

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 gentleman 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, 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 ruffed 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 gentlewoman 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 yeas 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)	Cardenas	Cohen
Blumenauer	Case	Connolly
Blunt	Casten (IL)	Cooper
Rochester	Castor (FL)	Correa
Bonamici	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	Ruiz
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	Schrier
F.	Loeb	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Escobar	Lowey	Serrano
Eshoo	Lujan	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	Suozi
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
Houlihan	Omar	Velázquez
Hoyer	Pallone	Visclosky
Huffman	Panetta	Wasserman
Jackson Lee	Pappas	Schultz
Jayapal	Pascrell	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
 McHenry Scott, Austin Wenstrup
 McKinley Sensenbrenner Westerman
 Meadows Shimkus Williams
 Meuser Simpson Wilson (SC)
 Miller Smith (MO) Wittman
 Mitchell Smith (NE) Womack
 Moolenaar Smith (NJ) Wright
 Mooney (WV) Smucker Yoho
 Mullin Spano Young
 Newhouse Stauber Zeldin

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) DeBene
 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 Fudge Davids (KS)
 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
 Haaland Harder (CA) McAdams
 Hayes McBeth
 Heck McCollum
 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 Neal
 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 Massie
 Budd Granger Mast
 Bucshon Graves (GA) McCarthy
 Graves (LA) McCaul
 Burgess Graves (MO) McClintock
 Byrne Green (TN) McHenry
 Calvert Griffith McKinley
 Carter (GA) Griffith Meadows
 Carter (TX) Grothman Meuser
 Chabot Guest Miller
 Cheney Guthrie Mitchell
 Cline Hagedorn Moolenaar
 Cloud Hern, Kevin Mooney (WV)
 Cole Herrera Beutler Mullin
 Collins (GA) Hice (GA) Newhouse
 Collins (NY) Hill (AR) Nunes
 Comer Holding Olson
 Conaway Hollingsworth Palazzo
 Cook Hudson Palmer
 Crawford Huizenga Pence
 Crenshaw Hunter Posey
 Curtis Hurd (TX) Ratcliffe
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (LA) Reed
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH) Reschenthaler

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
 Shimkus Turner
 Simpson Upton
 Smith (MO) Wagner
 Smith (NE) Walberg

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham Hastings Rooney (FL)
 Adams Higgins (LA) Scalise
 Blumenauber 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