

This very bill that we have been working on for a long time passed unanimously in this House of Representatives 4 years ago in December. Why didn't it become law? Because, in the Senate's rules, one Senator was able to block the legislation from even being voted on in the Senate. So here we are again, 4 years later, trying to get this legislation passed.

My friend mentioned USAID and their mission statement. Nothing in the definition of "assistance" in this bill precludes USAID from reporting on data fields that it currently reports on for the Green Book and for OECD. So, if they are already making reports, this legislation, to be very clear, does not prohibit them from also making those other reports, but they will comply with the legislation in this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a valued member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3766, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act.

I want to begin by recognizing my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), for all of the work that they have done to get this important bill to the floor and to thank them for working, as they always do, in a bipartisan way on behalf of the members of our committee.

I also thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this bill and for their creating an environment on the Foreign Affairs Committee, where we work together in a bipartisan way, and this legislation is a product of that work.

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act will enhance the transparency and effectiveness of U.S. foreign assistance by requiring a framework for monitoring and evaluating foreign development and economic programs and for publicly disclosing the data and results.

The United States carries out a wide variety of assistance programs overseas, and it is important that there is a clearly articulated strategy and monitoring apparatus for our assistance. It is just as important that the American people have access to the information about what activities their tax dollars are funding. This is critical to sustaining public understanding and support for our diplomatic work and our foreign assistance.

I also want to take a moment to commend the Obama administration for making much of this information publicly available online on their Foreign Assistance Dashboard.

I hope that my colleagues support this legislation so that we can continue

to increase efficiency and accountability in our foreign assistance programs. The American people deserve this, and it will make our foreign assistance better understood and more impactful. I urge my colleagues to support this excellent legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as I have no further requests for time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, let me, again, thank Chairman ROYCE for bringing this bill forward and thank Representatives POE and CONNOLLY for their hard work.

Our foreign assistance helps improve the lives of countless people around the world, and it helps advance American interests and American values. Foreign assistance deserves the continued support of Congress. At the same time, we need to know that our foreign assistance dollars are being put to the best use possible, that we are getting the biggest bang for our buck. The American people expect no less when it comes to their tax dollars, and they are right.

So let's stand up for foreign assistance and for transparency and accountability by passing this bill. I urge a "yes" vote.

I congratulate Judge POE and Mr. CONNOLLY.

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

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

I want to thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and, of course, my friend, Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia, for their support on this bill.

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee is probably more bipartisan than any committee in the House of Representatives. Almost everything that we do and the legislation we bring to the floor, the vast majority of Members support. Sometimes every Member supports the legislation. This is another one of those pieces of legislation that is good for the country and is really good for the whole world.

Transparency and evaluation is what this bill is about. As I started out in my comments, many Americans don't know what we do with their money. Let me just give a few examples:

Because of American aid, there are now millions of girls in other parts of the world who are getting an education. Because of Americans and their interest, half of the AIDS epidemic in Africa has been cut. It has been cut in half, the epidemic of AIDS in Africa. The life expectancy of people in Afghanistan, because of American aid, has grown 20 years. When it comes to the youth, many children throughout the world are dying because they have dirty water. It is not clean. Because of USAID and their help, that number has been cut in half. The children are now living because they are getting clean water.

Those are just a few things that are being done. We should be proud of those accomplishments.

We also want to make sure that those accomplishments and what we are doing with American money is transparent. We want to continue to evaluate it to see if it is working. If it is working, let's continue it, and if it is not working, then let's do something else.

I do want to thank those involved for their support, especially the chairman and the ranking member.

H.R. 3766 will give us the tools to make foreign aid programs efficient and effective, two words that sometimes aren't used with "government." I strongly support this legislation.

And that is just the way it is.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3766, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LASALLE LANCERS DID IT AGAIN

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, they did it again.

The LaSalle Lancers won the Ohio Division II State football championship for the second year in a row, and they won it convincingly, as they did last year, 42-0, this time over Massillon Perry.

One reason LaSalle was ready to compete and prevail for the State championship was they were challenged throughout the season by other great Cincinnati high school football programs. There is a saying, what doesn't kill you makes you stronger. Having to play Cincinnati powerhouse teams like Colerain, Elder, St. X, and Moeller didn't kill LaSalle, but it certainly made them stronger.

I am proud to say that LaSalle has been an important part of my life. I got my start in politics there by getting elected to the student council, and I played football, starting on the defensive line. Ten years later, my younger brother, Dave, also played defensive back for LaSalle. Of course, there is another saying, the older I get, the better I was.

So congratulations to LaSalle's players, coaches, students, teachers, parents, and supporters. Well done.

Lancers, roll deep. Congratulations.

□ 1800

IMPORTANCE OF ABUNDANT ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I want to take a little time this evening to take a different look at American energy, Mr. Speaker. As many of you know, one of my core convictions is the importance of upholding the dignity of human life. Our task here in Washington should be to promote ideas and policies that allow people to live longer, healthier, and more rewarding lives.

It is in that spirit that I have joined with my fellow Pennsylvanian, Representative KELLY, and like-minded colleagues to host tonight's Special Order.

Starting last week, world elites gathered in Paris to negotiate climate change commitments and promises that, if enacted, could undo generations of human progress, progress that has provided us with the affordable and reliable energy necessary for humans to truly flourish.

I am here tonight to tell another side of the story, one that abandons the dogma of scarcity put forward by elites in Paris and climate change zealots in Washington. I want to shift this debate to focus on the remarkable story of human abundance. Affordable, reliable energy has been responsible for helping to improve and prolong the lives of billions of people around the world.

Energy powers our businesses. It keeps the lights on in our homes. It allows us to have fresh food and clean water. It powers our schools and our hospitals. Energy is in many respects a life or death matter. It is a moral issue, and it deserves more careful consideration than it has been given by the President.

I would like to highlight a little bit, just taking a look at some charts. In taking a look at what has been happening with the use of energy, a lot of the energy we get is carbon-based fossil fuel energy, whether it is coal, oil, natural gas. Yes, it has increased in recent history.

What also has happened in recent history? As CO₂ emissions have gone up, so has the wealth of this world and of this country. As the population has gone up, so has energy use. What is really striking, Mr. Speaker, is taking a look at how the increase in life expectancy has coincided with this energy revolution as well. As you can see, for much of human history, our lives were short, miserable, and lacking in fulfillment.

Consider that, until the industrial revolution, people lived 27 years, on average, earned little money, and faced

limited opportunities. Again, though CO₂ has increased, so has incredible wealth, lifting billions of people out of poverty and life expectancy.

The point now is, in the United States, the average life expectancy is near 80 years old. As people learned to access the bounty of energy available, we turned it to our advantage. As we got better at it, incomes and populations soared.

This is another interesting chart, Mr. Speaker. As we look at the use of world energy, just going back over the last 30 years, the bottom line is energy use. The top line is the world GDP, the increase in wealth that we have seen coinciding with this increase in energy. You could take a look at some specific countries and see how energy has benefited them.

In China and India, both of which have industrialized and increased energy use over the last generation, life expectancy has increased by more than a decade. Infant mortality has plummeted by 70 and 58 percent, respectively, in China and India. This is all correlated with increased energy use and the availability of affordable energy resources.

As Alex Epstein argues in "The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels," hundreds of millions of people have gotten their first light bulb, their first refrigerator, their first decent-paying job.

With all of our world problems, affordable energy has helped make this the brightest, most abundant time in human history. Some disparage the story as one of unseemly consumption and excess. I see it as a tremendous triumph of human ingenuity and a victory for those who put human well-being as our top priority.

We can tell the same story about Western Pennsylvania, where, once again, we are witnessing increasing prosperity attracted by affordable and reliable energy. This entails better opportunities for Pennsylvania's youth and a better quality of life. That is why I am so troubled by the President's actions at home and in Paris.

In negotiating a global compact, which will likely entail further restrictions on our access to energy, the President is unknowingly endangering our future well-being. By not taking his plans to Congress for approval, as should be the case with a treaty, the President is ignoring the will of the American people.

This is not a trivial point. The American people will be denied the opportunity to weigh in on something that will drastically impact their daily lives. Remember, the President said when he was a candidate in 2008 that electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket under his plan.

All of this comes in addition to heavy burdens that the American people are already grappling with. The so-called Clean Power Plan is an example. By forcing more power plant closures and placing stricter requirements on those that remain, the President's plan will

raise energy prices by \$289 billion through 2030, hurting American families and businesses large and small.

Research suggests that we will see 224,000 fewer American jobs being created each year because of this rule. We will also see reduced disposable income and weaker economic growth.

Minority communities will be especially hard-hit. A study from the National Black Chamber of Commerce found that the Clean Power Plan would increase poverty among African Americans by 23 percent and Hispanics by 26 percent. This is unacceptable, and it is immoral.

Real people will be hurt by these actions. Yet, few in Washington seem to be caring about these real human costs. That is why I have introduced a bill called the Fair Burdens Act. This bill would prevent the burden from endangering our prosperity and well-being until the EPA can verify that a sufficient number of countries have enacted similarly stringent policies.

In other words, the Fair Burdens Act would ensure that Americans aren't made to needlessly suffer and that our jobs aren't forced overseas, as the President unilaterally slows the American economy.

We can't just rely on legislation. We need to change the narrative and educate the public. Affordable, reliable energy is a vital ingredient for human prosperity and well-being. Ignoring this fact and taking ill-conceived policy actions as a result condemns millions of Americans and billions around the world to dimmer futures, higher energy costs, and less prosperity. We owe it to our constituents to defend their ability to live fulfilling, prosperous lives.

I want to thank my colleagues who have joined me here tonight to do just that. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think tonight is a great night for us all to get together. While we are very concerned about the cost to American taxpayers and the fact that we will be going away from our fossil fuels, which are so abundant, so accessible and so affordable, there is another issue that takes place at the same time.

In the Paris protocol, we have heard the President say very clearly—and he has used this many times before—that things aren't getting done at the pace that he would like and that he has a phone and he has a pen and, if Congress can't act, he will act.

Well, I would like to suggest to the President, in fact, it is kind of shocking and stunning that a former professor of constitutional law would have a total disregard for the Constitution. I would like to tell the President that the Constitution is not a suggestion. It is who we are. It is what makes us an exceptional Nation.

Now, the United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change is taking place right now in Paris. It is stunning that the legacy of one man would

overshadow what is good for not only our country, but the world.

Decisions made by this President and the commitments made by this President, he looks at it as an executive decision, not as a treaty, a treaty that requires him returning to the House and to the Senate. Particularly treating this as a treaty, it would take two-thirds of the Senate to concur with whatever it is that we are proposing. Again, as I said, this is a former professor of constitutional law. Yet, he continually defies it. He makes the House irrelevant.

This is not, by the way, a Republican or Democrat issue. This is an American issue. This goes to the very framework and the very foundation of who we are as a Nation. So when you look at this, it is really hard to believe that there is such disregard.

I would just say to the President that, if you go to article II, section 2, clause 2, it is very clearly stated: "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 . . ."

Again, this is an overreach by an executive. It doesn't matter if it is a Republican sitting in the White House or a Democrat sitting in the White House or an Independent or a Libertarian sitting in the White House. It clearly is defined in our Constitution how these powers work.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if one were to ask a question of some high school students in a civics class—if you have an agreement, let's say, between two countries or three countries or four countries and those countries are agreeing to do things that are going to bind their respective citizens, you would ask those students, I would think, Mr. Speaker: What would you call that type of agreement?

I think every one of those students in a civics class might say a treaty. If it looks like a treaty, if it smells like a treaty and it works like a treaty, it is a treaty.

To just highlight what my colleague here has been saying, we have a process in our Constitution for when it is a treaty. It needs to get submitted to the Senate with a two-thirds vote.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I mean, it really does come down to, well, tonight we are talking about energy and we are talking about setting targets and timetables that will be very expensive for hardworking American taxpayers' money. I would like to remind the President that the money he is talking about committing is not his. It belongs to hardworking American taxpayers.

This insane idea that somehow there is an endless amount of money to be thrown around the world for whatever reason possible and knowing that, real-

ly, the Paris protocol is nothing more than a conversation taking place in Paris.

There is no commitment from these countries to do all these things. There is an ask for these countries to do these things. What they are asking is: If we do comply with these suggestions, these targets, these timetables, will we be subsidized by the United States of America?

The President has been unbelievable to make the commitments that he continues to make. He does not have that power. Our Constitution clearly defines the separation of powers. It is clearly structured so that no one body can run roughshod over the other body. This has been a concern forever. Yet, this President consistently time after time disregards the House and the Senate.

□ 1815

As I said earlier, this is not about Republicans or Democrats. This is about America and America's future. In this case, it is about energy. But as we go forward, what other overreaches will this Executive take? What other things will he do because it is about his legacy and not about the well-being of our country and our people. It is shocking. It is stunning that he would continue on this path.

What is even more stunning to me is that the American people sit idly by and watch this happen day after day, week after week, month after month. In 7 years of watching this, they sit back and say: I am not sure that he doesn't have the power to do this. Well, let me tell you, it is clearly defined in our Constitution that this President does not have this authority. In fact, no President, no Executive has the authority to do what this President is continuing to do.

As we meet here in America's House and we look at what can you do, because people back home tell me all the time, "Look, I agree with you, but what can you do about it?" and I know that for myself and my colleagues, we refuse to sit by idly and watch our Nation be given away and watch our Constitution be run over roughshod because of one man's legacy. This is not what is good for America. This is what is good for this administration and this President. That is not only shameful, it is unconstitutional and cannot be tolerated.

That is why, with Senator LEE in the Senate and myself, we have come up with H. Con. Res. 97 that states any commitment of funds, hardworking American taxpayer funds, has got to come before the Senate for its advice and consent.

As I said earlier, we can debate and we can talk and we can amend, but what we cannot condone is an Executive who has a total disregard for this House and for the Senate. As I said earlier, we need colleagues on both sides. This is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. This comes down to the very foundation of who we are as a country.

If we turn our back on this, what will be next? The continual disregard for the Constitution is not only of grave concern to me, to my colleagues, but every single American, regardless of how you vote or how you register. That is not the issue, my friends.

The issue is, when do the American people in America's House, with the Senate, stand up and say there will be no commitment of hardworking American taxpayer dollars unless it comes before the Senate as a treaty and gets the advice and consent of the Senate, two-thirds of which are required to pass this?

I know we are coming to an end in Paris, and I know there is great concern of getting to Paris to find out exactly what the Paris Protocol is structured with, but I would just say this: Before you pack your bags and leave, take a copy of your Constitution with you.

For those folks sitting back home and watching this happen, please, get out your Constitutions and look. For our schools, please start to preach and teach the Constitution, of which too many Americans are woefully uninformed.

Mr. ROTHFUS. It struck me as my colleague from Pennsylvania was talking about the Constitution. What he was getting at, Mr. Speaker, was a simple concept of authority and whether the President has authority to do what he is doing in Paris. The President is allowed to negotiate certainly. He can conduct foreign affairs. It is pretty clear in the Constitution that he has that authority to do so. But the President, on his own, does not have the authority to obligate American taxpayers to pay into any kind of fund. It is the House and the Senate that do the appropriations.

I am mindful that my colleague came out of the auto business, where he sold cars. I can imagine a situation where you might have a customer coming in, let's say a 15-year-old, who wants to go in and buy a car. Of course my colleague might welcome this individual to the showroom, and this individual, a 15-year-old kid, might make an offer, but I think he is going to be asking: Well, does this person have the authority at the age of 15 to make an offer? Maybe the kid will say: Well, I am doing it for my mom and my dad. Well, you are going to want to see what authority he has. I am mindful that our Constitution gives the authority to spend money to the Congress, which would then be signed by the President. I yield to my colleague if he wants to close.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would tell you this, and I think if there is anything more telling of the view that this administration has, all you have to do is go back in time to March of 2015 this year when Josh Earnest, who represents the White House in all the briefings, was asked by a reporter in regard to the Paris Protocol and in regard to the climate control conference that would be taking place.

This is so typical of this administration. The reporter looks to Mr. Earnest and says to him: Is this the kind of agreement that Congress should have the ability to sign off on?

Now, you would think that somebody who works for a former constitutional law professor would have a little bit of an idea when it comes to speaking; and even while they may feel in their heart that they have a total disregard for this body, I don't think that they would be encouraged to speak out the way Josh Earnest did that day. Let me read what Josh Earnest said when the reporter asked him: Is this the kind of agreement that Congress should have the ability to sign off on?

He looks him right in the eye and says: I think it is hard to take seriously from some Members of Congress who deny the fact that climate change exists that they should have some opportunity to render judgment about a climate change agreement.

Is that not stunning? And not only stunning, but chilling that, coming out of the White House, the spokesman for the President of the United States again consistently expresses the attitude of this President in that: Are you kidding me? We are actually going to have the people's House, the people's Representatives weigh in on a climate change initiative? They are not qualified. They only represent the people. No. We will make that decision. And he again totally trashes the House of Representatives.

By the way, for my friends who don't speak up when this happens to them, you got trashed, too, my friends. I have watched you stand and applaud a President who says consistently that: I do not need the House of Representatives to effect change. I will use my phone and I will use my pen, and I am tired of waiting for these people.

Well, Mr. President, once again I say to you that the Constitution is not a suggestion. It is who we are as a nation. It is what makes us great. It is what allows the people to decide how they will be governed, not the government to decide how the people will be governed. This is such upside-down thinking.

While I am concerned, as you are, with the abandonment of our fossil fuels and turning our economic revival upside down, I am more concerned with an administration that consistently turns upside down our Constitution, runs roughshod over the House of Representatives, disregards the Senate, and then sits back and says: This is the way it is going to be because I am the President of the United States.

I tell you, Mr. President, you are the President of the United States. You take the same oath all of us take. If for some reason you can't remember what it is, please take a look at it and remind yourself who you are, what you are, and whom you represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President, and

Members are reminded to address the Chair and not a perceived viewing audience or other Members in the second person.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his observations about our Constitution and what it requires.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who has been a very strong advocate for her constituents and for the energy policy that we need to have in this country.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join with Representatives ROTHFUS and KELLY and all my colleagues here tonight expressing concern about the reports coming from the Conference of the Parties, or COP 21, talks in France of a planned end-around of the Senate.

It is unacceptable to me that this administration is negotiating a major international agreement, promising vast sums of taxpayer dollars, with no intention of allowing the people's representatives to weigh in on a final agreement. While the President's team is in Paris trying to finalize a deal, we have been here listening to our constituents. That should be our goal: to listen to Americans and to fight to lower their electricity costs, not obligating taxpayers to send billions of their hard-earned dollars overseas to implement climate change schemes.

Nor should we continue down this path of forcing rate increases on the hardworking families in America, yet that has been the President's plan all along, Mr. Speaker. In 2008, President Obama proudly announced his vision for energy costs in our country. He said: "Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket . . . coal . . . natural gas . . . you name it . . . whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money, and they will pass that money on to consumers."

His plan: make them pay more. Even though his cap-and-trade legislation failed in Congress, the administration has not given up and continues to ignore the voices of the American people by passing rules that implement them, despite the law, and by traveling to Paris to work a deal to inflict more mandates on the American people.

Even now, with little support here at home, negotiators are working every angle to make sure a deal is secured, no matter how onerous it is to senior citizens and low-income families living paycheck to paycheck and for whom a rate increase will hurt the most.

This agenda has been a hallmark of the administration when it finalized the EPA's recent Clean Power Plan rules on existing and new power plants, which amount to a disguised cap-and-trade program.

But we are listening to the American people. Upon the start of the Paris talks, both Chambers of Congress passed joint resolutions against the

EPA's Clean Power Plan rules for new and existing power plants to nullify the rules put in place which were done by ignoring the will of the people.

Twenty-seven States have also taken the EPA to court over these two rules. It is important that we do this. Missourians rely on affordable energy. Americans everywhere rely on affordable energy, and to ignore their needs and wishes is irresponsible.

We do not need extreme, arbitrary mandates that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 15 years, close power plants across the Nation, eliminate jobs, and close off access to reliable, affordable energy for the most vulnerable in our society.

We need to promote policies that increase access to affordable energy, tap into the abundant energy supply, and create a reliable infrastructure supported by American labor and ingenuity.

We need to make sure that Americans' voices are heard, which is why I proudly stand with my colleagues in support of Congressman KELLY's concurrent resolution requiring the President to send any agreement stemming from these talks in Paris to the Senate as a treaty for advice and consent from those sent here by the people to represent them.

We need American energy policy that works for the American people, not against it. They deserve a fair process that upholds the constitutional authority of checks and balances envisioned by our forefathers.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the American people and support this resolution so the people's voices will be heard.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, those who disagree with us and our colleagues point to the wisdom of the experts on the potential impacts of climate change, but we know that many of the so-called experts have historically been wrong, often significantly wrong.

In 1986, John Holdren, a senior adviser to President Obama on science and technology issues, predicted: "carbon dioxide, climate-induced famines could kill as many as a billion people before the year 2020."

Since then, we have added almost 2½ billion people to the planet, an increase of almost 50 percent, and we aren't seeing a billion people dying from famine. We continue to make significant progress with improved technology, and we are feeding more people than ever, and people are living healthier and longer. We could not have done this without accessing abundant, affordable, and consistent energy.

Paul Ehrlich, another so-called expert on this issue, predicted in 1970, that: "By the year 2000, the United Kingdom will be simply a small group of impoverished islands, inhabited by some 70 million hungry people . . . If I were a gambler, I would take even more money that England will not exist in the year 2000." Well, England

still exists, and it is doing better than ever.

□ 1830

England's Chancellor of the Exchequer was recently published in *The Wall Street Journal* bragging about the nation's turnaround under conservative leadership: "How Britain Got Its Mojo Back."

To paraphrase Mark Twain, the report of Britain's death is greatly exaggerated, to say the least. If we had listened to the inaccurate and dire predictions of these experts and chicken littles and curtailed energy usage, our world would certainly look differently than it does. It would be poorer, less well fed, and billions of people would be generally worse off.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), and I want to commend my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), for his eloquent and passionate defense of constitutional government.

It is not just the administration's efforts here to ratify something and bypass Congress without any input from us, but they are also making laws through agencies, such as the EPA. We are engaged right now in a debate over the Clean Power Plan, which is a reiteration of cap-and-trade. It is all about regulating greenhouse gases. They have started this process because in 2007, the Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision, said that the Clean Air Act gave the EPA the authority to regulate greenhouse emissions. Not everyone agrees with that.

As you see here on the easel, I have a quote from former Representative John Dingell. This is what he had to say about the Supreme Court's decision in *EPA v. Massachusetts*. He said:

"Like most members of this committee, I think the Supreme Court came up with a very much erroneous decision on whether the Clean Air Act covers greenhouse gases. Like many of the members of this committee I was present when we wrote that legislation. We thought it was clear enough that we didn't clarify it, thinking that even the Supreme Court was not stupid enough to make that finding."

I want to state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that I am in no way making personal references to the members of the Court, particularly the five who voted for that decision. That is Mr. Dingell's opinion. But I think it is clear that it was never Congress' intent to allow the EPA to do this.

The point here is that we have had a debate over regulating greenhouse gases. We did that in 2010 in the form of the cap-and-trade bill. And Congress, with Democrat majorities in both Houses, said "no." Yet the President is intent on making the United States a party to a legally-binding agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that will have almost no measurable impact

on global temperatures. The EPA has admitted that in testimony before the Science Committee.

This is basically a public relations effort to encourage other nations to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. As Mr. ROTHFUS has pointed out, the cost on the American economy, and particularly on low-income families, will be enormous. Also, on single-income households and senior citizens.

Even the former lead author of the International Panel on Climate Change, Philip Lloyd, asserted in a new paper that there is strong likelihood that the major portion of observed warming is due to natural variation. If it is due to natural variation, there is little to nothing that we can do about it.

Congress has been bypassed by the EPA and other Federal agencies for too long. Is time to stand up and reassert ourselves as the sole body empowered to make law under the Constitution.

The debate over greenhouse gases and climate change is not the central issue. This is really about the EPA and this administration usurping the authority of Congress to make a law.

As my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) explained, the issue is that the authority of Congress, and consequently the right of American citizens to representation and the making of our Nation's laws is being seriously diminished.

Under our Constitution, Congress makes the law and is held accountable by the people through elections. The effort to restrain the EPA is more than a policy position on an issue, but a matter of fidelity to the Constitution and the clear separation of powers doctrine that is essential to the successful functioning of our government.

As the people's elected Representatives, and I want to emphasize it is elected Representatives, not elected bystanders, it should be one of our top priorities to reassert Congress as the originator of law and reestablish congressional accountability for the regulations issued by Federal agencies, by requiring a vote on the regulations that have a significant impact on the economy. This would have a devastating impact on the economy. By doing so, not only will the economy benefit, but the Representative and accountable government will be restored in the process.

I urge all my colleagues to support my friend from Pennsylvania's resolution to require that the President submit any agreement reached in Paris to the Senate for their advice and consent.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Let's take a look at where we are at in this debate over energy use and what has been going on in Paris. Again, it always seems to be a one-sided conversation about all the negatives and all the dire consequences. I highlighted a few of the examples before of what some of the advocates have been say-

ing, and how their dire predictions did not come to pass.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we take for granted how easy it is to live with constant access to reliable sources of energy. Our health, indeed our lives, and the lives of those who we love, often depend on our access to reliable energy available to us at every hour, every day. People in the developing world cannot yet say the same.

There is a powerful story of an unborn child who suffocated in utero in Gambia comes to mind. This tiny, three-pound little girl could not be saved, because the hospital did not have access to a reliable source of energy. Her mother required an emergency C-section, but the surgery could not begin until a generator was powered on. Precious minutes were lost, so precious life was lost. Without a reliable, consistent form of energy, the hospital did not even own an incubator, which would have also been necessary to save this baby's life.

We cannot forget how important affordable, reliable energy is for every human person, and how attacks on these sources of energy are attacks on life itself.

I yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the President's actions to regulate our power plants and his efforts to commit the United States to such onerous regulations through the United Nations. At no other time in our history has a President been more wrong more times on so many issues that this country is facing today than President Obama, Mr. Speaker.

At a time when our country is being attacked from inside our borders and radical Islamists are gaining ground all over the world, this administration is obsessed with climate change? And, he refuses to admit the radical Islam is our enemy? It makes me wonder if he thinks that Syed Farook in English means "global warming."

It is clear that he is intent on regulating our Nation's economy and hurting its citizens instead of focusing on the immediate threat. You can't make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker. I guess you could say the threat he should be focused on is global swarming. He just doesn't seem to get it, Mr. Speaker.

The sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is even if every country abided by its greenhouse gas emissions reduction commitments, temperatures would continue increasing 2.7 to 3.7 degrees Celsius. Without these reductions, temperatures would increase 3.0 to 4.0 degrees Celsius. The difference is miniscule.

Mr. Speaker, there are no positive economic or environmental benefits to the President's unlawful regulatory actions. Instead, the administration's pledge to the U.N. threatens job creation and economic growth right here in the United States of America.

According to one independent analysis, the economic cost to Americans

will be approximately \$29 to \$39 billion each year. Electricity prices for consumers in 40 States could increase by at least 10 percent, or more. He has already been quoted during his campaign saying that under his administration, electricity prices would, by necessity, skyrocket. These are his words, not mine.

This represents nothing less than a war, Mr. Speaker, on low-income families, and would further increase economic inequality.

Mr. Speaker, our country is in a crisis. Instead of its foolhardy and unconstitutional plan to regulate our climate, this administration should be focusing on the livelihood and safety of this Nation and Americans.

It is no secret that there are people around the world who hate the United States and wish to see its demise. There are attacks being planned and plotted even as we speak, Mr. Speaker. Yet this administration claims that that threat is contained and global warming is our main threat. Tell that to the 14 people who were tragically murdered while celebrating Christmas in San Bernardino.

That is how I see it here in America, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for doing this very important Special Order. I commend Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. KELLY for doing this.

I have got several things I would like to talk about. The first thing is that 190 countries are meeting in Paris to negotiate a new international agreement on climate change at the 21st session of the Conference of Parties.

According to the U.S. Special Envoy for Climate Change, President Obama intends to commit the U.S. to giving tens of billions of dollars per year to finance green energy initiatives in developing countries to reduce emissions by 26 to 28 percent below levels by 2025.

America, wake up. These tens of billions of dollars are coming out of your money. We have seniors that can't buy health insurance or pay their rent or insurance. We have seniors and other families that are suffering here in America. But yet, the President wants to commit tens of billions of our hard-working American taxpayers' money, and mine, too, to these other countries.

The Obama administration has indicated that the President does not intend to submit the Paris agreement to the Senate for its advice and consent as an article II treaty. This is a clear violation of the constitutional laws and ideals of America, and it will not be tolerated. We will hold him accountable.

The lack of progress becomes even more apparent when you start looking at the country level. China, for its part, offered to reach peak carbon dioxide emissions around 2030, while reducing emissions per unit of Gross Domest-

tic Product by 60 to 65 percent by that time from its 2005 levels. But the U.S. Government's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory has already predicted China's emissions would peak on their own around 2030, even without climate change initiatives. So they don't have any skin in the game.

A Bloomberg analysis found that China's 60 to 65 percent target is less ambitious than the level it would reach by continuing business as usual. All this came before the country admitted it was burning 17 percent more coal than previously estimated. That is more coal than the entire country of Germany.

So, our government, our President, and this administration want to bind America to a United Nations treaty.

And let's look at the facts. America has been blessed with an abundance of energy sources. We should utilize all those sources to the best of our ability—from coal, petroleum, natural gas, solar, wind, hydro electric, and even manmade nuclear energy. We should use those to the best of our and society's advantage.

□ 1845

We should not cripple the American power companies that supply energy to the manufacturers of America that employ the American citizens at the whim of an administration's green agenda and is paid for on the backs of hard-working American citizens in the way of lost jobs that go overseas because of higher regulations and energy costs, decreased wages because of a decrease in competition in the job market, higher energy costs felt by all of our citizens, but more on the lower end, as has been mentioned here, on the economic income scale because a higher percentage of their money goes to pay their utility bills.

Look at the facts. Geologists think the world may be frozen up again, 1895.

Disappearing glaciers—disappearing glaciers—slowly with a persistence that means there is going to be complete annihilation. That is in 1902.

Professor Schmidt warns us of an encroaching new ice age, 1912.

Scientists say Arctic ice will wipe out Canada, 1923.

The discoveries of changes in the Sun's heat and the southward advances of glaciers in recent years have given rise to the conjectures of the possible advent of a new ice age, 1923 again.

Most geologists think the world is growing warmer and that it will continue to get warmer, 1929.

The point of this is the consensus of scientists has been wrong over the course of the years. If you look at recent facts, that 2-degree Centigrade benchmark that the scientific community says we can't get warmer than 2 degrees or life on Earth is going to stop to exist as we know it, that is not a scientific number. That is an arbitrary number. I did the research on it.

That number comes from an economist in 1970 that the environmental

community has gravitated to. They have used that as a benchmark, and it is a fallacy.

The Earth's temperature has increased approximately one-half of a degree Centigrade over the past 20 to 30 years. This comes from the NASA Web site. I encourage the American people that are watching this to go to the NASA Web site. Look at the facts.

Also look at that half-a-degree Centigrade increase in our temperature in the world. It partly is attributed to the new way they are measuring things today. They are more accurate than they were 20 or 30 years ago. So that is a variation.

The other thing is they predict and they estimate that over 50 percent of that half-a-degree Centigrade increase—over 50 percent of that—comes from solar activity, not manmade or anthropogenic causes.

So what does that mean? That means do we just not really even look at the causes of these? No. Not at all.

Let's look at the facts. Even in left-leaning publications—in fact, I brought one here. I don't want to call them left-leaning, but the article in *The Economist* has a 14-page "Clear thinking needed" on climate change.

Even in this article they had some fallacies. One of them was saying the warming in the world is 100 percent by human activity. That is a fallacy. That is false reporting.

The other thing is they go in there and they say that, with all the wind power that we have put into the world, around the globe, and all the solar activity around the globe, and the massive government programs to supplement these, it has failed to make a dent in the so-called manmade CO₂ output on a global scale, and it is not reliable.

All those other forms of energy, the renewables, they are not reliable for baseline production, which is needed for national security.

As I close, I just want to say this: As I said, America has been blessed with an abundance of energy sources. So let us, as leaders of this great Nation, make energy policies that are common sense in nature and don't entangle us, as a Nation, with other nations that cripple us as a Nation not just economically, but they weaken our national security, and they are going to be paid for by all Americans and, again, felt mostly by those that can't afford it.

This treaty is a bad deal, and the President owes the respect to the American people to go through the people's House and the Senate to have any agreement binding.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, and I ask him to continue the good work.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his remarks.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just talk about this word denial that we hear thrown around a lot in this debate. There has been no denial, Mr.

Speaker, of the benefits that humanity has enjoyed because of fossil fuel use over the last decades.

Again, I am going to pull up this chart here. The benefits are clear. The lower left graph is GDP per person in the world. It has skyrocketed, coincidentally, with the increase of energy use.

But life expectancy has skyrocketed over the last 200 years, again, coincident with increased energy use, access to reliable, clean energy.

It is no wonder. You consider how energy is deployed. Take water, for example. The tremendous progress that we have made with clean water and pumping stations and ways to pull water in and to clean it, that is all done using fossil fuel-based energy, whether it is coal, gas, oil. There has been a tremendous success over the last 200 years as humanity has looked for energy and used fossil fuels-based energy products.

Mr. Speaker, if President Obama and the unelected Federal bureaucrats at EPA had installed today's regulatory regime in the 19th century, my district and this country would look vastly different.

Access to reliable, affordable energy has improved the quality of life of people wherever it is available, which is why the Clean Power Plan is so deeply misguided.

It will also raise energy prices again by \$289 billion through 2030, fulfilling a promise that the President made in 2008 when he said electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

But minority communities will be especially hard-hit. Again, a study from the National Black Chamber of Commerce found that the Clean Power Plan would increase poverty among African Americans by 22 percent and Hispanics by 26 percent. This is not acceptable.

In addition, the President's energy agenda constrains our energy mix and distorts the market to benefit certain politically favored technologies, regulations that reduce Americans' access to reliable, affordable energy sources, endangers our grid stability, putting millions at risk of losing power during times of peak demand.

Meanwhile, the Clean Power Plan will avert only two one-hundredths of a degree Celsius of warming over the next 85 years. That is less than 2 percent of 1 degree Celsius. It is not a fair tradeoff.

American energy policy should promote economic growth and prosperity so that we can tackle our debt. This is such an important point, Mr. Speaker.

When we have these debates and conversations about whether it is going on in Paris, whether it is going on in Congress, and we talk about American energy and coal and gas, nuclear, other forms, it is not all pain, the pain that those who are running around and saying the sky is falling, the sky is falling. Time and again, their predictions have been proved false.

It is undeniable, Mr. Speaker, that access to affordable, reliable energy

has greatly advanced humanity. And humanity can figure it out. We have made tremendous, tremendous progress with the environment over the last 50, 60 years.

Certainly we have seen that in Western Pennsylvania, and that progress is going to continue. It continues, in part, because we have access to great, reliable, abundant, cheap electricity. Fossil fuels have enabled that progress and will continue to enable that progress.

As we meet the challenges of a changing climate, Mr. Speaker, it is human ingenuity that is going to pull us through, human beings, persons, empowered to live lives freely.

Look what Holland has been able to do with the sea over the last 400 years. Before the advent of all the huge machines that can move dirt around, they have been holding back the sea and building levees and dikes. It has been remarkable what the people of Holland have been able to do, even more so now that we have access to the technologies that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we should be leading the world in heavy technology, as we address concerns with rising sea levels.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, to doubt the capacity of the human person and human ingenuity to overcome these challenges that may face us. But we can't be in denial about the fact that fossil fuel energy has been a tremendous boon to humanity.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, we have tremendous challenges—tremendous challenges—ahead in the coming years. We are \$18 trillion in debt as a Nation, and we have tens of trillions of dollars in unfunded liability.

We need to be growing like you have never seen before. With access to cheap, reliable energy, we will be able to pull ourselves out of debt. We will begin to have that renaissance in our economy.

We have to meet those challenges we have. But if we expect to meet those challenges, if we expect to meet the commitments we have made on Social Security for Grandma and Medicare and meet the commitments we have made to our veterans, tens of thousands who have sustained life-changing injuries over the last 14 years, we need to be growing again.

A key access to that growth is to have access to abundant, reliable, cheap energy. We know what it has done historically: increasing incomes, lifting people out of poverty, increasing life expectancy, increasing food production, increasing water purity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a success story that needs to be told.

I yield back the balance of my time.

OUR FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE TO PROTECT AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized

for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to take an hour, but I do propose to bring a very important issue before the House and before the American people. Today we had our first opportunity to really move to protect Americans.

Presently, if you are on the no-fly list, which is not easy to get on—there has to be some very specific reason why you could be a threat to American citizens, to the airplane on which you might be traveling, or you might be entering this country for some nefarious reason, like terrorism.

But if you are on the no-fly list and you do happen to be in America, you can go to a gun store or to perhaps any fairground where there is a gun show and you can buy a weapon, virtually any gun, an assault weapon, a handgun, a shotgun.

And the question arises: If you are too dangerous to fly, are you not too dangerous to buy a gun?

But, under American law today, you can, indeed, be too dangerous to fly. You could be a threat to the other passengers or to a tower, to an airplane. But, apparently, you are not a threat to buy a gun.

In fact, there are some 16,000 people, a very small portion of the American citizenry, that are on the no-fly list. Since 9/11 in 2001, more than 2,000 men, probably women, who are too dangerous to fly on the no-fly list have been able to purchase guns here in the United States.

So let's see if we get this straight. You have been designated by the Department of Homeland Security and the various Federal Government agencies—TSA, FBI, quite possibly the CIA, and others—as being a threat to the security and safety of America and Americans, and you are put on a no-fly list, meaning you can't get on an airplane.

□ 1900

You are not able to buy a ticket, you are not able to travel, and yet you find some way to go down to the local gun store in those States that do not have background checks or maybe a gun show where there are no background checks, you present yourself and say: "Oh, that is a pretty good-looking AR-14. I'd like to have it."

"Sure, you got the money?"

"I got the money."

"Here is the gun."

This makes no sense whatsoever. Somehow I think the American public gets this. If you are too dangerous to fly, then you are too dangerous to be able to buy a gun in America. It is that simple. There ought to be a law, but there is no law.

Here in the House of Representatives, many of us have been trying for, actually, several years to deal with this crazy loophole in our gun safety laws; yet we have been unable to have a bill come to the House floor where 435 of us