelessness.

Racial minorities were disproportionately represented among people experiencing homelessness in 2018. African Americans comprised 40 percent of all people experiencing homelessness, despite making up only 13 percent of the Nation's general population.

Hispanic or Latino persons comprised 25 percent of the total, despite making

up but 18 percent of the Nation's general population.

Nearly 38,000 veterans experienced homelessness in 2018, or 9 percent of the total.

Furthermore, according to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the U.S. has a shortage of more than 7.2 million rental homes that are affordable and available to the lowest income renters in our country.

After the 2008 financial crisis, it became clear that we need to address the epidemic of discrimination in lending where communities of color are disproportionately targeted. I can recall, having been on the Financial Services Committee, how we received testimony from persons who indicated to us that as a result of this downturn in 2008, the community of color, the African American community in particular, lost a generation of wealth. This is something that we are still trying to recover from.

This is why we need the Fair Lending for All Act. The Fair Lending for All Act would create such a fair lending testing program that would penalize individuals who discriminate. When they do so, and they discriminate invidiously and cause harm to persons, when they hold predatory loans and they make these loans, they will be held accountable because we must ensure we are not only understanding the patterns of housing discrimination more thoroughly but also understand that we are providing clear oversight and guidelines to combat housing discrimination.

In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, commonly known and well-known as the Kerner Commission, concluded in a groundbreaking report that White racism led to pervasive discrimination in employment, education, and housing.

In 2015, the Black homeownership rate was just over 40 percent, virtually unchanged since 1968. Over that same period, White ownership increased 5.2 percentage points to 71.1 percent, 30 percentage points higher than the Black homeownership rate.

As a result, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Fair Housing Act on April 11, 1968, 1 week after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. In fact, there are many people who contend that before the demise of Dr. King, the Fair Housing Act would not have been signed as quickly as it was.

Dr. King, as you know, was assassinated. For many of us, it was a sad and dark day in the history of our country. We were saddened by what happened to Dr. King, notwithstanding the fact that the Fair Housing Act became law as a result of his untimely demise.

The Fair Housing Act was conceived to battle discrimination in housing related to these housing transactions that are supposed to allow everyone to access housing but don't always accomplish those goals.

More than 4 million Fair Housing Act violations occur each year against peo-

ple of all protected classes, including based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Less than 1 percent of the violations of Fair Housing Act laws are reported each year.

□ 1915

In 2017, approximately 28,843 housing discrimination complaints were filed. Of these, 20,595 complaints, or approximately 70 percent, were filed with local private, nonprofit, fair housing centers.

Housing bills in the 116th Congress include H.R. 123, the FHA Additional Credit Pilot Program Reauthorization Act.

We introduced this on January 3, 2019. This would extend section 258 of the National Housing Act, which established an automated process for providing alternative credit rating information for mortgagors and prospective mortgagors.

I would add that, simply put, this would give persons who pay their light bills, their gas bills, their water bills, all of their utility bills timely but they don't have thick credit files—in fact, they have thin credit files, and some of them have no credit at all, in addition to these bills that they pay on a monthly basis—an opportunity to have these payments scored so that they, too, might have the opportunity to own a home.

Representative VICENTE GONZALEZ is one of the cosponsors of this legislation.

H.R. 166, the Fair Lending for All Act, was introduced on January 3 of 2019, and this would establish an Office of Fair Lending Testing to test for compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, ECOA, and to create criminal penalties for invidious discrimination in lending.

H.R. 149, the Housing Fairness Act, was introduced on January 3, 2019, and it would instruct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a nationwide testing program.

This nationwide testing program would be utilized to detect and document differences in the treatment of persons seeking to rent or purchase housing or obtain a refinance of a home mortgage loan. It would measure patterns of adverse treatment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, disability status, or national origin of renters, home buyers, or borrowers. And it would measure the prevalence of such discriminatory practices across the housing and mortgage lending market.

H.R. 165, Improving Access to Homes for Heroes Act. This was introduced January 3, 2019. It would provide Congress with the information it needs, as we work toward ending homelessness among our veterans, by requiring HUD to provide Congress with an annual report that gives a comprehensive assessment of the efforts being made to provide housing assistance to our veterans, and it would also require public housing agencies to include veterans in their public housing planning.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be associated with all of the bills. We are honored to act as original sponsors of all of these pieces of legislation, but I am much more proud of the fact that, in this country, we are still making progress, but we really have come a long way.

I can remember a time when the public housing in this country was segregated, literally—tax dollars providing housing that was segregated.

I am proud to say that we have come a long way and integrated the public housing, housing paid for with American tax dollars.

I can remember a time in this country when there were neighborhoods that persons of African ancestry were restricted from living in. Restrictive covenants were prevalent. And there are still some neighborhoods that there is a degree of difficulty acquiring access to; but, generally speaking, restrictive covenants are no longer in existence to the extent that they are commonly used to exclude persons of color, and other persons as well, based on religious preferences, from the neighborhoods.

This is a country that still has a long way to go, but this is a country that has made some great strides.

Notwithstanding the strides, however, we must continue to do our very best to make sure every person who wants housing and can afford it can get housing, which means that we have to have affordable housing.

I was very proud this week that just passed, in Houston, Texas, to visit an area in my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Texas, where a project had been razed, as in eviscerated, and there was a raising, if you will, of another project.

This project cost approximately \$30-plus million, and it was subsidized in part from CDBG dollars from this Congress to the tune of about \$3 million.

It was a wonderful thing to see this new growth, if you will, this new housing development in this community. It is a wonderful project that has amenities that you might expect to find in an upscale neighborhood.

Within the center for persons to use, the common area, there is a business center right within that complex. There is also a facility for meetings. There was an exercise room. And their plan is to have a swimming pool. Yes, people who need affordable housing do swim. They enjoy exercising, and they want to have the opportunity to go online and conduct business just as other people do.

So it was a wonderful thing to see this project have all of these various amenities that you might find in an upscale neighborhood.

I was there with a good many people who were just proud to be a part of the community and to see this development take place within their neighborhood.

As you know, we dwell in our houses, but we live in our neighborhoods. And

in living in a neighborhood, you want to make sure that you have got quality housing. You want parks. You want schools. You want the opportunity to have your food source immediately available to you, readily available.

This is all a part of what is being developed as a result, in part, of these new housing projects coming online.

So it is important for us to continue to use community development dollars in a very positive way, so that we can continue to develop, not just homes for people, but neighborhoods for people to live in as well as homes for them to dwell in.

Houston, Texas, I am proud to say, has a mayor who has made it his mission to be a good partner in the wise and judicious use of these community development dollars. That is but one project that I can call to your attention. I have attended the ribbon cutting of many other projects that are similarly situated.

I would add, as I come to a close, that the housing crisis that we are experiencing now is one that is quite visible. In my lifetime, I don't think I have seen this number of people dwelling on the bridges, dwelling along the side of freeways, dwelling under trees.

We say that home is where the heart is. If this is true, we have to query: Where is the heart of the homeless? Where is the heart of the homeless? Is it on a bridge or under a bridge or near a park bench at night? Is it someplace where those of us who lead lives adorned with luxury don't have them in sight?

Where are the homeless? Where is the heart?

But the question really isn't, where is the heart of the homeless person. The question is: Where is our heart?

Where is the heart of a nation that is the richest in the world that can tolerate this level of homelessness that is in plain sight?

You don't have to look very far to see it. Many of us take the freeways and we avoid it, but it is right there for all to see.

Where is our heart? Where is the heart of the country that can put people on the moon, the country that can house people in space stations; where is the heart of the country that can do all of these magnificent things, yet have persons who are sleeping under bridges?

I am proud that the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, the chairperson of the Financial Services Committee, has a bill that we are taking up, a bill that would accord some many billions of dollars for the homelessness part of it, some \$5-plus billion, and it would attempt to tackle this problem of homelessness in a very positive way.

It is not just another Lilliputian effort. This is a noble effort to do what we can to provide homes for people who are living on the streets of life in the richest country in the world.

So, this month I am proud to bring this resolution to the floor, and I am

proud to tell you that we are going to tackle these problems. We may not solve them immediately, but we have the will to solve them eventually.

This is our challenge. This is our quest. And this is what we must do in the richest country in the world.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 2, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

848. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonels Gregory Kreuder and Ty W. Neuman, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

849. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to commence chemical agent destruction operations at the Blue Grass Army Depot Chemical demilitarization site in Richmond, KY, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); Public Law 91-121, Sec. 409(b)(4); (83 Stat. 209); to the Committee on Armed Services.

850. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2019 Annual Report to Congress on Chemical and Biological Warfare Defense, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1523(a); Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1703; (107 Stat. 1854); to the Committee on Armed Services.

851. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a partial report comprising six report requirements out of seven examining the health of the defense electronics industrial base, including analog and passive electronic parts, substrates, printed boards, assemblies, connectors, and cabling by January 31, 2019, pursuant to Public Law 115-232, Sec. 845(a); (132 Stat. 1881); to the Committee on Armed Services.

852. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Determinations; Erie County, New York (All Jurisdictions) [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0002; Internal Docket No.: FEMA-B-1128] received April 25, 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.

853. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide NAAQS [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0637; FRL-9992-50-Region 1] received April 26, 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.

854. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; Correcting Amendments [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0133; FRL-9992-71-Region 9] received April 26, 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.

855. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona: Approval and Conditional Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Maricopa County Air Quality Department; Stationary Source Permits; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0481; FRL-9992-61-Region 9] received April 26, 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.

856. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0764; FRL-9993-02-Region 3] received April 26, 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.

857. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0787; FRL-9992-14-Region 9] received April 26, 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.

858. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Commercial Fuel Oil Sulfur Limits for Combustion Units in Allegheny County [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0513; FRL-9993-01-Region 3] received April 26, 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.

859. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology in the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0055; FRL-9992-51-Region 6] received April 26, 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.

860. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0476; FRL-9991-75] received April 26, 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.

861. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG Revision — Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Commercial Radiopharmacy Licenses [NUREG-1556, Volume 13, Revision 2] received April 25, 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.

862. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

863. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

864. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

865. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a vacancy and a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

866. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's summary of the inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities for fiscal year 2018, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

867. A letter from the Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2018 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

868. A letter from the Acting Manager, Equal Opportunity Compliance, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Authority's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

869. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 2018 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees and on Apportionment of Membership for Regional Fishery Management Councils, pursuant to Secs. 302(b)(2)(B) and 302(j)(9) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

870. A letter from the Executive Director, Improvement Steering Council, Permitting Council, transmitting the Council's FAST-41 Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2018, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4370m-7(a)(1); Public Law 114-94, Sec. 41008(a)(1); (129 Stat. 1760); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

871. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1010; Product Identifier 2018-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-19596; AD 2019-05-

14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 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.

872. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0151; Product Identifier 2019-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-19604; AD 2019-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 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.

873. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0920; Product Identifier 2016-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-19605; AD 2019-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 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.

874. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1236; Product Identifier 2017-SW-136-AD; Amendment 39-19613; AD 2019-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 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.

875. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31243; Amdt. No.: 3844] received April 25, 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.

876. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Railroad Noise Emission Compliance Regulations [Docket No.: FRA-2017-0038, Notice No.: 2] (RIN: 2130-AC69) received April 25, 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.

877. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2018 Report to Congress from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1315a(g); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1115A(g) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 3021(a)); (124 Stat. 394); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

878. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 116th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, Small Business, Science, Space, and Technology, and the Budget.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HOYER, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. McEACHIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ALLRED, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing requirements or treatment limitations with respect to diagnostic examinations for breast cancer that are less favorable than such requirements with respect to screening examinations for breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2429. A bill to restore administrative law judges to the competitive service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 2430. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for mental health professionals to relieve workforce shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2432. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the artificial intelligence strategy of the De-

partment of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. COOK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BACON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to modify, for purposes of veterans' preference for Federal hiring, certain requirements with respect to service and retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2434. A bill to resume the operation of the page program for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2435. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 2436. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definitions of a "small business" and "small organization" for purposes of assessing the impact of the Commission's rulemakings under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide parity for outlying areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BASS, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CASE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2438. A bill to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. STEFANK):

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2440. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for the purposes for which the funds were collected and to ensure that funds credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used to support navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to

the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for the humane treatment of dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BARR, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to make direct loans under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 2445. A bill to provide minimum standards for transactions secured by a dwelling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that bonds used to finance professional stadiums are not treated as tax-exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2447. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 2448. A bill to provide for ocean acidification collaborative research grant opportunities; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2449. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on duty hours for yardmaster employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 2450. A bill to establish a demonstration program at a military installation in the United States to evaluate the feasibility and benefits of using innovative technologies and systems to assist in the management of military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2451. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the "Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post

Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare for America health program to provide for comprehensive health coverage for all Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GOLDEN):

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations for certain logging vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2454. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 East Sharpfish Street in Rosebud, South Dakota, as the "Ben Reifel Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BRINDISI):

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to citizen petitions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2456. A bill to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2457. A bill to help train individuals in effective and evidence-based de-escalation techniques to ensure that individuals at diverse levels of society have and retain greater skills to resolve conflicts, manage anger, and control implicit bias without the use of physical or other force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require a certain percentage of funds appropriated for revolving fund capitalization grants be used for green projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 2459. A bill to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Hualapai Tribe and certain allottees in the State of Arizona, to authorize construction of a water project relating to those water rights claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 2460. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricul-

tural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit with respect to any stillborn child of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 2462. A bill to establish a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of such mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2463. A bill to provide for the establishment of Medicare part E public health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2464. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program supporting trauma centers with violence intervention and violence prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN):

H.R. 2466. A bill to extend the State Opioid Response Grants program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2467. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce from authorizing commercial finfish aquaculture operations in the Exclusive Economic Zone except in accordance with a law authorizing such action; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of October 28 as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 336. A resolution condemning the terrorist attacks on Christian worshippers in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday, April 21, 2019, and standing with the Government of Sri Lanka to encourage the protection and preservation of religious liberties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR,

Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PORTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RYAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H. Res. 337. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as "Mental Health Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Res. 338. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 339. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 15, 2019, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the barrage of fraud attempts that seniors face, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent these scams from happening, and to improve protections from these scams for seniors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BACON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TITUS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 340. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. NORTON):

H. Res. 341. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May as "National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Ms. DEAN):

H. Res. 342. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools

Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. OMAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H. Res. 343. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 344. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2, 2019, as a “National Day of Reason” and recognizing the central importance of reason in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 345. A resolution recognizing widening threats to freedoms of the press and expression around the world, reaffirming the centrality of a free and independent press to the health of democracy, and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority of the United States in promoting democracy, human rights, and good governance in commemoration of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. OMAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 346. A resolution recognizing the devastating April 21, 2019, terrorist bombings in Sri Lanka and observing 10 years since the end of Sri Lanka’s decades-long civil war, which ended on May 18, 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. KIM, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CROW, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H. Res. 347. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of May 5, 2019, through May 11, 2019, as “National Small Business Week” to celebrate the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the United States; to the Committee on Small Business.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 5, Clause 2: “Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a member.”

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 2436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 2438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment II of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 2444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution of the United States

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 2447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 2450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—Congress has the authority regulate interstate commerce

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 2458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 2461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to institute legislation which is necessary and proper for the protection of the American people.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 2466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian Tribes"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 35: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 36: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STEVENS, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 40: Ms. WATERS and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 41: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 77: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 85: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 95: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 141: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 303: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 375: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HECK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COOK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 397: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. MENG, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 435: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 445: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 497: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 510: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 532: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 553: Mrs. LESKO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. CLINE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 586: Mr. FLORES, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 598: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 642: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 647: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 649: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 651: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 663: Mr. COLE and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 674: Ms. HAALAND and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 693: Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BERA, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 732: Ms. DEAN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 832: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 873: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 874: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 897: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 913: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 925: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 938: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 943: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MCADAMS, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. COLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LAMB, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 945: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 946: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 956: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 961: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 965: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 987: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 989: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 996: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1004: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1019: Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1030: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1035: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1042: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1058: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1074: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1078: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1133: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1139: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MENG, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1146: Mr. KIND, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1155: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1157: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1163: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1166: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1171: Mr. CORREA and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1174: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1186: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1220: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1224: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAMB, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1225: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CASE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. TRONE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1236: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1237: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 1240: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1255: Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COLE, and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1256: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1257: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1289: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1301: Mrs. WALORSKI and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1309: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1316: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1321: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1327: Mr. BACON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1335: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1342: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1346: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1354: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1364: Mr. EVANS, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1386: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1396: Mr. POCAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr.

GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BACON, Mr. SCHRIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1400: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1418: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1439: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 1443: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BACON, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1446: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1471: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 1488: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1497: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1499: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1503: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1527: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1545: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 1546: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1554: Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. MILLER, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1572: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1595: Mr. VELA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1610: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1622: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1628: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1636: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1692: Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 1695: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1696: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1697: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1698: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1713: Mr. MAST, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KIM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1753: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1766: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1786: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1789: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1793: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1794: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1814: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COLE, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1846: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 1854: Mr. SPANO, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1863: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1869: Mr. COX of California, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1872: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1878: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1897: Mr. HECK, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1903: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 1911: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1914: Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 1939: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 1948: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr.

DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1978: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1981: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1987: Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. WILD, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 2003: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2004: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2009: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2010: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2013: Mr. CASE and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2015: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2062: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 2070: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2073: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2076: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2081: Mr. RYAN and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2091: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2094: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2101: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2115: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2142: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 2148: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2150: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GOLDEN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 2156: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 2161: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2178: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2184: Mr. CASE and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2191: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2195: Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2199: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2201: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2204: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2215: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2219: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2222: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2250: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2266: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2271: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2289: Mr. COX of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2293: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2294: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 2300: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2313: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2317: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2327: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2333: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2334: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 2335: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 2343: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2353: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HECK, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 2354: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2355: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2376: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2381: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VELA, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2388: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2420: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2421: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2422: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HECK.

H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H. Con. Res. 32: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H. Res. 23: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 54: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mrs. MILLER.

H. Res. 91: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 109: Mr. LUJÁN.

H. Res. 114: Mr. FLORES.

H. Res. 189: Mr. COOK and Mr. COLE.

H. Res. 214: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H. Res. 230: Ms. MENG and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 233: Mr. TRONE.

H. Res. 242: Mr. FLORES.

H. Res. 270: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H. Res. 277: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 297: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 299: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 310: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 311: Mrs. LOWEY and Miss RICE of New York.

H. Res. 325: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. PORTER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Commission of Coconut Creek, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2019-082, urging the United States Congress to Enact H.R. 763, The Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act of 2019; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.