

vital role in making northern Indiana stronger not only by bringing us the day's news, but always finding ways to serve her neighbors and give back to the community she loves to call home.

I am grateful to Maureen not only for her excellence in journalism, but also for the incredible example she has set for aspiring journalists and young Hoosier women who are always looking for ways to give back to build a brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exceptional character, leadership, and compassion Maureen has demonstrated both on and off the air.

Mo, I wish you the very best.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

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

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 47, the Natural Resources Management Act, which we will vote on tomorrow. This comprehensive public lands package has numerous provisions that benefit my State of Utah and makes permanent the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In my district, this legislation provides an important land conveyance to Juab County that will be used to house personnel to prevent and fight wildfires. This bill also facilitates a land transfer in Utah County to Utah's School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, or SITLA.

SITLA holds lands in trust, proceeds which support Utah's education system. This land transfer will ultimately benefit Utah State University and its students.

I also want to congratulate my colleague, Representative JOHN CURTIS, for his work in bringing together and working with State, city, and county stakeholders in Emery County. The Emery County title in this bill has broad local support and will protect over 600,000 acres of wilderness, the largest wilderness designation in 25 years.

This legislation is good for Utah's economy. The Land and Water Conservation Fund should never have been allowed to expire because it is such a vital program.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COMMISSIONER MARCUS HARDY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness, but also to honor a commissioner, Commissioner Marcus Hardy, who was a highly respected leader in his community.

Marcus served as a city commissioner in the town of Crescent City, Florida, which is located in the district

which I am proud to represent. I was fortunate enough to work alongside Mr. Hardy in efforts to improve Crescent City and the greater community.

Beyond being a devoted public servant, a coach, and a role model, Marcus was a family man and a friend to many. Anyone who knew him knew his heart and his passion for serving others. He often spent his free time serving as a mentor for the Boys II Men organization in Crescent City or working to revitalize Putnam County for the benefit of the whole community.

Marcus will be remembered for his compassion, his leadership, his friendship, his large, firm hand grip and contagious smile.

Thank you for your service, Marcus. You will be missed by many.

AMERICANS' SHIFTING VIEWS ON ABORTION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a recent shift we have seen in this country over the recent weeks—that is Americans' views on abortion.

Not long ago, a Marist poll found that 55 percent of Americans were likely to identify as pro-choice compared to about 38 percent identifying as pro-life—indeed, a 17-point gap. Now, the polls are tied.

As reported this week by Axios, a similar Marist poll found that Americans are now, for the first time, equally likely to be pro-life as they are to be pro-choice, both registering at 47 percent.

Why the sudden change? The horrific rhetoric offered by some of the left, that is why, including the Virginia Governor's indefensible remarks that he would support the murder of a baby post-birth. It is inconceivable to me that someone could differentiate a post-birth "abortion" from actual murder.

The good news is I think most Americans agree with me. That is why we are seeing, finally, this dramatic shift.

My colleague from Missouri, Representative ANN WAGNER, has introduced the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act in order to end infanticide taking place after failed abortion attempts. The Democrats have repeatedly blocked the effort, including tonight. We need to have a vote on this bill.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues have made public the details of the so-called Green New Deal. Among other things, if implemented over the next 10 years, it

would eliminate the use of fossil fuels and nuclear power. That means our gasoline-powered vehicles and implements would be useless, and there would be no air travel.

It would also require that virtually all building structures would be rebuilt or need to be remodeled. Every facet of life would be forced to change.

The most frightening thing about this is that my colleagues sponsoring it are actually serious.

Furthermore, the architects failed to explain how they are going to rebuild the economy they would decimate.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the architects of this legislation change the color of the Green New Deal and call it the Red—as in stop sign red—New Disaster.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to lead a Special Order alongside my colleagues to discuss, frankly, a reckless and misguided and radical proposal recently introduced by some of my Democratic colleagues, the Green New Deal.

Tonight, together with many of my fellow members of the Congressional Western Caucus, we will be taking the time to share with the American people the details of the ill-advised and bizarre provisions included in this green manifesto and the grave impacts that they would have on our Nation's economy.

□ 2000

We will also share what we, as Republicans in the people's House, believe when it comes to our national strategy to innovate, diversify, and strengthen America's energy sector.

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a bad deal for the American people. This so-called deal calls for cutting of greenhouse gas emissions to net zero in only 10 years.

And while many studies are still working to grasp the perilous impacts and the enormous costs of this proposal, one independent estimate, led by a team of Stanford engineers, suggests it would cost our Nation in the neighborhood of \$7 trillion to convert all of America's power to renewable power sources.

To quote the former Secretary of Energy under President Obama, Ernest Moniz, he said: “I’m afraid I just cannot see how we could possibly go to zero carbon in the 10-year timeframe. It is just impractical.”

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal goes much further than just the energy sector, however. It also mandates the guarantee of a job for everyone, paid vacations for everyone, free college for everyone. It dictates that every existing building in this country must be upgraded and retrofitted for “comfort.”

It calls for a drastic overhaul of our transportation systems across the country, threatening not only our trucking and airline industries, but also the daily lives of the 85 percent of Americans who drive every morning or evening to get to work.

Mr. Speaker, while calling for all of these implausible mandates, the Green New Deal would also insert the Federal Government into seemingly every aspect of our daily lives.

By expanding our Federal bureaucracy far beyond anything we have ever seen in history and undermining the federalist principles our country was founded upon in the Constitution, this proposal would jeopardize the future of America as we know it. It would sacrifice the American energy, manufacturing, and transportation sectors; jeopardize businesses small and large across the Nation; and lead our country down the path of socialist nations like Venezuela, North Korea, and Cuba.

As the Senate Democratic Whip DICK DURBIN said after reading the proposal: “What in the heck is this?”

Mr. Speaker, I couldn’t agree more.

My State, the great State of Washington, consistently ranks among the top of the list of States with the cleanest energy production. Do you know why that is? It is because of the strong reliance on our incredible system of hydroelectric dams, many of which are in my congressional district along the Columbia and the Snake Rivers.

Nearly 70 percent of our power comes from hydropower, a clean, renewable, reliable, and affordable source of base-load energy.

It also comes from our use of nuclear power. The Columbia Generating Station, which is also in the Fourth Congressional District which I represent, is the only nuclear power plant in the greater Northwest region. It too provides clean, reliable power for the Pacific Northwest.

On top of these sources, Washington State uses a variety of other energy sources, including natural gas, coal, wind, solar, and biomass.

It is because we use an all-of-the-above mix of energy sources, but largely concentrated on clean, renewable, reliable hydropower, that Washington State continues to demonstrate how we can lead in the use of clean energy while still diversifying and thereby strengthening our energy portfolio.

Unfortunately, the Green New Deal negates this ability to do so. Not once

is the word “hydropower” mentioned in the legislation. And in the frequently asked questions document that was released to accompany the introduction of the Green New Deal, it stated that “The plan is to transition off of nuclear.”

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to continue to strengthen America’s energy independence and increase our use of clean sources of energy, we must absolutely include hydropower and nuclear power. The science says so, the facts say so.

So when Democrats in Congress release a sweeping, colossal overhaul of our Nation’s energy policies and do not include these clean energy sources, it is clear that this is far more about politics and not about sound science.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow House Republicans and I continue to advocate for sound, comprehensive approaches to energy policy. We must continue to explore every opportunity to develop viable alternative energy sources, which is why under Republican control of the House in recent Congresses, we have made serious investments in advanced nuclear and basic science research, grid-scale energy storage, and equipped our national laboratories with robust resources to lead the way in research, development, and innovation.

National laboratories, like the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in my district, play a crucial role in developing the basic science research needed to pave the way for these alternative sources. Then when private industry can utilize this research, the open marketplace can put these new sources to use.

That is exactly what our country needs: more collaboration, more innovation; not a top-down mandated system of bureaucratic dictates based upon a green manifesto.

Mr. Speaker, I often share with my constituents that as a third generation farmer, I consider myself to be a conservationist and on the front lines of being a good steward of our natural resources. I know that we must respect our environment, we must ensure clean air and clean water for our citizens, and we must encourage innovative ways to produce energy through a variety of reliable, renewable traditional and alternative sources.

Tonight I am looking forward to hearing from my friends and my colleagues in the Congressional Western Caucus on why the Green New Deal would be catastrophic for their constituents and what we in our Nation’s capital should really be prioritizing in order to continue America’s energy independence dominance.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my first speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the gentleman that represents the Eighth District of that great State.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues in opposition to the Green New Deal.

This disastrous plan, cooked up by out-of-touch Washington elites, simply does not work for Minnesota families.

According to the Energy Information Administration, 68 percent of Minnesota’s energy consumption comes from a combination of coal, natural gas, nuclear, hydropower, and gasoline, all of which are to be banned completely by the Green New Deal in 10 years.

Allowed under this radical pipe dream are wind, solar, and biomass, which barely account for 15 percent of Minnesota’s energy consumption.

Picture a family in Ely, Minnesota, where wind chill temperatures reached 71 below zero this January, waking up in a warm house heated by natural gas.

They start a hot pot of coffee, powered by our affordable electric grid; take a hot shower, again, heated by natural gas; drive their kids to school in their van, powered by reliable, affordable gasoline; go to work, possibly at a mine or a local hospital; drive home again in that same gasoline-powered car; make dinner for their family, using their gas-powered stove; and then wake up again and do it all over.

The little things that we take for granted every day are powered by conventional energy.

The Green New Deal would have a severe impact on our everyday lives, something that northern Minnesotans do not want or need.

The Green New Deal would force every Minnesota family to turn in their cars for electric vehicles and retrofit their homes to run on renewable sources, like solar or wind.

I understand elites from D.C. and New York City may love this plan, but I know the reality. I encourage my colleagues, especially those who support this plan, to go back to their districts, like I did last week and really listen to their constituents, listen to their concerns, listen to how this plan would devastate the middle class and devastate hardworking Minnesota families.

Retrofitting homes, buying electric cars, and ending the mining, airline, and much of the shipping industries may be fun ideas for the ultra-wealthy, but I know what it really means for middle-class families in northern Minnesota.

We cannot let these unrealistic ideas get in the way of actual progress. We must develop renewable forms of energy, but at the same time, not shut out conventional, affordable energy sources on which millions rely.

Do not let the Green New Deal distract from what northern Minnesotans care about: expanding rural broadband for better internet access, bringing good paying jobs back to our communities, and protecting Social Security and Medicare.

With the projected cost of tens of trillions of dollars, the Green New Deal puts all of this at risk.

I will not risk the future of Medicare and Social Security. I will not risk the future of middle-class families.

However, I will stand up for the farmers, our miners, our small business owners, manufacturers, and workers threatened by this Green New Deal.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for expressing so eloquently how Americans around the country would be affected by this if this legislation was adopted into law. People from different parts of the country with extreme weather, as you have heard, depend on reliable sources of energy.

From minus 71 to hopefully a little warmer climate, the next speaker I am going to yield to is the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the chairman of our Western Caucus and the representative from the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington, for organizing this important Special Order on the Green New Deal.

Mr. Speaker, America's energy renaissance is the backbone of our economy. It is a story of freedom, prosperity, and opportunity.

After decades of reliance on other countries to meet our energy needs, the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that America will export more energy than it imports starting in 2020. We are no longer dependent on volatile foreign sources produced in Russia or Saudi Arabia.

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

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

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

The oil and gas industry supports more than 10.3 million jobs and nearly 8 percent of our economy.

The United States is the world's top energy producer, and the American Dream is thriving.

January 2019 saw the hundredth consecutive month of positive jobs growth in America, the longest period of continuous jobs growth on record.

The U.S. job market is strong, and in December, employers posted 7.3 million open jobs, a new record.

Now, despite America's energy renaissance and the aforementioned emissions reductions, we continue to hear hyperbolic statements about pending climate catastrophe and the need for radical change to stave off future disaster.

The Democrat socialists pushing the Green New Deal want to get rid of all energy sources except wind, solar, and batteries by 2030. How are we going to do that when wind and solar only pro-

duced 7.6 percent of our electricity in 2017?

The Green New Deal would drive energy production and jobs to countries like China and India that have much worse environmental standards. Global greenhouse gas emissions will increase as a result, in direct contradiction to the main talking point of the Green New Deal.

The socialist Green New Deal says it will provide higher education, higher quality healthcare, and affordable, safe, and adequate housing to all.

□ 2015

The Mercatus Center estimates that the cost of the single-payer healthcare provision alone would cost \$32 trillion in the first 10 years, something that I think is probably on the low side.

The Green New Deal is an alarmist pipe dream that seeks to fundamentally transform America without a blueprint. This socialist manifesto changes by the day, and important details on how a transition of the Green New Deal's magnitude will occur are missing, including how we will pay for this pie in the sky aspiration.

If one needs to have more evidence that the Green New Deal is not plausible, look no further than the country of Australia where electricity prices are the highest in the world and the Aussies' obsession with renewables has destroyed their electric grid. Mass blackouts and mass power cuts are the new norm, and a massive Tesla battery backup system ran dry this past month as the Aussie power grid crashed in summer temperatures. Ninety thousand Aussie homes had no air-conditioning for the next 2 weeks of blistering heat.

Let's learn from Australia's mistakes. Let's not repeat them.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to enlightening everyone on this legislation further in the coming days.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Arizona for expressing his thoughts on how this would impact the people not only in Arizona, but also around the country.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents continue to ask me what is actually in this Green New Deal legislation. Unfortunately for the American people, the Members of Congress who introduced the resolution had, I guess, several hiccups along the way during their rollout and released conflicting documents to accompany the bill.

One significant piece of legislation that my constituents have asked me about is whether the related resolution mandated a job for everyone in the United States. Well, that is, in fact, true. A part of the frequently asked questions document that was released with the legislation even stated that economic security would be provided for those who are "unwilling to work." Many of my constituents think that is an amazing statement.

After an adviser to the Green New Deal accused Republicans of doctoring

this document, The Washington Post later reported that he erroneously made that accusation. In fact, this document was released by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ's office.

Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ has since retracted the frequently asked questions document, but the message I hope my constituents and the American people hear clearly is that we know the motives behind this legislation. We know the intent. From ending the airline industry to shutting down all nuclear power, unfortunately, some people on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side, are threatening the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the frequently asked questions document that was released by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ's office.

LAUNCH: Thursday, February 7, at 8:30 a.m.

OVERVIEW

We will begin work immediately on Green New Deal bills to put the nuts and bolts on the plan described in this resolution (important to say so someone else can't claim this mantle).

This is a massive transformation of our society with clear goals and a timeline.

The Green New Deal resolution a 10-year plan to mobilize every aspect of American society at a scale not seen since World War 2 to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and create economic prosperity for all. It will:

Move America to 100% clean and renewable energy

Create millions of family supporting-wage, union jobs

Ensure a just transition for all communities and workers to ensure economic security for people and communities that have historically relied on fossil fuel industries

Ensure justice and equity for frontline communities by prioritizing investment, training, climate and community resiliency, economic and environmental benefits in these communities.

Build on FDR's second bill of rights by guaranteeing:

A job with a family-sustaining wage, family and medical leave, vacations, and retirement security

High-quality education, including higher education and trade schools

Clean air and water and access to nature

Healthy food

High-quality health care

Safe, affordable, adequate housing

Economic environment free of monopolies

Economic security for all who are unable or unwilling to work

There is no time to waste.

IPCC Report said global emissions must be cut by 40-60% by 2030. US is 20% of total emissions. We must get to 0 by 2030 and lead the world in a global Green New Deal.

Americans love a challenge. This is our moonshot.

When JFK said we'd go to the by the end of the decade, people said impossible.

If Eisenhower wanted to build the interstate highway system today, people would ask how we'd pay for it.

When FDR called on America to build 185,000 planes to fight World War 2, every business leader, CEO, and general laughed at him. At the time, the U.S. had produced 3,000 planes in the last year. By the end of the war, we produced 300,000 planes. That's what we are capable of if we have real leadership

This is massive investment in our economy and society, not expenditure.

We invested 40–50% of GDP into our economy during World War 2 and created the greatest middle class the US has seen.

The interstate highway system has returned more than \$6 in economic productivity for every \$1 it cost

This is massively expanding existing and building new industries at a rapid pace—growing our economy

The Green New Deal has momentum.

92 percent of Democrats and 64 percent of Republicans support the Green New Deal

Nearly every major Democratic Presidential contender say they back the Green New Deal including: Elizabeth Warren, Cory Booker, Kamala Harris, Jeff Merkley, Julian Castro, Kirsten Gillibrand, Bernie Sanders, Tulsi Gabbard, and Jay Inslee.

45 House Reps and 330+ groups backed the original resolution for a select committee

Over 300 local and state politicians have called for a federal Green New Deal

New Resolution has 20 co-sponsors, about 30 groups (numbers will change by Thursday).

FAQ

Why 100% clean and renewable and not just 100% renewable? Are you saying we won't transition off fossil fuels?

Yes, we are calling for a full transition off fossil fuels and zero greenhouse gases. Anyone who has read the resolution sees that we spell this out through a plan that calls for eliminating greenhouse gas emissions from every sector of the economy. Simply banning fossil fuels immediately won't build the new economy to replace it—this is the plan to build that new economy and spells out how to do it technically. We do this through a huge mobilization to create the renewable energy economy as fast as possible. We set a goal to get to net-zero, rather than zero emissions, in 10 years because we aren't sure that we'll be able to fully get rid of farting cows and airplanes that fast, but we think we can ramp up renewable manufacturing and power production, retrofit every building in America, build the smart grid, overhaul transportation and agriculture, plant lots of trees and restore our ecosystem to get to net-zero.

Is nuclear a part of this?

A Green New Deal is a massive investment in renewable energy production and would not include creating new nuclear plants. It's unclear if we will be able to decommission every nuclear plant within 10 years, but the plan is to transition off of nuclear and all fossil fuels as soon as possible. No one has put the full 10-year plan together yet, and if it is possible to get to fully 100% renewable in 10 years, we will do that.

Does this include a carbon tax?

The Green New Deal is a massive investment in the production of renewable energy industries and infrastructure. We cannot simply tax gas and expect workers to figure out another way to get to work unless we've first created a better, more affordable option. So we're not ruling a carbon tax out, but a carbon tax would be a tiny part of a Green New Deal in the face of the gigantic expansion of our productive economy and would have to be preceded by first creating the solutions necessary so that workers and working class communities are not affected. While a carbon tax may be a part of the Green New Deal, it misses the point and would be off the table unless we create the clean, affordable options first.

Does this include cap and trade?

The Green New Deal is about creating the renewable energy economy through a massive investment in our society and economy. Cap and trade assumes the existing market will solve this problem for us, and that's simply not true. While cap and trade may be

a tiny part of the larger Green New Deal plan to mobilize our economy, any cap and trade legislation will pale in comparison to the size of the mobilization and must recognize that existing legislation can incentivize companies to create toxic hotspots in frontline communities, so anything here must ensure that frontline communities are prioritized.

Does a GND ban all new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear power plants?

The Green New Deal makes new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear plants unnecessary. This is a massive mobilization of all our resources into renewable energies. It would simply not make sense to build new fossil fuel infrastructure because we will be creating a plan to reorient our entire economy to work off renewable energy. Simply banning fossil fuels and nuclear plants immediately won't build the new economy to replace it—this is the plan to build that new economy and spells out how to do it technically.

Are you for CCUS?

We believe the right way to capture carbon is to plant trees and restore our natural ecosystems. CCUS technology to date has not proven effective.

How will you pay for it?

The same way we paid for the New Deal, the 2008 bank bailout and extended quantitative easing programs. The same way we paid for World War II and all our current wars. The Federal Reserve can extend credit to power these projects and investments and new public banks can be created to extend credit. There is also space for the government to take an equity stake in projects to get a return on investment. At the end of the day, this is an investment in our economy that should grow our wealth as a nation, so the question isn't how will we pay for it, but what will we do with our new shared prosperity.

Why do we need a sweeping Green New Deal investment program? Why can't we just rely on regulations and taxes and the private sector to invest alone such as a carbon tax or a ban on fossil fuels?

The level of investment required is massive. Even if every billionaire and company came together and were willing to pour all the resources at their disposal into this investment, the aggregate value of the investments they could make would not be sufficient.

The speed of investment required will be massive. Even if all the billionaires and companies could make the investments required, they would not be able to pull together a coordinated response in the narrow window of time required to jump-start major new projects and major new economic sectors. Also, private companies are wary of making massive investments in unproven research and technologies; the government, however, has the time horizon to be able to patiently make investments in new tech and R&D, without necessarily having a commercial outcome or application in mind at the time the investment is made. Major examples of government investments in "new" tech that subsequently spurred a boom in the private sector include DARPA-projects, the creation of the internet—and, perhaps most recently, the government's investment in Tesla.

Simply put, we don't need to just stop doing some things we are doing (like using fossil fuels for energy needs); we also need to start doing new things (like overhauling whole industries or retrofitting all buildings to be energy efficient). Starting to do new things requires some upfront investment. In the same way that a company that is trying to change how it does business may need to make big upfront capital investments today

in order to reap future benefits (for e.g., building a new factory to increase production or buying new hardware and software to totally modernize its IT system), a country that is trying to change how its economy works will need to make big investments today to jump-start and develop new projects and sectors to power the new economy.

Merely incentivizing the private sector doesn't work—e.g. the tax incentives and subsidies given to wind and solar projects have been a valuable spur to growth in the US renewables industry but, even with such investment-promotion subsidies, the present level of such projects is simply inadequate to transition to a fully greenhouse gas neutral economy as quickly as needed.

Once again, we're not saying that there isn't a role for private sector investments; we're just saying that the level of investment required will need every actor to pitch in and that the government is best placed to be the prime driver.

RESOLUTION SUMMARY

Created in consultation with multiple groups from environmental community, environmental justice community, and labor community

5 goals in 10 years:

Net-zero greenhouse gas emissions through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers

Create millions of high-wage jobs and ensure prosperity and economic security for all

Invest in infrastructure and industry to sustainably meet the challenges of the 21st century

Clean air and water, climate and community resiliency, healthy food, access to nature, and a sustainable environment for all

Promote justice and equity by stopping current, preventing future, and repairing historic oppression of frontline and vulnerable communities

National mobilization our economy through 14 infrastructure and industrial projects. Every project strives to remove greenhouse gas emissions and pollution from every sector of our economy:

Build infrastructure to create resiliency against climate change-related disasters

Repair and upgrade U.S. infrastructure. ASCE estimates this is \$4.6 trillion at minimum.

Meet 100% of power demand through clean and renewable energy sources

Build energy-efficient, distributed smart grids and ensure affordable access to electricity

Upgrade or replace every building in US for state-of-the-art energy efficiency

Massively expand clean manufacturing (like solar panel factories, wind turbine factories, battery and storage manufacturing, energy efficient manufacturing components) and remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing

Work with farmers and ranchers to create a sustainable, pollution and greenhouse gas free, food system that ensures universal access to healthy food and expands independent family farming

Totally overhaul transportation by massively expanding electric vehicle manufacturing, build charging stations everywhere, build out high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary, create affordable public transit available to all, with goal to replace every combustion-engine vehicle

Mitigate long-term health effects of climate change and pollution

Remove greenhouse gases from our atmosphere and pollution through afforestation, preservation, and other methods of restoring our natural ecosystems

Restore all our damaged and threatened ecosystems

Clean up all the existing hazardous waste sites and abandoned sites

Identify new emission sources and create solutions to eliminate those emissions

Make the US the leader in addressing climate change and share our technology, expertise and products with the rest of the world to bring about a global Green New Deal

Social and economic justice and security through 15 requirements:

Massive federal investments and assistance to organizations and businesses participating in the green new deal and ensuring the public gets a return on that investment

Ensure the environmental and social costs of emissions are taken into account

Provide job training and education to all

Invest in R&D of new clean and renewable energy technologies

Doing direct investments in frontline and deindustrialized communities that would otherwise be hurt by the transition to prioritize economic benefits there

Use democratic and participatory processes led by frontline and vulnerable communities to implement GND projects locally

Ensure that all GND jobs are union jobs that pay prevailing wages and hire local

Guarantee a job with family-sustaining wages

Protect right of all workers to unionize and organize

Strengthen and enforce labor, workplace health and safety, antidiscrimination, and wage and hour standards

Enact and enforce trade rules to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas and grow domestic manufacturing

Ensure public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and eminent domain is not abused

Obtain free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous peoples

Ensure an economic environment free of monopolies and unfair competition

Provide high-quality health care, housing, economic security, and clean air, clean water, healthy food, and nature to all

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the other gentleman from the great State of Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), who represents the Fifth District and I believe served on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee very well.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I applaud and give my thanks and gratitude to the gentleman from Washington for his efforts in leading this today, and to the Congressional Western Caucus and the members who are exposing what is really not a Green New Deal, but really is a green socialist manifesto.

Here is what we need to understand about this. This is so broad and expansive, as Mr. NEWHOUSE has said, it will, basically, invade every aspect of every American's life, and it will cost tens of trillions of dollars to implement.

How will we pay for that? We are going to pay for that with crushing new taxes on individuals, families, and companies. We are going to destroy the current foundation of our entire American economy.

There will be more borrowing, not just from the public sector, but from the private sector. The public sector is in trouble because the Federal Government just hit \$22 trillion of national debt.

The question is, what will the impact of this be on the environment? It would do little to solve the alleged problem of

carbon in the atmosphere because the United States is no longer the primary source of carbon emissions.

Between 2005 and 2017, our Nation has reduced CO₂ emissions by 862 million tons. Today, the U.S. is responsible for only 15 percent of global CO₂ emissions. During roughly the same period, China increased its emissions by 4 billion tons and India by 1.3 billion tons.

Needless to say, the GND doesn't explain how we would compel other nations to change their behavior. But domestically, as I have said, we are going to emasculate our economy. The coal, nuclear, natural gas, petroleum, and air travel industries will be wiped out, and all of the industries that support those industries. That means hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs almost instantly.

At the same time, the Green New Deal, or the green socialist manifesto, is going to guarantee a wage. It is going to guarantee income for everyone.

As Representative RYAN said, we can't green the economy without the power of the free market system. He is right. That is the ultimate point of what I want to say today.

We know that science doesn't support the green socialist manifesto, but we know something that is really critical to understand. This proposal, which today is so vast, so encompassing, and so primitive in its creation, is also so destructive to our economy and multiple industries, multiple sectors of our economy, that I would say there is only one way that you can implement such an outlandish and reckless idea, and that is to use the awesome, over-reaching power of government to not just induce, but to coerce implementation of this faulty idea.

In its scope, breadth, and depth, this plan is authoritarian in nature. It will require government flexing its muscles to mandate activities and forbid other actions in every American's life.

We can't afford this plan. This plan will not provide what it says it is going to do. Moreover, in a free, constitutional Republic, you can never allow this kind of socialism to be combined with authoritarianism.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS for sharing his thoughts on the direction that this would take our Nation and the dangerous path it would lead us upon. Those are things that we need to make sure that we don't allow happen, and I think the American people would agree with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the good doctor from Kansas' First District who serves on the Agriculture Committee. I know this is going to have a huge impact on many industries, but particularly agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that, back home, the Green New Deal means that John Deere dealers are having a new combine sale.

I stand before you this evening to tell you exactly why the Green New Deal is a sham. Rather than setting realistic goals to reduce carbon emissions and incentivize cleaner energy development, this so-called deal stalls innovation and drastically expands government involvement in almost every aspect of everyday life, at a price tag of more than \$50 trillion.

Over the past 2 years, we have unleashed our economy by reducing government overregulation, allowing more Americans to invest in their families, futures, and pursuits. The Green New Deal will throw the brakes on our economy, as well as the world's economy. Nothing will increase worldwide carbon production more than a stalled economy.

Additionally, this Green New Deal reverses our success by imposing harsher regulations that will put American workers and American companies at an extreme disadvantage. This socialist proposal that Democrats are championing completely ignores the cost to American taxpayers and fails to address the negative impacts that other countries have on global climate change. It implements policies that will dramatically increase taxes, burdens, and energy bills for families.

This deal will absolutely devastate our economy with its outrageous demands for new green infrastructure, new green labor practices, and new green taxes. It will crush American manufacturing and transportation industries. It would completely halt domestic energy production that has had record exports under the Trump administration.

I am a firm believer that we must focus on leaving this world better than we found it for the next generation. For my children, for your children, and for our grandchildren, we need to be good stewards of the resources and the planet we have been given, but any reasonable solution will require us to use common sense when approaching the issues.

We must also be careful not to fall into the trap of believing that the U.S. Government is the answer to correct all our problems. America has always been a nation of innovators, and instead of imposing new regulations and taxes, we must continue to lead the world and partner with American industries to develop creative solutions and new innovative technologies. Innovation will do more to impact climate change than any law Washington, D.C., can write.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. MARSHALL for sharing with us his thoughts from the great State of Kansas.

Some of the proponents of the Green New Deal have criticized others for criticizing the Green New Deal, saying that we don't have any room to talk if we are not going to offer something toward the issues that we face as a world and as a country.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, we do have options, and we do have solutions

that we have been offering. Let me share a piece written by my Republican colleagues just recently who lead the Energy and Commerce Committee. Mr. GREG WALDEN, Mr. FRED UPTON, and Mr. JOHN SHIMKUS shared an article that was published in several newspapers around the country. Some of the things that they say go like this: “America’s approach for tackling climate change should be built upon the principles of innovation, conservation, and adaptation. Republicans have long championed realistic, innovative, and free-market strategies to promote a cleaner environment and to reduce emissions. The results are clear: The United States is leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions thanks to vibrant energy sector competition and innovation.”

They go on to say: “We should continue to encourage innovation and renewable energy development. We should promote carbon capture and utilization, renewable hydropower, and safe nuclear power, which is emissions-free. We should also look to remove barriers to energy storage and commercial batteries to help make renewable sources more viable and our electricity grid more resilient. And we must encourage more research and business investments in new clean energy technologies. These are bipartisan solutions that we must seize on to deliver real results for the American people.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) from the 27th District.

□ 2030

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a bad deal for the people of America. Just days ago, we passed \$22 trillion in debt for which we have no plan to begin paying off. The Green New Deal would only add trillions more while simultaneously destroying the American economy, which not only means families across our Nation would lose their ability to sustain themselves, but it would also shut down the innovation engine of the world.

The 27th District of Texas, which I represent, has a better approach. We are home to a diverse energy portfolio, which includes wind, nuclear, LNG, oil production—not to mention our fair share of cows and airplanes.

We are home to a safe, reliable nuclear power plant in Matagorda County that generates 2.7 gigawatts of power, and that is a power of nearly 2 million Texas homes and businesses. It would take 8.4 million solar panels to replace that kind of energy. Even President Obama’s Secretary of Energy said, “It’s just impractical.”

We are also home to the leading export energy port in the Nation. We have been a great part in the success of what we have seen as a nation of going from an energy-dependent nation to an energy-dominant nation. And what

that new American energy dominance means, it means global stability and peace in the world as our allies are able to buy energy from us rather than from countries who don’t have our best intentions in mind.

But as the world’s need for energy grows, American companies are more likely to care about being good stewards of our creation compared with those from other energy-producing nations.

The United States cut carbon emissions by 14 percent since 2005 while global emissions rose 26 percent over the same period. Of all the G20 countries, we have the best record recently on carbon emissions and reductions.

In Texas our market-based approach to energy is leading the way even as our economy continues to boom. Furthermore, a thriving economy is absolutely essential to creating and deploying the innovative solutions we need to face the environmental challenges of the future.

So when it comes to the Green New Deal, let’s stop looking to socialism for answers and start looking to places like Texas.

This Green New Deal would be devastating to American jobholders, harmful to our allies around the world, and it is also counterproductive to advancing protections to our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to firmly oppose this outlandish and unrealistic idea.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for giving us great thoughts about the impacts of what the Green New Deal would actually mean for Americans and jobs in the United States of America.

As the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) makes his way to the microphone, I just want to share with you one study that was released today by the American Action Forum. It says that the Green New Deal will cost a startling \$93 trillion over 10 years.

Now, put that into perspective: That is equivalent to \$600,000 per household.

To generate \$93 trillion in income tax revenue, we would have to tax every household earning more than \$30,000 at a 100 percent rate for 10 years.

If every household earning over more than \$200,000 were taxed at 100 percent for 10 years, it would still fall \$58 trillion short. So you can just see that this does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

You know, those numbers are just shocking, as you related, in terms of how it would devastate the American economy and American families.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to add my voice in opposition to this so-called Green New Deal.

You know, this outrageous proposal would be a massive government take-

over of every facet of our daily lives. From how we eat, to how we travel, this so-called Green New Deal calls to replace every building and car in America within 10 years. It would cost up to \$93 trillion. That would cost every American household an extra \$65,300 per year.

That might be crumbs in New York and California, but it is not in Kansas, where the average family income is \$56,422.

If the crushing tax increase on every family isn’t bad enough, the plan also calls for an eventual end to air travel.

As representative of the Air Capital of the World, clearly, this is alarming.

According to the Kansas Department of Transportation, aviation is responsible for 91,300 jobs in Kansas and has an economic impact on our state of \$20.6 billion.

Grounding air travel would decimate jobs in Kansas, just as the entire Green New Deal would devastate the economy of our country.

The only thing this proposal accomplishes is exposing the priorities of politicians who are determined to increase taxes and expand government to impose their agenda on every family, farm, and business.

Kansans know how to protect our environment and quality of life without being told to do so by government officials in Washington, D.C., and I stand with them in opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEWHOUSE for leading this special order.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES). I appreciate very much him sharing his thoughts about the Green New Deal and the impacts it would have on our country—something that we just absolutely cannot afford. So I appreciate very much his time this evening, and I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article from Reuters titled ‘Labor Unions fear Democrats’ Green New Deal poses job threat.’

I didn’t write that title. That is what they did. In it, a spokesman for a major union in this country speaks on the legislation’s language, calling for a transition for union jobs. He says, ‘We’ve heard words like ‘just transition’ before, but what does that really mean? Our Members are worried about putting food on the table.’

Another labor union, the Laborers’ International Union of North America states, ‘We will never settle for ‘just transition’ language as a solution to the job losses that will surely come from some of the policies in the resolution.’

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans across the country deserve to be heard. Unfortunately, as this article states, neither union was contacted for input before the legislation was released.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from California’s First District (Mr. LAMALFA), my good friend and a fellow farmer.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Indeed, what we know so far about the Green New Deal, it is more like a green pipe dream. It would lead to a total government takeover of just about every aspect of our lives.

Now, it is interesting to watch, since the deal was proposed not that many days ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them are starting to back away from it. There were 67 coauthors on that. We are seeing some starting to back away, saying, well, this really isn't the dream or the deal; it is more of an aspiration.

Well, by the time you freaked out half the country with these ideas that you put into legislation, maybe we need a little more heads-up on what really is the goal here.

Some of the guarantees in it:

A government paycheck for those unwilling to work.

Is that really in there? What are we talking about here?

The cost of this implementation? \$93 trillion, quadruple of what our national debt is right now. The cost will be passed on, of course, to—as always—the taxpayer, to families, to those struggling—especially middle-income folks—who could see their energy bills going up from already at a high point to an additional \$4,000 annually per family.

We should really have our supporters of this bill benefit from the lessons learned in California on the high-speed rail boondoggle that tripled in a short amount of time soon after it was barely approved, \$10 billion by the taxpayers to a nearly \$100 billion project, all under the guise of saving greenhouse gases.

Except during the construction of the high-speed rail in California, it will make a whole bunch of greenhouse gases with the equipment involved, so we are going to plant trees to offset that. Yet, at the same time, they are running the rails through hundreds of acres of almond trees in the middle of California that they are supposed to be offsetting.

It is a reckless attempt to undermine America's increasing dominance—not just energy independence—but now dominance in energy around the world.

It ignores the basic reality; a lot of what America was built upon were indeed fossil fuels, those known reserves that we have in this country.

Now, let's talk a little bit about the Paris accord that I think President Trump rightfully withdrew the United States from. The goal being greenhouse gas reduction, CO₂ reduction.

Well, when you look at the stats, who is already leading the way outside of the accord? The U.S.—of those western countries—is the only one that has actually reduced its number of CO₂ in that amount of time.

We are the ones doing it. You know why? Because we have freedom; because we have the ability to innovate

here, to invent the new technology, to invent the things that are going to help us do things better and cleaner into the future.

I don't hear a lot of talk on this about new hydropower, which is clean and ready to go any time you turn on the switch to the gates to allow the turbines to flow.

Biomass. In my area of the country—the Western Caucus, my colleagues here—we burn part of the west every year. We should be putting that fuel into clean burning power plants to make electricity, cleaning our forest, making it more fire-safe, better for the wildlife, better for the environment, not having all that CO₂ go up. And then creating jobs in our backyard to get people to work from cleaning up the over-inventory the U.S. forest and BLM has from allowing their forest to run rampant with no management for the last 100 years.

These are things we should be talking about, not this green dream thing. Instead, we are going to hear nothing but climate change, climate change, climate change, with solutions that just harness or handcuff the economy, the jobs, and the people of this country inside this chamber and in the real world out there where people actually produce things.

We need to focus on the things that we know can work, producing energy with hydropower. Yes, with nuclear power, no emissions. With biomass, help clean that inventory that burns hundreds of thousands of acres every year of forest land, and put it to work for us.

That is what we are going to be successful at, because the United States is always number one in developing the new technology, the new ways to do cleaner, better, more efficiently, instead of handcuffing our economy and that innovation and exporting it somewhere else.

I do agree with my colleagues that have spoken here tonight. And in sending the message, we need to strongly oppose this bill and get back to something that actually works for the working people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time of the gentleman.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). I appreciate very much him sharing his thoughts—and California's thoughts—about what we have in front of us and the impact it would have.

And if anyone is thinking that this is just a bunch of Republicans that are thinking this way and have these thoughts, let me share with you some quotes from some of my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

Representative JEFF VAN DREW, a Democrat from New Jersey. He says of the Green New Deal, "It is not a serious policy proposal. It seeks the complete reorganization of American society, which took hundreds of years to build, in a matter of 10 years."

Or the senior Senator from California—Mr. LAMALFA's state—just stated last week that "There's no way to pay for it."

From my own State, my colleague, Representative RICK LARSEN just said recently, "It is difficult to support the resolution right now when one of the lead sponsors says one of the intentions is to make air travel unnecessary." He is the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation.

My neighbor from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said, "The idea that in 5 or 10 years we're not going to consume any more fossil fuels is technologically impossible. We can have grand goals, but let's be realistic about how we get there."

Even our own Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI from California, said of the proposal, "The green dream or whatever they call it, nobody knows what it is, but they're for it, right?"

So you can see, it is not just us, this is a bipartisan feeling about the Green New Deal that it needs a lot more consideration.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), my good friend from the Palmetto State, Fifth District, and a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEWHOUSE for leading the effort on this.

And I rise to oppose the Green New Deal for many of the reasons that have already been said, but this is the most amateurish resolution that has come before this Congress in a long time, not from only my point of view but many others who have served longer than I have.

We were asked to consider a policy that would change every aspect of American life, deciding what we eat, how we travel, how we stay warm, and even what jobs we can take and what homes we are allowed to live in.

We are presented with a total overhaul of society, but with no explanation how. There is no roadmap, no method of implementation, and, of course, no price tag. All we know is that this will be dictated by a cabal of better-knowing bureaucrats. Yet every estimate shows just how unrealistic this green deal really is.

According to the American Action Forum, the total cost could run as high as \$93 trillion over 10 years.

□ 2045

This totals 21 times our current Federal budget of \$4.4 trillion. That can only mean one thing for the American people: taxes, taxes, and more taxes.

This resolution is so lacking in detail, we might as well vote on the merits of a scrap of paper that says, "solve the problem." This is no way to govern.

The only details we do have are from a survey that enjoyed a brief existence online before it was removed out of embarrassment and has since been denied.

One source of embarrassment was the call to get rid of cows. To my knowledge, this is the first time that a Member of this House has called for bovine genocide.

That the deal's supporters are now hiding these facts reveals that the true agenda behind the Green New Deal is too horrifying to be shared with any of the public. As a rule of thumb, any law that cannot be shared with the people cannot serve the people.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his input on this important issue. It underscores the cost to the Nation if this were adopted and its impact on our economy. I thank the gentleman for that tremendous help.

I thank all my colleagues, members of the Congressional Western Caucus, for participating tonight to point out some of the fallacies of the Green New Deal. Certainly, it is something that, as legislation is proposed, this is the process: We talk about what we like, what we don't like, and we offer alternatives, trying to find solutions in a bipartisan way.

Republicans have always advocated to continue looking at these issues of climate change, of energy use and production, of issues facing the environment. We are always looking for ways to innovate, to adequately fund research, but, basically, underscoring all of that, relying on the use of sound science for any decisions that we make, to make sure that the policies that we adopt are those that will be sustaining and good for not only our country, but for the world.

So we base our decisions on science, not politics. As Republicans, as members of the Congressional Western Caucus, which is a bipartisan organization, we look forward to debating seriously and making serious decisions in regard to these very important issues that face our country, face the next generation, and face the world.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing debates on this important topic, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of inclement weather.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tues-

day, February 26, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BIENNIAL REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS

U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR) to biennially submit a report containing recommendations regarding Federal workplace rights, safety and health, and public access laws and regulations that should be made applicable to Congress and its agencies. The purpose of this report is to ensure that the rights afforded by the CAA to legislative branch employees and visitors to Capitol Hill and district offices remain equivalent to those in the private sector and the executive branch of the Federal government. As such, these recommendations support the intent of Congress to keep pace with advances in workplace rights and public access laws.

Accompanying this letter is a copy of our section 102(b) report—titled “Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act”—for consideration by the 116th Congress. We welcome discussion on these issues and urge that Congress act on these important recommendations.

Your office is receiving this initial copy prior to it being uploaded to our public website. On March 4, 2019, this report will be disseminated to the larger Congressional community and available on www.ocwr.gov. As required by the Congressional Accountability Act, 2 U.S.C. §1302(b), I request that this publication be printed in the Congressional Record, and referred to the committees of the House of Representatives and Senate with jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN,
Executive Director.

116TH CONGRESS—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Office of Congressional Workplace Rights—Board of Directors' Biennial Report required by § 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act issued at the conclusion of the 115th Congress (2017–2018) for consideration by the 116th Congress

Statement From the Board of Directors

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) embodies a promise by Congress to the American public that it will hold itself accountable to the same federal workplace and accessibility laws that it applies to private sector employers and executive branch agencies. This landmark legislation was also crafted to provide for ongoing review of the workplace and accessibility laws that apply to Congress. Section 102(b) of the CAA thus tasks the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR)—formerly the Office of Compliance—to review legislation and regulations to ensure that workplace protections in the legislative branch are on par with private sector and executive branch agencies. Accordingly, every Congress, the Board reports on: whether or to what degree [provisions of Federal law (including regulations) relating to (A) the terms and conditions of employ-

ment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievance and disciplinary procedures, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees; and (B) access to public services and accommodations] . . . are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch, and . . . with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch. This section of the CAA also requires that the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate cause our report to be printed in the Congressional Record and refer the report to committees of the House and Senate with jurisdiction.

On December 21, 2018, as we were in the process of finalizing our Section 102(b) Report for the 115th Congress, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, S. 3749, was signed into law. Not since the passage of the CAA in 1995 has there been a more significant moment in the evolution of legislative branch workplace rights. The new law focuses on protecting victims, strengthening transparency, holding violators accountable for their personal conduct, and improving the adjudication process. Some of the changes in the CAA Reform Act are effective immediately, such as the name change of our Office, but most will be effective 180 days from enactment, i.e., on June 19, 2019. The CAA Reform Act incorporates several of the recommendations that the OCWR has made to Congress in past Section 102(b) Reports and in other contexts, such as in testimony before the Committee on House Administration (CHA) as part of that committee's comprehensive review in 2018 of the protections that the CAA offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace. These changes include the following:

Mandatory Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Anti-Retaliation Training

The Board has consistently recommended in its past biennial Section 102(b) Reports and in testimony before Congress that anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal training should be mandatory for all Members, officers, employees and staff of Congress and the other employing offices in the legislative branch. Last year, the House and the Senate adopted resolutions (S. Res 330 and H. Res. 630) that require all of its Members, Officers and employees, as well as interns, detailees, and fellows, to complete an anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training program. We are pleased that the CAA Reform Act includes these broader mandates for the congressional workforce at large. Under the new law, employing offices (other than the House of Representatives and the Senate) are also required to develop and implement a program to train and educate covered employees on the rights and protections provided under the CAA, including the procedures available under CAA title IV, which describes the OCWR administrative and judicial dispute resolution procedures. 509(a), 2 U.S.C. §1438(a). Employing offices must submit a report on the implementation of their CAA-required training and education programs to the CHA and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate no later than 45 days after the beginning of each Congress, beginning with the 117th Congress. For the 116th Congress, this report is due no later than 180 days after the enactment of the CAA Reform Act, which is June 19, 2019. 509(b)(1), (b)(2), 2 U.S.C. §1438(b)(1), (b)(2)

The OCWR stands ready to assist employing offices in developing their anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal