

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 119, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1001 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1001

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1001, providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 119, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy. The rule provides for consideration of the concurrent resolution under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, my district in central Washington demonstrates the strength in utilizing a diverse portfolio of energy sources, while also working on the forefront of energy innovation in clean energy solutions for the future.

From the mighty Grand Coulee Dam, which is the largest hydroelectric power producer in the United States, to the Chief Joseph Dam, to the series of lower Snake and lower Columbia River dams, our region is undoubtedly blessed with low-cost, clean, reliable, and renewable hydropower.

In fact, hydropower provides our State with almost 70 percent of our energy needs. Improvements made to this

technology to improve the efficiency, the safety, and the productivity of hydro demonstrate the importance of constantly improving our energy technologies.

Now, while we do rely heavily on hydropower, Washington also utilizes an array of other energy sources, both produced and imported, including oil, natural gas, coal, and a number of renewable energy sources such as wind and solar.

My district is also blessed with the only nuclear generating station in the Pacific Northwest, and that is the Columbia Generating Station, which is operated by Energy Northwest. Columbia produces 10 percent of the electricity generated in Washington and is a reliable, clean energy producer not dependent on weather conditions like some renewables are.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, while I am sure you are fascinated by this brief rundown of Washington State's source of energy, you may be wondering why I am speaking about such matters with the resolution before us today.

The resolution says, quite simply, that it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy—a simple statement. And while I could be spending my time listening to many ways a harmful tax would harm our economy and the American people, I thought I would also offer a demonstration of the many resources we have at our disposal for strengthening America's energy dominance.

Many of my colleagues, much like myself, support what we can call an “all of the above” energy approach. We believe government should not be picking winners and losers and should not be placing the thumb on the economic free-market scale. A carbon tax would be exactly that, a devastating hammer to what is currently an economy on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by the majority whip, Representative STEVE SCALISE from the great State of Louisiana, to oppose a carbon tax as a solution to address carbon emissions and climate change, because, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it simply is not a solution.

However, that is not to say that I oppose reducing carbon emissions. My constituents and the people of the great Pacific Northwest most certainly want a clean, healthy environment, and we should be doing everything we can to limit emissions. But a burdensome new tax that would fundamentally bring our innovative energy sector and growing economy to a standstill is not the answer.

Further, a carbon tax fails to recognize the diversity of our Nation and the different energy resources that exist in the United States. Quite frankly, the resources that exist in the State of Washington certainly may not be present in the State of North Dakota or Louisiana or Massachusetts.

We should be making clean energy more affordable, not making traditional energy sources more expensive. We should be cutting burdensome regulations that constrain the development and deployment of energy, whether it be nuclear, fossil fuels, or hydropower. These regulatory burdens should be removed and reformed to spur clean energy innovation with the power of markets, not within the hands of government bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, we, in central Washington, have another prize gem in our backyard. I am proud to represent the people that work at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. This premier Department of Energy lab is on the forefront of energy innovation. From enabling safe and sustainable fossil fuel exploration production, transportation, conversion, and end use, to transforming the U.S. power grid to meet economic, environmental, and security priorities for the 21st century, our national labs like PNNL delivers distinctive science and technology solutions for efficient and sustainable energy.

I am a proud member of the House Appropriations Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee where we continue to prioritize strategic energy research and development that will increase U.S. economic growth, innovation, and competitiveness.

Congress should continue to work on utilizing and empowering public-private partnerships to rapidly develop new technologies and then let the market catalyze its growth and commercial liability. There are great examples of these efforts taking place in the innovative high-tech communities of the Tri-Cities, Washington, where experts from the private sector are partnering with research and support offered by PNNL to develop grid-scale storage solutions and small modular reactor technologies, fundamentally transforming the future of nuclear power generation and battery storage technologies.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want energy security and want a clean environment. They want economic growth, job creation, and they want to keep their low-cost electricity. The way to a cleaner, more prosperous future for our Nation's energy needs is not through more government bureaucracy. It is through empowering American innovation. That is why a carbon tax is wrong for my district in central Washington State. It is wrong for the entire State of Washington, and it is wrong for the United States of America. We need to innovate, rather than regulate the future of America's energy dominance.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate a Republican sense of Congress resolution proclaiming that a carbon tax would be bad for the U.S. economy. That is it. That is how this majority is choosing to spend its precious legislative time. I mean, this is a big nothing burger.

Instead of considering legislation to address the administration's horrific child separation policy at the border or addressing the surging cost of prescription drugs or taking action to address gun safety, or finally, finally holding Russia accountable for their interference in the 2016 election, something the President himself has trouble acknowledging, we are here considering a sense of Congress stating that a carbon tax would be bad for America.

You know, I don't know how many of my Republican colleagues are scientists, but you might want to meet some and talk to some of them. They are smart people. They deal in facts. They deal in evidence. They deal in results.

Look, Mr. Speaker, as any third grader knows, the Earth revolves around the Sun, and if I drop a pen, it will fall to the table because of gravity. We know that smoking causes cancer, and we know that the Earth is not flat. We also know that climate change is real and that 97 percent of climate scientists agree that humans are the main cause. But Republicans are burying their heads in the sand with this glorified press release attacking a potential tool to combat it.

But even worse than what we are doing is what the Republican majority is blocking from consideration. This week they blocked an amendment that would have provided much needed funding to the Election Assistance Commission to protect our elections from further Russian interference. This is outrageous. Just days after President Trump sided with Putin over our own intelligence community, Republicans blocked funding to protect our elections. Essentially, the President sold out America in Helsinki.

So Republicans want to vote on a sense of Congress, let's consider the resolution reiterating Speaker RYAN's statement in response to the President's terrible performance in Helsinki. It acknowledges Russia's role in interfering in our election, and it affirms our support for the intelligence community. But, of course, the majority has blocked that resolution.

Instead, we are now debating our 92nd closed rule this Congress. This is the most closed Congress in history, with zero open rules. And for those in the gallery, the reason why this is important is because the majority of bills that have come to this floor have come in a way that nobody can amend them. Nobody can change even a word in the bill. I mean, this is supposed to be the people's House, not the Russia house.

Mr. Speaker, this, what we are doing today, is a waste of time. We have real issues to address—substantive issues to address. The American people deserve more than show votes that throw red meat to the oil lobby. I would say to my Republican colleagues: Do your job. Listen to the American people. Start addressing some of their concerns, like the fact that we need to protect our election system from more Russian interference. That is a serious matter. All of our intelligence agencies have said it is a serious matter, that it happened.

□ 1245

And what is your response? You zero out money in an appropriations bill to help protect our election system. Then you block an amendment that would allow us to put the money back in.

All we want is a fair fight. If you want to vote "no" on it, vote "no" on it. But the American people are concerned, even if you are not. Do your job.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from referring to occupants in the gallery and are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side seem to be focused on closed versus open rules. We hear that time and time again. They are ignoring that the structured amendment process has routinely been used by both parties when they were in the majority.

This majority has made it a priority to make in order amendments for floor consideration, which, I might point out, a majority of those amendments have been Democratic-sponsored or co-sponsored. In fact, as of July 12 of this year, Republicans in this Congress, the 115th Congress, provided for the consideration of more than 1,650 amendments on the House floor: 745 of those were Democrat amendments; 630 were Republican amendments; and 280 were, proudly, bipartisan amendments, Mr. Speaker. So by no means are we stopping the process. That doesn't even count the thousands and thousands of submissions that Members make, both Republican and Democrat, to committees for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the fact that this is a totally closed process. It is open for participation by every Member of the House who represents constituents across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 119, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses and is not in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend from Massachusetts just said that we

need to be addressing real concerns. Well, I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that the loss of paychecks of tens of thousands of Kentuckians over the last decade, as a result of a war on fossil energy, is a major concern. Maybe not in Massachusetts, but men and women who have lost paychecks, whose lives have been devastated by overregulation, that is a real concern, Mr. Speaker.

This Congress, fortunately, in cooperation with this administration, is now leading our country back, not just toward energy independence, but energy dominance and strong economic growth, and, finally, jobs as a priority, and energy security, by rolling back onerous regulations that have harmed livelihoods and threatened our grid resiliency.

Mr. Speaker, implementing a carbon tax would not only harm these efforts, but it would result in massive job losses, lead to higher prices for families and businesses, and jeopardize our energy security.

My home State of Kentucky relies heavily on fossil fuels, as our coal resources provide our State thousands of jobs and deliver more than 83 percent of our electricity. This allows Kentuckians to enjoy some of the lowest average electricity rates in the Nation.

A carbon tax, Mr. Speaker, would be an attack on the poor. It would be an attack on people who cannot afford high electricity bills.

The implementation of a carbon tax would be detrimental not only to Kentucky's economy, but to the progress of our Nation, and the progress we are making toward energy resilience and freedom.

Instead of increasing government mandates and regulations on industries, and picking winners and losers, we should look for new, innovative ways to promote air quality and address environmental concerns. The best way to do that is not through central planning from Washington. It is to unleash free enterprises to encourage innovation and to harness the carbon cycle.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a climate denier. I am not a science denier. I am a climate thinker. I am a science thinker. Real science is not just about assessing cost only. It is about looking at benefits as well. Those supporting a carbon tax look only at costs, but not benefits, of coal and other fossil energy.

Coal provides cheap, plentiful, reliable energy over the long term. We should not want the most carbon-free energy. We should want the best energy. We should want the most reliable energy. We should want the most effective energy, energy that best facilitates human life, human flourishing, and human progress. And that is what fossil energy is.

Government mandates and central planning, like a carbon tax, add costs to private sector innovation, resulting in poor air quality and more, not less, global pollution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the goal should not be green energy. The goal should be the advancement of the human condition.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 119, and I thank Representative SCALISE, our whip, for his efforts on this important issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, I tried to get the gentleman from Kentucky to yield, but I guess he didn't want to get into an exchange. But he said that he is worried about Kentucky jobs. There is nothing in this bill that will protect one job anywhere.

We are not debating a carbon tax. This is a sense of Congress. This is a press release. This is not going to protect anybody's paycheck. This is ridiculous. Are you going to go home to your constituents and say, "Oh, I did something for you. I passed a press release"? I mean, give me a break.

The gentleman talks about the poor. If he is worried about the poor, then stop cutting Medicaid. If he is worried about the poor, stop cutting food assistance from people struggling in poverty, because that is what the Republican majority has been doing consistently in this Congress. So I don't need any lectures about that.

To the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my colleague, let me again say, because I think people need to have this sink in, this is the most closed Congress in the history of our country: 92 closed rules. That means that the majority of bills—I want my Republican colleagues to listen to this as well—the majority of bills have come to the floor where nobody, even Republicans, are allowed to offer any amendments—nothing.

Is this the people's House? Is this what you came to Washington to do, to shut out debate, to shut out good ideas?

It is a disgrace. My hope is that the people of this country are watching and that they will send you a message in November.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, the Voter Empowerment Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, which would ensure equal access to the ballot, modernize the voter registration system, and take steps to eliminate deceptive practices that deter voters from casting their ballots.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), to discuss that proposal.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this rule and to support the previous question.

In a democracy, the right to vote is the most powerful nonviolent tool we have. Many people marched and protested for the right to vote. Some gave a little blood, and others lost their lives.

Some of you have heard me say that the right to vote is precious, almost sacred. In my heart of hearts, I believe that we should make it simple and convenient for all of our citizens to be part of the democratic process. It should not matter whether you are Black or White, Latino, Asian-American, or Native American. We should be able to participate in the democratic process.

On March 7, 1965, I gave a little blood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the right to vote. Before the Voting Rights Act in 1965 was passed, some people had to count the number of bubbles in a bar of soap or the number of jelly beans in a jar.

All across America today, when people go out to attempt to vote, they stand in long, immovable lines. That is not right, that is not fair, and it is not just. We can do better, and we must do better.

We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to empower all of the American people, not just a select few. We must do what is right, what is fair, and what is just.

Today, our democracy is under attack, by forces within and forces abroad. We need to fix it and fix it now.

For these reasons, I am proud to sponsor H.R. 12, the Voter Empowerment Act, with my friends and my colleagues. It is a good bill, a necessary bill, and a patriotic bill to protect and to preserve our voting system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to support the previous question.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), my good friend.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, as you have heard just a moment ago, in support of H. Con. Res. 119, which sends a strong message that a carbon tax would be devastating to the economy of the United States, and especially to my district in West Virginia.

I am so proud to cosponsor this resolution, along with the leadership of Majority Whip SCALISE, and thank him for his strong and powerful work on this important issue.

West Virginia is a coal State, unapologetic. Our coal miners and coal communities suffered greatly under the prior administration of Barack Obama and that administration's anti-coal policies.

But now, thanks to President Trump, West Virginia has hope for a better fu-

ture. West Virginia is the second largest producer of coal in the country. Between January and March of this year, mines in southern West Virginia produced more than 12 million short tons of coal, a signal that the President's policies are having a positive impact on the people of my State.

When miners are put to work in West Virginia, the State's economy flourishes. Check this out: West Virginia's 2017 gross domestic product growth rate was one of the highest rates in the entire country. What a game changer for West Virginia. It shows that the President's economic policies are working for everyday Americans.

A carbon tax would undo many of these good economic results and would increase expenses for everyday Americans, including increasing power rates and the cost of groceries. A carbon tax is a bad idea.

Wages could fall as much as 8.5 percent for American workers, and our manufacturers could see production halted by as much as 15 percent, stifling our economic recovery. Simply put, a carbon tax is an attack on the welfare of all Americans, especially on seniors and families on fixed incomes.

A vote in support of this rule and resolution is a vote supporting the hard-working men and women of West Virginia and America who make this country great.

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

Mr. Speaker, this week, Republicans have brought to the floor a bill that zeros out funding for a grant program to the Election Assistance Commission to help States and local governments secure our elections.

Now, a news flash, Mr. Speaker—I hope my Republican friends are listening—Russia was just caught meddling in our election. In fact, meddling is not strong enough. They attacked our country.

When we discovered this, Mr. QUIGLEY offered an amendment to restore this critical funding, and it was blocked in the Rules Committee. My friends in the Rules Committee won't even let us vote on it.

People may ask why, why can't we have a vote on putting money back in to secure our election system. Well, the reason why, I think, is because we might win and that Democrats—and there are probably a lot of Republicans—would join with us in supporting the amendment.

□ 1300

They denied it because it makes sense. It is common sense.

We should be funding this program and, instead, we are debating a press release that my friends on the other side are so passionate about, that will do nothing for anybody. It is just a press release. We are not debating a carbon tax. We are debating a press release. We ought to be protecting our election system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for

the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, standing under the revered E Pluribus Unum, I ardently plea for unanimous consent to amend the rules to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore desperately needed funds to prevent the pernicious and nefarious Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Washington yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds indispensable to prevent Russian interference in American elections in 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, does the vote on the matter pending before us include restoration of funding to protect our elections from Russian interference?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending measure.

Mr. CICILLINE. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending measure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am now proud to yield to the gentleman from my home State of Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule and make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russia from, again, interfering in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms.

GABBARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to help our States secure their vulnerable election systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule in order that the Quigley amendment restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to prevent the Russians from interfering in American elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule in order to make the Quigley amendment in order to restore urgently needed funds to prevent Russian interference in our upcoming elections.

And I would just ask the gentleman from Washington if he would yield for purposes of considering this unanimous consent amendment so that we can, together, Democrats and Republicans, work together to protect the integrity of our elections. Restore funding so we can look our voters in the face and say, "Your vote counted. We are going to protect it from Russian interference."

I am imploring my friend on the other side of the aisle to permit this unanimous consent question so we can restore this urgent funding. This shouldn't be a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is an American issue. This is the integrity of our democracy.

Will the gentleman yield to a unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington—

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague be permitted to answer the question. I have asked him will he yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be in order.

Mr. CICILLINE. I have asked the gentleman from Washington: Will he yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not in order and is no longer recognized.

Mr. CICILLINE. ***.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hell else we can do over

here. I mean, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Washington only wants to yield for debate only, but how about yielding so that we can act?

I mean, I think the American people want us to do something. I mean, what happened in the 2016 election, what Russia did to our country, was a serious matter. And I am going to tell you, it is not just Democrats that are concerned. I know Republicans and Independents are concerned as well.

This is an American issue, and when our Nation is attacked, we come together. We put partisanship aside. We act. We just don't talk. We act.

We have been trying, using every procedural means we know. We have been appealing in the Rules Committee. We have been trying to bring these issues to the floor, and we get shut down every single time. This is unbelievable.

I mean, history is going to look back on the inaction of this Congress with great shame.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, getting back to the resolution at hand about moving away from regressive taxes and top-down, Big Government regulation, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case tend to find themselves to the surface at some point or another, and, in fact, there was a vigorous debate at the Rules Committee last night, yesterday. There was a vigorous debate, and I do recognize that my Democratic colleagues simply lost the vote. It did not stop the debate, however, because an amendment was brought forward that each member of the Democratic Party voted for it at the Rules Committee.

And under testimony that was given last night, it would be a counter play for the Democratic Party. When Republicans said we should not have a carbon tax, my Democratic colleagues came to the Rules Committee and argued they would be for a bill that would raise hundreds of billions of dollars in taxes that would be placed on energy in this country, hundreds of billions of dollars, at minimum. That is what they stood for.

So the policy behind what we are talking about here is, we said we believe that America should have a robust energy policy that is not taxed, that harms the American people. We should have a system of not just economics, but of energy policy that would also include green energy; would also include nuclear energy, which I consider pretty clean since it is a non-emitting source; that we would also allow the marketplace to have natural gas and something which they vigorously want to defend, and that is, home heating fuel, which is diesel fuel to be dumped by the billions of gallons in the Northeast.

Mr. Speaker, what we talked about yesterday also included the discussion

about the Election Commission. In fiscal year 2018, funding provided \$380 million across the country for the Election Assistance Commission, which was a final payment that was made in 2002, of \$3.65 billion, because, you see, way back in 2002, just before that, there was an election that many people thought the outcome was wrong; so Republicans agreed we would put \$3.65 billion available for States to buy what they would choose for brand new voting machines to ensure the assistance was given from the Federal Government to States for the security of the voting public.

Of the 2018 funds this year, only weeks before the election, 39 percent of those dollars are still available. Thirty-nine percent has not even been asked for this year, and 19 States have yet to even ask for any application to be able to go in and update or change their system.

The House Administration and the Homeland Security Committees are working diligently with law enforcement to find out what, if any, difficulty there was in the balloting process.

I have no doubt—none, no doubt—that there was interference in this last campaign election by outside forces, maybe even Russians. And it might not have just been Russians. It might have been a number of people.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller said we were duped; the American people were duped. We did not recognize the interference.

But I don't know whether it was at the ballot box or getting people to the ballot box, their will or desire to vote, or how they would vote. I am not sure we know that yet. But the special counsel is going to let us know that.

So, as we were talking about funding for 2018, 2019, Mr. Speaker, at this time there is no request for even 40 percent of the funds that we have. It is at the end of \$3.65 billion. The States have had this fund available.

So we think that the facts of the case, as we give them today, should be enough evidence, not only to you, Mr. Speaker, but for the American people that there is not at this time a request necessary for more money.

□ 1315

I will cease my discussion now, Mr. Speaker, but will tell you that the resolution that is directly in front of us says we should not tax the middle class of this country, we should not tax further disabled people or the community of elderly people who have enjoyed the price of fuel going down because of what the Republican policy initiatives have enabled us to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I can't believe what is said on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee, if he is so sure of his

arguments on this issue, then bring the amendment to the floor, present your case, and let the majority of this House determine what we should do. I guarantee you the majority of this House would vote to provide the money to the States and to local communities, because they are hearing from their constituencies about how concerned they are about potential Russian meddling in our election.

They are doubly concerned after the President's horrific performance in Helsinki where he seemed to go out of his way to cozy up to Putin. So people are concerned.

So the vote that we lost in the Rules Committee was not to enact this amendment, the Quigley amendment, to put the money back in so that the grants could go to States and local communities, the vote we lost—people need to understand this: the vote we lost was to have the ability to debate it and vote on it.

This is the United States House of Representatives. That is what we are supposed to do. Stop the obstructionism, especially on an issue like this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask Mr. MCGOVERN a question so we can get some clarity on where we are right now.

As I understand it, one position is that the State election systems are fine, they don't need any infusion of Federal help. And then there is another position, which you are advancing, which is that we need to put in hundreds of millions of dollars in order to secure the elections to prevent a repeat of the cyber sabotage and the cyber invasion that we experienced in 2016. And yet we are not getting a chance to vote on that. Is that right?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. That is correct, we cannot vote on that.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, why can we not vote on that? The American people are demanding that we defend our elections against foreign attack. Why can we not even vote on that in the House of Representatives?

Mr. MCGOVERN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, when I offered the Quigley amendment, which would have allowed us to have this vote, all the Republicans voted "no."

Mr. RASKIN. I just saw dozens of our colleagues ask unanimous consent that they reconsider that position so the American people can have a hearing on whether or not we are going to have real elections in 2018. Have you been able to discuss it with the other side about whether they would be willing to entertain another unanimous consent motion so we can actually have a debate on this?

Mr. MCGOVERN. We can try one more time. We have been trying and

trying and trying, but they are insistent on blocking this amendment from even being considered.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this, but this is a point of national emergency right now. This is our democracy, this is our Constitution that is at stake. And as I understand it, every State of the Union wants election infusion funding coming from the Federal Government and needs it in order to fortify against cyber attack.

In my State, in Maryland, we just were able to determine that a private vendor that is one of the lead contractors in our election system has Russian ties and is being controlled by someone very close to Vladimir Putin. So we need an infusion of Federal help to fortify our election.

So please continue and do whatever you can with the Republicans just to allow us a vote on the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. What this House needs is a little democracy.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers on this side of the aisle, but before I reserve my time, I just want to remind my good friends on the other side of the aisle that my colleague and good friend from Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, did offer this amendment in the Appropriations Committee just last week. We did spend a great deal of time debating and discussing this idea.

As the good chairman from the Rules Committee said, and I will repeat, of the funds that were appropriated, there were \$380 million appropriated for the Election Assistance Commission, which was the last of the final payment of the \$3.65 billion originally authorized under the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Of these 2018 funds, there are still 39 percent of these dollars available to the States.

There is no crisis. The money is available to States that want those dollars for assistance. In fact, to date, my latest information, Mr. Speaker, there are still 19 States yet to submit an application.

So there is no crisis. There is help available. States have an opportunity to receive the resources necessary to make sure we have what all American people want, that our elections are held with the utmost honesty and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, all these excuses. As the gentleman knows, hundreds of Members of this House don't sit on the Appropriations Committee. Should they not have a voice on this issue?

And, by the way, since that vote in the Appropriations Committee, a lot has changed in this country. If you are reading the news, 12 Russians were in-

dicted for meddling in our election. The President of the United States went over to Helsinki and made nice with Vladimir Putin. That shocked not only the citizens of the United States, but the entire world.

So I disagree with the gentleman when he says there is no crisis. There is a crisis and we need to address it. We need to do everything we can to prepare ourselves for another attack. All we are asking for is a vote.

If the gentleman doesn't think there is a crisis, doesn't want to vote for this, he can vote "no," that is his right, but for the hundreds of Members of this Chamber who would like a debate and a vote on this, give them that opportunity.

The Rules Committee ought not to be a place where democracy goes to die, especially on issues like this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I want to return to the fact that it is a scientific fact that climate change is occurring and that human activity is the primary cause of that change.

Its destructive physical and economic effects are already being felt throughout the United States and, in fact, throughout the world. This resolution simply denies that reality.

Entire American towns are beginning to be displaced due to sea level rise, and desperate attempts to save these communities through costly infrastructure projects are costing American taxpayers millions of dollars a year.

In my home State of California, wildfire seasons are becoming longer. Actually, it is not a season. It is now year-round. They are stronger, they are more destructive, and they are costing, thereto, American taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

Yet despite these rising costs, rather than working on a solution towards this pressing problem, House Republicans have put forth a resolution that denies that climate change is a costly problem and that we are passing it on to our kids and our grandkids. They put forth a resolution that attempts to shut the door on any conversation about policies that can both promote economic growth and at the same time curb harmful pollution and protect the planet.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with reality rather than denying reality. The Safe Climate Caucus members have been calling for real conversations on the causes, impacts, and solutions of climate change for years.

Instead of proposing ways to reduce carbon pollution or allowing constructive congressional dialogue on how to avoid costly climate damages, the Republican majority continues to refuse to even have this conversation about how to address one of the greatest threats to human survival on this planet. We have not seen any serious solu-

tions put forth by Republicans in Congress in nearly a decade.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

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

Americans across our country are very much suffering the negative effects of climate change. They expect Congress to respond with a plan. We may not agree on all the details, but our constituents deserve a serious debate.

This resolution is not serious. It reflects an extreme rightwing climate inaction plan: embrace denial, sow disinformation, and cash checks from polluters.

This resolution reveals the hypocrisy of the Republican energy strategy.

They claim to care about innovation, but support budget cuts to critical research programs like ARPA-E and EERE.

They claim to care about economic growth, but ignore the millions of jobs that have been created in the clean energy universe and fail to see the opportunities to add millions more.

They claim to care about low-income Americans, but cheer the rollback of environmental standards that would protect them.

They claim to support free markets, but fail to speak out when President Trump suggests unprecedented market interventions to bail out uncompetitive coal plants at great expense to Americans, especially manufacturers.

Make no mistake: greenhouse gases are serious pollutants that will have long-term consequences. America needs a climate plan, not a love letter to polluters.

Members that support this resolution are sending a clear message to the American people that they care more about polluters' interests than the people we are asked to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided resolution.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we speak about the most egregious acts from this administration, one after another after another, but I will not forget about our children.

I rise today to tell my fellow Members of Congress that I am appalled over reports of the mistreatment and abuse towards children at the Shiloh Residential Treatment Center.

The facility is under contract with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and located just south of Houston, Texas. The Shiloh facility is owned and operated by the same entity that formerly operated Daystar Treatment Center in Manvel, Texas.

You may remember this place. Daystar was closed because of the way in which they physically restrained children that led to the death of three teenagers. In most cases, children were hog-tied.

Now, instead of being hog-tied, they are drugging children into submission. One child was prescribed ten different shots and pills, including the antipsychotic drug Latuda, Geodon, and olanzapine. We are giving them Parkinson's medications, we are giving them pain medications, antidepressants, and cognizant enhancers. This is a disgrace.

Federal District Judge Laughrey recently explained: "Psychotropic drugs are powerful medications that directly affect the central nervous system. They are particularly potent when administered to children. . . . They are more vulnerable to psychosis, seizures, irreversible movement disorders, suicidal thoughts, and aggression. . . ."

This is a disgrace and this is un-American and it must stop now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a carbon tax. It is invisible, it is relentless, it is punitive, and it is entirely avoidable.

According to NOAA, in 2017, the U.S. had 16 disasters with damage exceeding a billion dollars each. With three devastating hurricanes, extreme wildfires, hail, flooding, tornados, and drought, the United States tallied a record high bill for weather-related disasters, \$306 billion. That is a carbon tax.

Western wildfires, fanned by hot, dry conditions, racked up \$18 billion in damage, triple the previous U.S. wildfire record. That is a carbon tax.

The U.S. has sustained, between 1980 and 2017, we had an average billion-dollar events of six a year; in the last 5 years, it has been close to 12.

□ 1330

In the coming decade, economic losses from extreme weather, combined with the health cost of air pollution, spiral upwards to at least \$360 billion every single year. That is a carbon tax.

The second thing I want to say is this: A confident nation faces its challenges. It doesn't deny them. If we acknowledge that we have a climate crisis, we can create jobs by solving it. Energy efficiency, renewable energy, storage batteries, all of these things that are being embraced by Vermont entrepreneurs are resulting in the biggest growth of jobs in our State, which is in the renewable energy sector. So we can make a better economy by acknowledging our problem.

And, third, I want to speak to Mr. JENKINS because he represents some of the hardest working, best people in this country, and those are the West Virginia coal miners. They kept the lights on in Vermont for us for a century, and I thank them. And it is why

I worked with Mr. MCKINLEY to make certain those coal miners got their healthcare benefits and why I am continuing to fight so that those coal miners get their pensions.

But we can help them with a carbon tax that returns all of whatever it is they contributed back to them and their communities so they can have a future.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I make an inquiry of the gentleman from Washington?

I know the gentleman said he has no further speakers, but we are being inundated with speakers on this side. Does the gentleman want to maybe send a few minutes our way?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as tempting as that sounds, I think that the adequate 30 minutes per side is enough for both of us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thought I would ask.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. But as my colleague from Massachusetts said, this isn't really a bill. It is a press release. It is a love note to the fossil fuel industry.

We should have an open rule on the floor for this resolution so that we can talk about the real issues around climate change, so that we can talk about the effects of a changing growing season and the effects of extreme weather on our farms and fishing communities, so that we can talk about sea level rise and ocean acidification on our coastal communities, so that we can talk about the impacts of changing climates on health and healthcare costs.

We are seeing these problems in my home State and in the Gulf of Maine, in particular, where the water is warming at a rate 90 percent faster than the rest of the world. We don't know what impact that will have on the lobsters, groundfish, and future fisheries, but the fishermen are worried, and we are already starting to see the changes.

We are putting our heads in the sand if we just do nothing, if we keep supporting fossil fuels, and if we keep preventing even a simple debate on the costs of carbon and possible climate solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and oppose this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Maine, as well as the gentleman from Vermont, getting back to the debate at hand.

I just want to share a few things that I have learned from a recent poll conducted by the Institute for Energy Research. They found that a resounding 85 percent of respondents agreed that

we should not make energy more expensive.

Even more tellingly than that, though, when asked whether they trusted the Federal Government to spend the money from a tax on carbon emissions wisely, only 18 percent of the respondents felt that they would, while 74 percent said that they did not feel that way.

An overwhelming 73 percent of respondents agreed that the last thing that we need is higher taxes or more bureaucracy. And, lastly, 85 percent of respondents feared that consumers will wind up paying the cost associated with a tax or regulation, exactly what we have been saying.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the American people remain profoundly skeptical of government intrusion into the free markets, and like I said before, a carbon tax would be wrong for our Nation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a debate on the topic of climate change on the floor of the House is long overdue. Those who care about the future of our planet and our species have waited for Congress to begin working on negotiating some sort of sensible solution to climate change for years. A topic of this gravity deserves our attention.

Now, Republicans have been in charge of Congress for the 5½ years that I have been here, but have they brought a new idea to the floor today? Have they proposed a solution? Are they taking the threat seriously? Do they believe in science? Today's debate makes it clear that the answer is no.

Instead of a proposed solution, we are wasting our time with an empty partisan resolution, a misleading and false resolution that doesn't do anything more than thoughtlessly swat away an idea that deserves careful consideration.

Solutions do exist. We can design market-based climate policies that would greatly reduce greenhouse gases. If we design the policy right, it can help low-income and middle class citizens, while creating jobs and spurring innovation.

I believe it is important for us to focus our attention on things like immigration, on the economy, on healthcare.

Well, climate change is impacting immigration. In 2017, The New York Times reported that 10 percent of Mexicans age 15 to 65 could eventually try to emigrate north as a result of rising temperatures.

Climate change is impacting the economy. Hurricanes Irma and Harvey cost this Nation \$280 billion.

That is just the beginning. Climate change is impacting our health. This includes extreme weather events, vector-borne diseases, chronic conditions, and things like that.

Today, instead of posing a sensible solution, instead of seeking a productive discussion on the options at our disposal, Republicans have decided utterly to reject a possible market-based solution without any evidence or justification, without any hearings or real debate, without regular order.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule that would permit a House vote on the most shortsighted, antimarket sense of the House on a carbon tax.

For decades, economists across the ideological spectrum have argued that carbon price is the most efficient way to discourage the use of fossil fuels and the best way to encourage the growth of energy efficiency measures, alternative energy sources, and market decisions on everything from housing to transportation.

Indeed, this is the preferred solution to climate change by those on the right, by the Republican public intellectuals and think tanks, which is why it is baffling that a Republican congressional leadership would want to attack their preferred policy option.

It is axiomatic economics that we tax the things we want to discourage. The scientific evidence continues to accumulate in prodigious amounts that carbon pollution is profoundly changing the climate of our Earth. The costs of inaction are staggering, into the billions.

Carbon pricing is the most market-oriented policy action we can take to combat this. Designed well, the economic dividend will put much more money into the hands of the American people and will grow our economy more quickly.

History will look back on this House resolution with sadness and regret. Once again, we will have chosen short-term profits of the fossil fuel titans over the long-term survival and prosperity of mankind on our planet.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the scientists have spoken. Climate change is happening, human behavior is contributing to it, and it is a long-term threat to our prosperity and our national security.

But climate change is also the ultimate, very large problem that moves very slowly, which makes it particularly poorly matched with the political system we have today. And what causes me great concern is when wrongheaded resolutions which I op-

pose—and I oppose the rule associated with it—are put to the floor of this House to discourage this House from proposing the most effective and most successful way of dealing with climate change, which is to put a price on carbon.

We can take all of those revenues and return them to the American people. We can wall them off from government spending. There is a whole variety of approaches we could take to ensure that the revenues generated from taxing carbon pollution are returned to the American people.

As a Congress, wouldn't we rather tax pollution than tax hardworking Americans? That is what a carbon tax will do. I encourage my colleagues to reject this resolution and allow us to have the real debate the American people deserve on this floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution encapsulates what is wrong with the Republican management of this Congress. It is a cartoon that doesn't deal with the underlying issues. They conjure up an imaginary carbon tax when there are real proposals to price carbon before committees in Congress now.

Instead of engaging in fantasy, we could have a debate about real legislation that would satisfy their answers and be able to deal with what our responsibilities are in the future.

What we are talking about today encapsulates the failure of Republican leadership in this Congress. They can't deal with immigration. They can't deal meaningfully with climate change and carbon pollution. Instead, we are dealing with empty gestures.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly suggest we reject this rule and get down to business.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I just double-check and inquire of the gentleman whether he has any additional speakers over there?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. We are prepared to close on the Republican side.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, is my understanding correct that I have 1½ minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that we are here debating a press release. We are not debating a carbon tax. We are debating a press release.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you are against the carbon tax, go back to your office and issue a press release and send it to your local newspapers, because that is what this is.

We are wasting precious time on this floor when there are other issues. We

have children being separated from their parents at the border. We have prescription drug prices that are skyrocketing. We need an infrastructure bill. We have gun violence in this country that is out of control, where there are massacres occurring on a regular basis. And what are we doing? We are doing a press release. This is shameful.

And on the issue of Russian interference in our elections, we ought to be having a debate on an amendment to provide more funds to States and local authorities to protect their election systems.

The gentleman from Washington says: Oh, there is still 39 percent of the money left. They don't need it. I think his information is old, because we are told that every single State has put in a request for additional assistance. Why don't we debate that and vote on it and do the right thing?

I am looking at a New York Times article that just appeared today where the President of the United States, Donald Trump, says Russia is no longer targeting the U.S. I mean, is this for real? What is wrong with him?

It is time for Congress to stage an intervention with him and tell him to listen to his intelligence agencies who contradict what he has just said this morning. This is urgent.

We can't count on the President of the United States to do the right thing. Congress needs to stand up. Congress needs to be counted.

Vote "no" on the previous question. Vote "no" on this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to engage with my good friend and colleague from the State of Massachusetts, especially on a particularly important issue such as carbon tax.

It is my feeling and the feeling of the majority of this House that we need to move away from aggressive taxes and top-down Big Government regulation. We need to get behind innovative-centric solutions that remove bureaucratic barriers to clean, affordable, and reliable energy technology and allow for real global carbon emission reductions.

Our affordable and reliable energy supply must be the focus, along with a cleaner environment and a stronger economy. A carbon tax simply would not yield those kinds of results.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying legislation, H. Con. Res. 119, which is simply this: Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1001 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 12) to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, 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 one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Science, Space and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Al-

though it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

□ 1345

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 990

Whereas the national security interests of the United States are dependent on the brave men and women who enforce our Nation's immigration laws;

Whereas abolishing United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) would mean open borders because it would eliminate the main agency responsible for removing people who enter or remain in our country illegally;

Whereas calls to abolish ICE are an insult to these heroic law enforcement officers who make sacrifices every day to secure our borders, enforce our laws, and protect our safety and security;

Whereas abolishing ICE would allow dangerous criminal aliens, including violent and ruthless members of the MS-13 gang, to remain in American communities;

Whereas during fiscal year 2017, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges;

Whereas ICE ERO made 5,225 administrative arrests of suspected gang members in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas criminal aliens arrested by ICE ERO in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than—

- (1) 76,000 dangerous drug offenses;
- (2) 48,000 assault offenses;
- (3) 11,000 weapon offenses;
- (4) 5,000 sexual assault offenses;
- (5) 2,000 kidnapping offenses; and
- (6) 1,800 homicide offenses;

Whereas ICE Homeland Security Investigations made 4,818 gang-related arrests in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 904 sexually exploited children;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 518 victims of human trafficking;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean that countless illegal aliens who could pose a threat to public safety would be allowed to roam free instead of being removed from American soil;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean more dangerous illegal drugs flowing into our communities, causing more Americans to needlessly suffer;

Whereas ICE plays a critical role in combatting the drug crisis facing our Nation;

Whereas ICE seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics in fiscal year 2017, including thousands of pounds of the deadly drugs fueling the opioid crisis;

Whereas ICE seized 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and 6,967 pounds of heroin in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE logged nearly 90,000 investigative hours directed toward fentanyl in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas abolishing ICE would leave these drugs in our communities to cause more devastation;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean eliminating the agency that deports aliens that pose a terrorist threat to the United States;

Whereas ICE was created in 2003 to better protect national security and public safety after the 9/11 terrorists exploited immigration laws to gain entry into the United States;

Whereas the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks found that many of the 9/11 hijackers committed visa violations;

Whereas ICE identifies dangerous individuals before they enter our country and locates them as they violate our immigration laws; and

Whereas abolishing ICE would enable the hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals who illegally overstay their visa each year to remain in the United States indefinitely: Now, therefore, be it