

\$600 billion in renewable energy subsidies and has seen no meaningful decrease in carbon emissions.

Mr. Speaker, the United States was already a leader in reducing carbon emissions before the Paris Agreement was signed. Since 1970, the United States has reduced six key air pollutants by 73 percent and has seen the largest absolute reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> of any country in the world since 2000.

Instead of focusing on bringing us back to the past, we should focus on encouraging innovations that we are already seeing in the energy sector today. Whether it be carbon capture technology, clean coal, or taking advantage of the liquid natural gas revolution that is taking place across the country, the private sector is leading the way in creating a cleaner energy future for this country.

That is the way it should be, not through a heavy-handed government imposing unrealistic, top-down mandates.

Requiring the U.S. to follow the requirements of the Paris Agreement will stifle innovations and return us to the policies of the past when energy was more expensive and economic growth was abysmal.

It appears that I am running out of time, so what I will do is implore my folks to, first, relook at this.

I thank all the Western Caucus members who contributed to the Special Order. It is truly a privilege to be chair of the caucus, which is now 74 bipartisan members strong.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to lead the fight against the extreme agenda, which is why we organized the Special Order in opposition to H.R. 9.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I will close with a quote from the National Federation of Independent Business, who oppose this legislation.

Under this legislation,

Small businesses would face significant future government mandates, additional regulatory and legal burdens, and unworkable government policies that would result in skyrocketing energy prices.

At a time when the small business economy is booming with small business owners reporting record hiring of new employees and historically strong compensation increases for their employees, Congress should be considering policies that will allow this economic boom to continue, not bring it to a halt.

I hope this legislation is voted down by the House this week and we get serious as a Congress about promoting energy dominance for the betterment of our economy, energy consumers, the environment, and geopolitically across the world.

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

#### PARIS ACCORDS WERE FLAWED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, years ago, the administration, working through an international group, had helped to negotiate and put together an agreement on climate change known as the Kyoto Protocol. That protocol was resoundingly rejected by the United States Senate.

It actually had provisions in it that indicated that should the United States in the future end up entering into some sort of climate agreement or any type of agreement, that there would have to be some type of a consent by the United States Senate; that this would have to be presented before the United States Senate.

We don't have a unilateral government. We don't have a dictatorship. We have scenario whereby we have a Congress, we have a President, and we work together. In this case what has happened is, under the Obama administration, these Paris accords were agreed to unilaterally, meaning they were never submitted to the Congress. They were never submitted to the United States Senate for approval.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the American people have their Representatives. Their Representative is their Senator, and that is how their voice is heard on agreements like this.

Yet, we had a President that unilaterally agreed to the Paris accords and did not submit it to the United States Senate. So now we have a President that is saying: Well, this was unilaterally agreed to. I am unilaterally withdrawing.

We have a bill this week, H.R. 9, that attempts to prevent the President from withdrawing from this. So I want to stick with procedure here for just a minute, Mr. Speaker.

We unilaterally entered into an agreement that we don't believe should have been entered into unilaterally. We think it should have been presented to the United States Senate. It was not.

Now the President is saying, I am withdrawing. And now this bill is trying to prevent that. So, on the one hand they think that a President should be able to unilaterally act, and in another scenario, the withdrawal that President Trump has proposed, you have folks saying with H.R. 9 that, no, no, you can't do that. You can't have both. One or the other, take your pick.

Now, let's actually get into the contents of the agreement. The Paris accords set targets on emissions reductions for the United States. All right, so they try and set emissions reductions.

Mr. Speaker, under this agreement, we could eliminate all emissions from the United States, all greenhouse gases. We can eliminate all of them, and China can come in and they can emit 10 times what we were emitting before we cut. Under this agreement that is totally legal. It doesn't make sense.

To add insult to injury, China can go years and years increasing emissions; not reducing, increasing. I want to remind you, we live in a global environment. As much as we like to think we are the only country in the world, we are not. It is a global environment. If you care about the whole environment for the entire globe, you have got to look holistically.

You can't come to the United States and say: Okay, you have to cut emissions. Yet, in China, they can double, triple, they can go tenfold increasing their emissions, twentyfold increasing their emissions, and that is all legal under this agreement. That is inappropriate. If we care about the global environment, let's care about the global environment.

Now, to add insult to injury, the agreement also establishes an entirely different metric for developing countries like China than it does for the United States.

Now, think about this, if we are in the Olympics; we are running a race, and you win the race. But then somebody comes, and they say: No, no we are giving this Chinese runner a 20-second deduction. That is not fair. And that is what has happened here.

They have an entirely different metric that they are measured by. Why? If we live in a global environment, if we care about overall reducing emissions, why are we giving different standards, different measurements? That is inappropriate. This entire agreement is flawed.

Now, some of you may be sitting there thinking: Well, wait a minute. I care about the environment. I care about emissions reduction.

Let me read you a statement that was included in the International Energy Agency's Global Energy & CO<sub>2</sub> Status Report.

Here is the statement: "Emissions in the United States remain around their 1990 levels, 14 percent and 800 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> below their peak in 2000."

Now, here is the kicker. Listen to this statement. "This is the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000."

I am going to say that again. "This is the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000."

Let me translate that, Mr. Speaker. What that means is that the United States, over the last, nearly 20 years, has reduced emissions greater than every other country.

So, we are actually operating without a requirement, just with an incentive. We are operating on already reducing emissions. We are already transitioning to an all-of-the-above energy strategy which includes solar, which includes wind, which includes geothermal, which includes hydro, and nuclear, and natural gas, and coal, and oil, and other things, all of the above, whichever makes the most sense.

We had a hearing today in the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and it was fascinating listening to people

talking about the impact of these energy policies on the poor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the home State where I am from, south Louisiana, we have the lowest electricity rates in the United States, the lowest. The States that have the highest are the ones that are forcing things that are perverting or distorting markets. Those are the States that have the highest electricity rates. That disproportionately affects the poor.

We were citing today an analysis by the Manhattan Institute. In that analysis, they looked at if you invested \$1 million and you could invest it in solar, you could invest it in wind, or you could invest it in natural gas and shale—I see my friend here from North Dakota that represents much of the shale production in the United States—you would get a sixfold increase in the amount of energy produced by investing it in shale.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, transitioning to natural gas results in a significant reduction in emissions as compared to other sources. It is part of our existing infrastructure. It is part of a transition plan. And not to say that we don't ever transition or continue migrating to renewable sources; it is all of the above.

Don't say all of the above, as President Obama and others did, but then carry out policies that prevent you or drive up the cost of these other energy sources. It doesn't make sense and that is what disproportionately affects the poor.

Mr. Speaker, we have other Members here from the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, and I appreciate them being here. I am looking forward to engaging with them on bringing reality, bringing practicality to this discussion today.

But I want to say in summary: number one, procedurally, the Paris accords were flawed. Practically speaking, the targets that were established disproportionately affect the United States, and it establishes a different measuring stick, a different standard for us than it does for China and other countries.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, China, the country that is here under the auspices of a developing Nation, this is the country that is spending billions and billions of dollars around the world on projects in other countries to improve their national security, their defense, contrary, in many cases, to the United States and our allies. This is a developing country. This is inappropriate.

And I will say one last thing in closing. We are the country that over nearly the last 20 years has had the greatest reduction in emissions and we have done it by incentivizing, not by coming in and distorting markets and putting perverse policies in place.

H.R. 9 is a flawed approach that is going to have a disproportionate impact on the poor. It is going to simply squeeze a balloon in the middle and make it pop out on the sides where you

have more emissions resulting in China and other countries. Because companies will leave the United States, jobs will leave the United States if we address this inappropriately, and they will go to other countries where they will be less energy efficient. They will release greater emissions into our global environment. That is not a win.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of H.R. 9. I urge support of involving the United States Senate, the United States Congress in these discussions and negotiations, and to develop a true all-of-the-above energy strategy that incorporates things like incentives, thinks about our infrastructure network and other important components of ultimately achieving this objective, which we all share, which is giving a better planet to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman BUDDY CARTER, that, similar to me, represents a coastal district.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for hosting this today. This is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege of representing the First Congressional District of Georgia, a district that includes the entire coast of Georgia, over 100 miles of pristine coastline. We are very proud.

The coast of Georgia is my home. That is where I have lived all of my life, where I was born, and I was raised, and where I intend to live the rest of my life. I love the coast of Georgia, and I have always said that I am going to protect the coast of Georgia, and I am.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is real. Protecting our environment is real. We understand that. Since day one, the climate has been changing. Yes, industrialization has had an impact on it as well. We understand that.

In order to represent my constituents, I believe our Nation needs to be working in a responsible way, a responsible way to prepare ourselves for future weather events while striving for cleaner and more affordable energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, in an 11-month period, we had two major hurricanes on the Georgia coast: Hurricane Matthew and Hurricane Irma. The number of hurricanes appears to be increasing and there are those who would argue that the intensity of those hurricanes are increasing. That is something we are concerned with.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, as well as on the Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and that is very important. That is where I need to be as the Representative of the coast of Georgia. I need to be on those committees. This is where I want to be.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, to address this problem, the majority party, the Democrats, have offered H.R. 9. It is coming to the floor this week and it is not a solution. It is not a solution to climate change.

What it is, is government overreach at its best. It disallows the President from withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement. It puts our economy, our national security, and our ability to make our environment cleaner in danger, while other nations, as was pointed out by my colleague from Louisiana, other nations just simply continue on. They aren't held by these same principles.

□ 1530

China right now is responsible for 30 percent of the pollution in the world, and yet they aren't abiding by this. They aren't even a part of the Paris climate agreement. They are not even participating in this until 2030.

As my colleague pointed out, again, they can just continue to increase pollution while here in America, if the President is not allowed to get us out of this climate agreement, we are going to have to adhere to that. That is not fair, and it is not going to help if China is not held to the same principles that we are held to.

Mr. Speaker, between the year 2000 and 2014, the United States decreased emissions by more than 14 percent, in fact, by more than 18 percent, but China's emissions have increased. They have doubled since the year 2000, and they are significantly higher than the U.S. right now.

The U.S. is already leading the way without the Paris climate agreement. We are leading the way. We are the economic leader, and we can't let a half-baked policy like H.R. 9 jeopardize that status.

Companies in our country are responsible, and they are leading the way. As my colleague from Louisiana mentioned, we had a meeting earlier today of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. We had witnesses who told us about companies that are involved in this that already, on their own accord and on their own initiative, are doing things and putting in place programs that are going to help with climate change.

For example, there is a startup called 4Oceanis that has collected 4.2 million pounds of ocean garbage. If we put our economy at risk through expensive regulations and mandates, then we risk losing companies like this and the capital that they have necessary to invest in these projects.

As my colleagues stated earlier, we have to have an all-of-the-above approach. In order to control climate change, we need three things: We need adaptation; we need mitigation; and we need innovation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9 is bad policy. Again, as my colleague pointed out earlier, it was brought about without even a subcommittee hearing. It was rushed through. This is a very important subject. This is a very important subject that can't be rushed. We can't take this lightly. We have to take this seriously. We are taking it seriously in the Republican Party.

The Democrats didn't think about the real consequences of this bill. Here we have the Green New Deal, pie in the sky that would ruin our economy by \$93 trillion, and it includes things such as healthcare for all. Now, what has that got to do with climate change? Absolutely nothing.

We need to concentrate; we need to focus; and we need to have real, commonsense solutions to this. That is what we are proposing. But here we have politics as usual on Capitol Hill with Democrats bringing this to the floor. They couldn't care less about the impact on our economy or the impacts on real people.

This legislation, H.R. 9, quite frankly, would be better off being called the "U.S. Energy Disadvantage Act." That is what they ought to call it.

Having said all this, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you—and I mean this sincerely—I am excited. I am excited about the future of clean energy. I am excited about the future of innovation in America. We have the greatest innovators in the world right here in America. We have the smartest scientists in the world right here in America. If we simply give them the chance to do their work, then they will do it. I am convinced of that.

Yes, we need to incentivize it and we need to encourage it, but we don't need to be an obstacle, and we don't need to be in the way.

Look at the internet, arguably one of the greatest inventions in modern times. Where did that come from? Right here in America.

I am excited. I am convinced that we can come up with real solutions to this. Unfortunately, H.R. 9 is not one of those real solutions. H.R. 9 is going to ruin our economy.

The Green New Deal, are you kidding me? That kind of pie-in-the-sky type of legislation has no place. We need real solutions. Citizens sent us up here to come up with real solutions, not some pie-in-the-sky idea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 9 and deliberate on real solutions that will make our world cleaner and improve our environment without destroying our economy.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), who is another member of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Americans care about clean air; Americans care about clean water; and the U.S. needs to be at the table for these discussions as we move into a global economy. But, Mr. Speaker, a bad deal is worse than no deal at all. Make no mistake, H.R. 9 is a bad deal.

Almost no countries are in compliance with the Paris deal now, let alone its future requirements. I am going to have some breaking news here: China is not a developing country. China emits

over 30 percent of the world's pollution. But not China, not India, not Australia, not the EU, and not even Canada are in compliance with the current terms.

The U.N. Emissions Gap Report estimates U.N. countries will have to triple their efforts to meet the Paris deal commitments. This deal imposes stricter requirements on the United States than other countries. It requires significant and economically damaging carbon emission reductions from the United States without requiring those same requirements from China, from India, and from other developing countries.

A true international agreement to address carbon emissions would require actionable commitments from all the countries and would have included a mechanism for enforcement. China has only committed to raising its nonfossil fuel share of its economy to 20 percent by 2030 and a commitment that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will peak in 2030. That is not including their financing of essentially unregulated coal plants all over the developing world.

U.S. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have peaked in the mid-2000s and have decreased since then. The United States is on track to hit about 65 percent of the voluntary targets based on both the Bush- and Obama-era regulations and existing power sector trends.

Mr. Speaker, we need to focus on developing and exporting innovation and technology to reduce emissions; give us cleaner air and water and reliable, affordable energy for families all across the country. Without that, this bill is simply virtue signaling. But it is worse than that because, by its very nature, it will force the exporting of pollution to countries that do not have the United States' regulatory controls.

We benefit from producing energy here. It is done safely and securely and creates American jobs. We need to end our reliance on foreign fuels and promote homegrown and home-produced fuels just like we have done in North Dakota.

The energy sector not only is great for our economy, but it is incredibly important for national security. So let's get on with real solutions. Let's get more pipelines in the ground. Let's allow for natural gas to be burned during the winter instead of heating oil. Let's end sue-and-settle environmentalism, and let's not forget that we had 8 years under the Obama administration to lead environmentally by symbolism and symbolism alone. We need to get rid of symbolism and start working toward action.

Democrats are offering unrealistic, counterproductive policies like stopping pipelines needed to transport environmentally safe natural gas and stopping trains from going into their own States. We need to allow for our energy infrastructure to catch up to where it needs to be, and then we can lead the world in global innovation and technology.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), who represents a lot of the victims of bad energy policy or energy policy that is not thought out.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

I represent West Virginia, an energy State. Our natural resources power the Nation, and our coal produces the steel that is the backbone of our country's infrastructure. The bill my colleagues across the aisle have introduced today is a direct threat to the economy of my State and to the security of our Nation.

When President Obama entered into the Paris Agreement in 2016, he made a shortsighted, hasty decision which passed egregious costs on to American consumers and sent \$1 billion in taxpayer funds to subsidize other nations' energy agendas without congressional authorization—while never offering a clear plan for our country to meet the commitments made, aside from the overall goal of killing energy production in the U.S.

This is an attempt to further the war on coal which decimated my State, killing jobs, destroying businesses, and exacerbating the opioid epidemic. We face a bleakness which we are starting to recover from, yet, now, Washington liberals are restarting the charge.

We have seen unrealistic proposals like the Green New Deal put forward which would not only bankrupt our country, but also kill our energy industry once and for all. I will not stand here and let that happen.

When President Trump withdrew from the agreement in 2017, he showed leadership. He showed the world that he was willing to resist diplomatic pressure in order to protect American interests and ensure energy competitiveness.

Those who support this legislation aren't telling the whole story on America's energy production. The Paris Agreement, since its creation, has not accounted for the United States' abundance of natural resources and the hundreds of thousands of Americans employed by the energy industry.

Additionally, the Paris Agreement ignores that America produces affordable, reliable energy, including coal, oil, and natural gas, and it also ignores the importance that energy has to the United States' economy and national security.

In the past 5 years, there has been a 110 percent increase in coal exports, and we still have 259 billion tons of coal reserves, the largest in the world.

Since 2008, the U.S. has increased crude oil production by 48 percent and natural gas production by 53 percent; and looking forward, the increased access to undeveloped energy production could create as many as 690,000 jobs by 2030.

Energy has been our past, and energy is our future. It is important the United States is already leading the world in reducing greenhouse emissions through innovation and technological development. If my colleagues across the aisle were interested in working with Republicans to address climate change, then they would not ignore the fact that the United States has already had the largest absolute decline of carbon emissions among all the countries since the year 2000.

We did not need an international agreement to do it. Forcing America to reenter the Paris Agreement is not the answer for climate concerns. It is restarting a tried-and-failed approach which only leads to less jobs, a weaker economy, and a less safe America.

The answer to the climate debate is not a \$93 trillion socialist restructuring of our country. It is innovation, and it is supporting new technology like taking rare-earth minerals and distilled water from previously used coal ash. It is supporting carbon capture moving forward. It is recognizing that, in the dead of winter when the renewable energy grids fall short, we can rely on coal to get us through the next polar vortex.

America cannot afford to reenter the Paris Agreement. We cannot afford to lose jobs. We cannot afford to lose security. We cannot afford the security risks. We cannot afford to weaken our economy. And we cannot afford to say “no” to innovation.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I will now close.

Mr. Speaker, it has been fascinating serving on the House Natural Resources Committee, where we have talked about efforts to stop pipelines from being built under the auspices of this is protecting our environment.

Mr. Speaker, study after study has shown that, when you stop pipelines, it doesn't stop the utilization of oil and gas. What it does is it puts that on barges, on trains, and on trucks—less safe means of transportation. The safest thing you can do is put energy in a pipeline. If you care about the environment, that is what you should do.

Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing recently in the Natural Resources Committee where we had a career Department of the Interior official. We talked to him and asked him: What happens when you try and stop the supply of energy? Does that reduce the demand for oil and gas?

Do you know what the response was? This person has served in at least the Clinton administration, all of these different Republican and Democratic administrations. He said: No. As a matter of fact, we have researched this extensively. What it does is it causes us to import more energy.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you of some of the top nations we would import from:

Venezuela, Middle Eastern countries, and Nigeria. We are giving them billions of dollars.

To put it in perspective on how much this is, Mr. Speaker, in 2011, 58 percent of our Nation's trade deficit was attributable to our importing energy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear. I am going to reiterate what my friend from Georgia said.

I have children. I care about the environment. I taught outdoor education classes for years, and I care about the environment.

□ 1545

I care about the environment. I know that facts can be pesky little things, but we have to introduce more science and data into these decisions to make sure that we are making informed, deliberate decisions that result in a better global environment, not simply coming in and squeezing the United States to the benefit of China where they end up releasing greater emissions into our global environment.

That is a flawed strategy. It is what this bill, H.R. 9, would do. I urge, once again, rejection of this flawed approach.

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

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, let me take a quick moment and sort of get adjusted here.

We are going to spend a couple of minutes walking through some things that I think are exciting, hopeful, and worth getting our heads around.

Every week, I try to come to this microphone when we are here to talk about what I believe makes the future really bright for all of us, everyone from my 3-year-old—or 3½-year-old, as she corrects me—little girl to someone who is moving into their retirement years.

Once again, what is the greatest fragility in our society? This is one that is hard for us to get our heads around or even talk about. It is our demographics.

Whether we like it or not, baby boomers are retiring, and we have 74 million baby boomers. The last baby boomer will hit 65 in about 8½ years.

In 8½ years, two workers, one retiree. In 8½ years, 50 percent of our spending from this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and up.

It is demographics. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is demographics.

At the same time, we have a substantial collapse, fall, in our birthrates. As you know, our birthrates now are well below the replacement rates.

What do you do as a society? What do you do as a government? What do we do as a body here that is making public policy to make the future bright?

We keep coming to the floor and talking about that we believe there are, functionally, five elements. It is the adoption of technology. It is the adoption of economic policies that maximize economic growth through tax policy that creates investment in new technology for productivity; immigration policy that maximizes new Americans having talents that help us grow the economy; regulatory policy that uses technology and information to regulate instead of bureaucratic filing in file cabinets, functionally; incentives to stay in the workforce and incentives to enter the workforce.

As we have seen recently, millennial females are moving into the workforce. We still have a problem with millennial males.

How about someone who is older? Can we do certain incentives in Social Security, Medicare, and other earned benefits to encourage staying in the workforce or even creating a second career? We are going to have to redesign a bit of those incentives that are in the current earned benefits.

Can you create some incentives on Social Security, saying, “If you will continue to work, we are going to do these things?” Because that labor force participation is so important.

We have worked through these. Now we try to come in and show what we see working in our society. Then, I want to talk a little bit about one of these things, and that is the adoption of technology.

This week, the majority, the Democrats, will have a resolution on the floor about the Paris climate accords. I want to walk a bit through how technology, pro-growth technology, is the solution. I am going to show you some of the really optimistic things happening out there.

Let's start swapping a couple of these boards. First, I apologize for the first slide. The scale is a little off, but it is basically to make a simple point.

I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee. We had the debate in December 2017. Over here, I was hearing how the world was coming to an end, how revenues were going to collapse. It turns out that now we at least have a good, comparable dataset. What is the term? “Ceteris paribus,” where you can equal to equal.

In 2017, before there was tax reform, the first 6 months, and now we have the 2019 first 6 months. Guess what? Revenues are up, even though we are already in the tax reform environment.

I was waved off by some much more sensitive staffers. We had a list of quotes from the majority, things they said, their predictions, what their economists said. I am not going to read them.

But do understand, think about some of the crazy things we heard about what tax reform was going to do to the revenues of the country, what it was going to do to the economy, what it was going to do to employment, what it was going to do to labor force participation.