

Coach Lori Blade's incredible success has produced 624 wins, dozens of conference titles, and two State championships.

On April 30, Coach Blade was enshrined into the Illinois Basketball Coaches Association Hall of Fame. Her 22 seasons of accomplishments have vaulted both Edwardsville and Carrollton High Schools' programs to statewide dominance.

Beyond the victories, Coach Blade has made a profound impact on countless lives, teaching players to take pride not just in the game, but in everything they do. Pushing her players never to be satisfied or content, Coach Blade has had a phenomenal career on the court and on the softball diamond, being the only coach in IHSA history to have over 600 wins in two sports.

Congratulations, Coach Blade, on all of your accomplishments. Thank you for your commitment to our students, and I wish you all the best in your future seasons, unless you play my hometown Taylorville Tornados.

□ 0915

LYNN WOOLSEY'S VISIT

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, 444. That is the number of times Lynn Woolsey came to this floor, stood at that podium right over there, and addressed this House during Special Orders, speaking against war and in support of peace.

Lynn Woolsey, for 20 years, represented much of my congressional district. My colleagues here in Congress will remember her as a passionate and outspoken advocate—a leader—in the effort to strengthen our national security without war. One of the ways that she did that was through her hundreds of Special Order hour speeches. In the final one of these, No. 444, she said the following:

“Sometimes I've been accused of wanting a 'perfect world.' But I consider that a compliment. Our Founders strove to form a 'more perfect Union.' Why shouldn't we aim for a perfect world? You see, I'm absolutely certain that if we don't work toward a perfect world, we won't ever come close to providing a safe, healthy, and secure world for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.”

She is with her grandchildren Carlo and Luca here today.

Let us thank Lynn Woolsey for her service, and let's urge all Members of Congress to approach our work with the same tenacity and resolve to work together toward peace, health, and security for all.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 89

Whereas a carbon tax is a Federal tax on carbon released from fossil fuels;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase energy prices, including the price of gasoline, electricity, natural gas, and home heating oil;

Whereas a carbon tax will mean that families and consumers will pay more for essentials like food, gasoline, and electricity;

Whereas a carbon tax will fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to more jobs and businesses moving overseas;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to less economic growth;

Whereas American families will be harmed the most from a carbon tax;

Whereas, according to the Energy Information Administration, in 2011, fossil fuels share of energy consumption was 82 percent;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax will impose disproportionate burdens on certain industries, jobs, States, and geographic regions and would further restrict the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas American ingenuity has led to innovations in energy exploration and development and has increased production of domestic energy resources on private and State-owned land which has created significant job growth and private capital investment;

Whereas United States energy policy should encourage continued private sector innovation and development and not increase the existing tax burden on manufacturers;

Whereas the production of American energy resources increases the United States ability to maintain a competitive advantage in today's global economy;

Whereas a carbon tax would reduce America's global competitiveness and would encourage development abroad in countries that do not impose this exorbitant tax burden; and

Whereas the Congress and the President should focus on pro-growth solutions that encourage increased development of domestic resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 89, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 89, which takes a strong stand against the carbon tax that would hurt American families, workers, and job creators.

As the President closes out his time in office, he would like nothing more than to ram through more of his harmful energy agenda. Just look at the President's budget this year. Among the \$3.4 trillion in tax hikes he proposed, the President included a \$10 per barrel tax on oil. This tax alone would cause gas prices to increase by an estimated 25 cents per gallon. With a carbon tax, there would be a tax hike on production, distribution, and the use of not only oil but also of natural gas and any other form of energy that emits carbon. Such a tax would have many serious impacts on our economy by making day-to-day life more expensive for families throughout this country.

First, a carbon tax could drive up the cost of energy for both the producers and the consumers. This translates to larger energy bills that eat up even more of Americans' take-home pay, especially during the hottest and coldest months of the year.

Second, a carbon tax would destroy well-paying jobs throughout the American energy sector—a sector that has fueled significant job growth throughout the country.

Third, a carbon tax would deliver a direct hit to working families and have compound effects that would reach all corners of the economy. In fact, a carbon tax would increase the cost of, virtually, every good manufactured or service performed in the United States, including everyday necessities. If a good requires energy to make or transport, which most do, taxes on that energy are, essentially, a tax on that good. As a result, Americans would have to pay more for everything—from milk to clothing to school supplies.

Finally, to make this bad idea even worse, we know that a carbon tax would hurt those who are living in poverty and those who are on fixed incomes more than anyone else.

Put simply, a carbon tax would make it harder for us to grow our economy and help working families and small businesses succeed.

We all want an all-of-the-above energy approach that supports new innovations, not a targeted tax hike on specific industries. Thanks to the leadership of Whip SCALISE, Congress will pass this bill today and send it to the Senate, and we will send a clear message to the people in our districts, as well as to the Obama White House, that we do not support this extreme tax.

Instead, we will continue to pass legislation that grows our economy and that helps more Americans get back to work. After all, last week, we received the worst jobs report in almost 6 years. It is more important than ever that we move forward with a bold, pro-growth agenda, not another expensive Washington tax.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What is happening today is further evidence that the Republicans are simply not doing their job. There is real work to be done. It is simply inexcusable that action has not yet happened to prepare for the Zika virus. That would be real action. Helping the people of Flint get clean drinking water, in my home State, would be something real. There is no budget resolution that has been considered here on the House floor. Raising the minimum wage would also be real, and it would help lift many families out of poverty. Closing tax loopholes and making the Tax Code fairer would be real.

Instead, today, we are voting on two senses of Congress resolutions. Doing so provides further evidence that the Republicans not only are not acting on those real problems mentioned earlier but are in denial on another real issue that needs action—climate change. The scientific evidence of climate change is overwhelming, and the consensus is clear, and we have seen the impacts of climate change, virtually, every day in our country and around the world.

This week, the CBO, led by a Director appointed by the majority here, released a report that identified the effects of climate change as a potential risk to the Federal budget. According to that report, the cost of hurricane damage is projected to be \$35 billion more than it is today because of climate change.

The report stated:

“Human activities around the world, primarily the burning of fossil fuels and widespread changes in land use, are producing growing emissions of greenhouse gases.”

Climate change requires all of us, including the Republicans here who are in total denial, to come to our senses and to act on the challenge of climate change.

This sense of Congress resolution, like the second one, completely fails to meet that challenge. I urge its rejection.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman

from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague and friend on the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. BLACK, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 89, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

At a time when 80 percent of domestic energy consumption comes from natural gas, from oil, from coal, it is, clearly, counterproductive to make these necessary resources more expensive by imposing an indirect tax on these fuels. A carbon tax means higher utility bills for families, more expensive goods and services for consumers, decreased economic activity, and it would really hurt job creation. We already heard about the dismal numbers last week that were released—38,000 non-farm-related jobs.

Let me just be clear. When we were in the recession, one of the prime drivers economically that took us out of the recession was the shale revolution—a real energy renaissance in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this type of tax is not just a tax on carbon—it is a tax on working families; it is a tax on the American economy; it is a tax on American competitiveness; it is a tax on our energy security. It strikes right at the foundation of our national security. It is the wrong thing to do. It is a regressive tax. It hurts the people who are most dependent on fixed incomes—seniors. It hurts them most.

Why would we even consider doing this?

There are better ways to set up taxation for this country that meet our needs. I just don't understand why one would propose this type of tax, other than the fact that there is a radical environmental agenda, which would hurt manufacturing and American competitiveness. We can't do this. We need to grow this economy. We need growth around 3 to 4 percent minimum to create jobs, to let American business create value, to assert American leadership globally. We are not going to do this with a carbon tax. We won't do it. We need pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand this. A recent study by the Institute for Energy Policy found that over 60 percent of Americans oppose this type of idea.

I applaud Whip SCALISE for offering this sensible resolution because it then puts forth a very strong, affirmative statement that we are not going to dis-

arm the American economy, that we are not going to strike a blow at American competitiveness when we are struggling already as it is.

I am sick and tired of the fact that American leadership is eroding around the world. I am sick and tired of the fact that we are walking around with timidity. We ought to be embracing the concept of American leadership. This gives us an opportunity, based on American innovation and energy—the clearest example of which I know of American exceptionalism—to rewrite the rules of energy security based on open markets, transparent pricing, and diversity of supply source.

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

I am pleased to hear my friend from Louisiana with his impassioned presentation today; but his presentation, coming on the heels of what we all heard from the Prime Minister of India—calling for a low carbon, sustainable, innovative future—makes me sad.

If we would have had our economy take these issues seriously—maybe have a week of hearings—we would have been able to demonstrate to the gentleman with an impartial panel of independent experts all across the political spectrum—Conservative, Liberal, Republican, and Democrat—that a carbon tax, revenue neutral, is, actually, the key to the innovative future they want.

There are all sorts of ways to design a carbon tax, to, actually, enhance the role—the economic status—of low- and moderate-income people, but we never had a hearing on that. It is just simply dismissed as something that we can't do, but they have done it elsewhere in the world. If the committee had done its job, we would be dealing with facts, not hyperbole.

□ 0930

If the committee had done its job, we would have heard that we have very real challenges today to American security, which our Department of Defense has pointed out.

Climate change, despite denial from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, is a threat today to the American military posture. Climate change is disrupting industries like fishing. It is producing unprecedented flooding, forest fires, and a wildly unpredictable weather future. The reduction of arctic ice at unprecedented levels ought to be of concern to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Maybe if we had some open, honest hearings that were balanced and independent, that case would have been made and they may support it.

But whether or not they care about climate change and global warming, a carbon tax makes sense for American innovation, the economy, and our competitiveness. It is the areas of low-carbon energy that have seen the job growth. There are now more people

working in wind and solar than the coal industry by far. That is where the job growth has been undertaken.

A carbon tax would enhance America's global competitiveness. And if we had hearings, listening to independent experts across the board, that case would be made, and I don't think we would have this foolish resolution on the floor.

These are elements that would inject into our energy policy an even, balanced approach using market forces, which are much easier than some of the incentives that we have, which are important, which people on both sides of the aisle have supported in the past. But a carbon tax is a more effective way of achieving those objectives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sad that we didn't have that debate in committee. I am sad that we didn't hear from independent experts. I think of our friend Bob Inglis, former Congressperson, who is on a personal crusade working with the evangelical community about the merits of a carbon tax. It would have been great to have heard from Bob and others like him to be able to present a balanced picture and be able to deal with meaningful policy.

I still hope that someday, that time will come that our Ways and Means Committee actually takes the time to dive into one of the most important issues of the day and to examine one of the tools that independent experts all across the spectrum agree would be a solid addition and actually simplify the Tax Code while we can help people in low income and small business and provide incentives for America's global competitiveness, like we heard from the Prime Minister of India from that very rostrum just 2 days ago.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a colleague of mine and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK). We see eye to eye on almost everything in our lives, and it is really good to be able to stand here today and speak so strongly in favor of H. Con. Res. 89. I really do appreciate the passion and sincerity of my colleagues across the aisle.

What we are talking today is about policy. What we are talking about today is the all-important, unintended consequences that so often are put to blame for bad things that happen to American people. They are well intended, yes, at their conception, but very harmful.

We are talking about a carbon tax, \$10 a barrel on oil. And we are saying: Well, don't worry about that because that is going to be charged upstream. That is going to be charged when it is taken out of the ground.

But we all know that every single tax, every single cost is paid downstream.

What do I mean by that?

Every day hardworking Americans get up in the morning and want to put a roof over the heads of their families, food on the table, clothes on their back, and a little bit of money put away for their future. But every day we continue to come up with policies that somehow, although well intended, make it harder for them to make a living, make it harder for them to live the American Dream, make it harder for them to get ready for the future.

Now, I know there are always going to be existential threats. I get that. My grandson is afraid to get out of bed at night because he thinks there is a monster under it. He thinks that if you get up in the middle of the night, maybe there is somebody in the closet or maybe there is something else.

Now, I am not a climate change denier. Of course, the climate changes. I have seen it happen in my life. I have seen it where people say it is getting too cold and now it is getting too warm.

Well, you know what?

It just changes. I get that.

What doesn't change is the assault on the American people to pick up the tab on all of these costs. There is nothing that makes less sense to me than what we are doing. And back home where I come from, there is an old saying that goes something like this: Measure twice and cut once.

Why?

Because once you do that cut, it is permanent. That is why you want to measure twice to make sure that the cut you make is the right cut. That is why you need to take the policies that affect everyday American people and make sure that you are not hurting them.

Well intended, I get it. I know it is well intended. I just don't think the American people have to pay the brunt of this.

I am very aware of the Prime Minister of India being here Wednesday. And I also know that between India and China, that is where the greatest pollution comes from. I get it. I get it.

Putting \$10 a barrel on oil coming out of the ground just doesn't make sense. I would just like my friends on both sides of the aisle to think about somebody named Steven Jobs. Steven Jobs did not invent the PC because we taxed typewriters too high and caused the cost of that. Innovation, of course, is the answer. And we have seen great innovation.

I know where I am from in western Pennsylvania, that clean coal is real. But the President promised, when he was running as a candidate, that he would put those who chose to make electricity by burning coal out of business. So we regulate them to the point where it is no longer cost efficient to do that, but we keep moving that way.

The fact that 40,000 Pennsylvanians make a living that way, well, don't worry about that, they will have to find something else to do. You can go down to West Virginia and you can

hear where candidates told them: Listen, you are going to be out of business, but we will find something else for you to do and we will just get to that later.

Look, we have an opportunity today. This is a sense of Congress to tell the American people what it is that we think goes on with this policy. For far too long we have turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to the people who sent us here to represent them. We talk very loftily about what it is that we would like to see, how it is that we would like it to go, our dream for the future. But we forget that every day, hardworking American taxpayers get up, throw their feet out over the side of the bed, and go to work for a very particular reason: their families, their churches, their schools, their communities and, more importantly, all of America.

Well intended, yes. But the results would be devastating.

And who would pay this carbon tax? Who would pay this \$10 a barrel?

It would be any man or woman who has to go out and buy anything for his or her family. It would be reflected in the cost of everything we put on our backs and everything we put in our mouths. It would affect everything we do when we travel from one point to another, but we say it is necessary. It is necessary because we have to tax this so high that we drive people away from it.

I would hope that we could come together in America's House and do what is right for America's people, to do what is right for the people who sent us here to represent them because they are working so hard to make sure that there is a future for their children.

In the last month when we created one job for every 8,000 Americans—one job for every 8,000 Americans, are you kidding me?—in the greatest country the world has ever known, in a Nation that leads the world in defending freedom and liberty, in a Nation that knows that the best way to help others is through American participation—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I do want to make sure that this final point comes across: We can work together for solutions. We can work together to do the same things for the same people that we all came here to represent. I do not think that there are ill-intended ideas on the other side. I think they are well-intended. I just think they are wrong. I think they are wrong for the times, and I think they are wrong for the American people.

As I said earlier, where I am from, there are a lot of old adages. And one of them is: don't worry about the mule, just load the wagon.

I will tell you right now that the mule is trying to find a way to unhook

itself from the wagon because that load has gotten too heavy to pay. I know that the people who are loading the wagon think it is okay because at some point, that is going to have to be delivered somewhere. The truth of the matter is it is not.

We have put too heavy a burden on American taxpayers, hardworking American taxpayers, hardworking Americans. 1.4 million American lives have been sacrificed for the freedom and liberty not just of this country—our country and our Nation—but for the whole world. So I say let's be careful before we do these well-intended but careless things. Let's be careful before we turn our backs on the people who we actually represent here, and that is hardworking American people.

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

I couldn't agree more with my good friend from Butler, Pennsylvania, that we can actually come together and fashion solutions. That is why it is such a tragedy that this resolution comes to the floor without ever having our committee work on it, because we could have had hearings that could have narrowed those gaps.

I include in the RECORD a letter from six conservative advocates for climate change action.

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Later this week Congress will take up a resolution sponsored by Congressman Scalise (R-LA1) that expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the economy of the United States. We are concerned that this resolution offers a limited perspective on carbon taxes and is blind to the potential benefits of market-based climate policy. Legislation that incorporates a carbon tax could include regulatory and tax reforms to make the United States economy more competitive, innovative, and robust, benefiting both present and future generations.

We recognize that a carbon tax, like any tax, will impose economic costs. But climate change is also imposing economic costs. This resolution falls short by recognizing the cost of action without considering the cost of staying on our present policy course. There are, of course, uncertainties about the future cost of climate change and, likewise, the cost associated with a carbon tax (much would depend on program design and the pace and nature of technological progress). The need for action, however, is clear. A recent survey of economists who publish in leading peer-reviewed journals on these matters found that 93% believe that a meaningful policy response to climate change is warranted.

The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market-friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax. This would harness price signals, rather than regulations, to guide market response. That is why carbon pricing has the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private oil and gas companies in the world (the corporate entities among the most directly affected by climate policy).

In reaching a conclusion, this resolution neglects the fact that the United States already has a multiplicity of carbon taxes.

They are imposed, however, via dozens of federal and state regulations, are invisible to consumers, unevenly imposed across industrial sectors, unnecessarily costly, and growing in size and scope. The policy choice is not if we should price carbon emissions, but how.

Unfortunately, this resolution also fails to differentiate between proposals that would impose carbon taxes on top of existing regulations (chiefly the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan), and proposals that would impose carbon taxes in place of those existing regulations. Conservatives and free market advocates should embrace the latter, regardless of how they view climate risks.

An economy-wide carbon tax that replaces existing regulatory interventions could reduce the cost of climate policy and deregulate the economy. It could also provide revenue to support pro-growth tax reform, including corporate income or payroll tax cuts, which could dramatically reduce overall costs on the economy. Revenues could be applied to compensate those who suffer the most from higher energy costs; the poor, the elderly, and individuals and families living on fixed incomes.

Unfortunately, none of those options are presently available because Members of Congress have neglected opportunities to design and debate market-friendly climate policies in legislation. Instead, they have yielded authority in climate policy design to the Executive Branch. By discouraging a long-overdue discussion about sensible carbon pricing, this resolution frustrates the development of better policy.

Sincerely,

JERRY TAYLOR,
President, Niskanen Center.

BOB INGLIS,
Executive Director, RepublicEn.

APARNA MATHUR,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

ELI LEHRER,
President, R Street Institute.

THE REV. MITCHELL C. HESCOX,
President, Evangelical Environmental Network.

ALAN VIARD,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania could have heard them talk about the need for action and how you can design a carbon tax that meets the objectives he is talking about, but we never did that. We didn't listen to experts across the spectrum—Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, economists, and scientists—to be able to examine the facts.

Instead, we have a cartoon proposal that they are arguing against as opposed to something that we could have worked on together that is promoted by most of the independent experts in the field. And someday within our lifetime this Congress will consider and, I think, probably approve.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Seattle, Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who has looked at some of these challenges around the globe.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I come to speak on the floor, I think I

am in the House of the deniers. Now, in 2007, that liberal journal, National Geographic, had an article called "The Big Thaw." And it says:

"It's no surprise that a warming climate is melting the world's glaciers and polar ice. But no one expected it to happen this fast."

That was in 2007. That was 9 years ago.

I was taken, along with GERRY CONNOLLY, up to the Arctic with the Norwegian Government. They are worried about what is happening.

This resolution is just burying your head in the sand. I think you are thinking that if you put your head in the sand long enough, it will go away and, when you pull your head out, it won't be there.

The CBO just put a report out: Texas, Louisiana, and Florida are going to have hurricane damage that is unbelievable. FEMA already accounts for 45 percent of money spent on hurricane damage, \$95 billion since 2000.

Now, if you think the insurance companies are going to keep insuring against hurricanes, you have another thing coming. At some point, they are going to say: We are not doing hurricane insurance in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and a whole bunch of other places. That is the economics.

You say: Let's not pay anything right now, let's not change anything, let's not work on it.

But if we don't work on it, we are going to pay later. I am old enough to remember a FRAM commercial on the television. It was an air cleaner on your car, and it said: Pay me now or pay me later. And this is what this is about today.

Now, there are things going on in this country which just absolutely boggle my mind. In North Carolina, the assembly got together and they said: You know what? We are not going to spend any money to measure the sea levels.

Now, you have hundreds of miles of coastline in North Carolina where the sea is rising and property values are going to be lost. We are talking money here. We are not talking soft, liberal stuff. This is real, and people don't want to even look at it.

In Florida and Wisconsin, they took a novel approach and they said: We are not even going to use the words "climate change" in anything.

Now, here in Congress, the climate deniers take many forms, from blocking the words "social cost of carbon" to directing the Department of Defense to ignore climate change. All the while, the DOD itself highlights the threat of climate change to national security. Republicans like to talk about national security.

□ 0945

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. If you are serious about talking about national security,

you better start talking about the climate change that is going on in the world. Sea lanes across the North Pole are coming, boats are already coming, we are building the Panama Canal wider, and it is opening up on the north end of the globe.

Now, this absurdity cannot last, and we have got to begin to do what Mr. BLUMENAUER suggested. There have to be hearings. Bob Inglis, I knew him when he was here. God, he was a wild-eyed liberal. I couldn't believe what a wild-eyed liberal he was. He came down here talking about a carbon tax. I had a carbon tax. Mr. LARSON had a carbon tax.

This is not a partisan issue, Democrat versus Republican; it is whether or not you are going to look at the science of what is happening on the globe. I urge people to vote "no" on this. You will come back and do it in a couple of years.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding. I am proud to bring forward this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that expresses the strong sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

If you look at what this administration has done through radical rules and regulations, through all of its agencies, starting with the EPA, with the IRS, with the NLRB, the whole alphabet soup of Federal agencies that every morning wake up trying to figure out how to make it harder for our economy to get moving again, how to make it harder for people to create jobs in America, frankly, the results of these radical regulations are shifting and running jobs away, out of our country to foreign countries like China, like India, and they want to keep it going.

This is not a new concept, Mr. Speaker. They tried this years ago when they brought through the cap-and-trade bill. Passed out of the House, it couldn't even pass in the Senate when they had a supermajority in the Senate with 60 votes because it was such a detrimental idea that would devastate our economy. Yet even with that defeat, President Obama still tries to come back with a carbon tax through other means, whether it is regulations or whether it is superimposed carbon taxes through the EPA and some of the other things they are doing.

We have had hearings on this, Mr. Speaker. There is data all around that confirms how devastating a carbon tax would be to the United States economy. You can just look at what some of the outside groups that look at this said. The National Association of Manufacturers, the people that make things in America, have confirmed we would lose more than a million jobs in America if a carbon tax was imposed.

Where would those jobs go? They would go to countries, ironically, that

don't have the good environmental standards we already have. So they would go to countries like China and India where, if you are concerned about carbon going into the atmosphere, the things that they do to produce the same things we produce here in America, it creates more than five times the amount of carbon in those countries. So you are shifting jobs out of America to send it to countries where you would actually create more carbon.

They talk about somehow being able to create policy that will stop hurricanes and change the sea level rising, for goodness sake, as if some policy is going to do that.

By the way, the result of their policies will increase carbon in the Earth's atmosphere. But let's not even talk about that. Let's actually talk about the track record of this administration that now wants to control the Earth's temperature.

They spent over \$500 million and couldn't even create a Web site to take your health insurance requests, healthcare.gov. Remember that? Well, this same group now thinks they can control the Earth's temperature through radical policies.

Again, let's look at the devastating impact these policies would have. They wouldn't work, first of all, but they would have a devastating impact on the middle class of this country. The Congressional Budget Office, our own Congressional Budget Office that looked at this, said a carbon tax would actually hit low-income people the hardest, even harder than high-income people.

It would have a devastating impact on those people who are least able to afford it because it would increase the cost of everything they do. It would increase your food costs at the grocery store. It would increase, of course, what you pay at the pump. It would increase your electricity prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. The Heritage Foundation looked at this and said that this kind of carbon tax would actually increase the cost of everything that families buy by over \$1,400 per family. Families are going to pay \$1,400 more every year for the cost of a carbon tax that the other side wants to defend. And to yield what? To just yield an opportunity for countries like China and India to grow their economies at the expense of ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you look at what they are trying to do—and, again, if you want to do this, bring it forward as an idea in legislation. They tried it with cap-and-trade, and it got defeated when Democrats controlled everything. There is bipartisanship on this issue, and the bipartisanship is in opposition to a carbon tax.

So why don't we go on record and be very clear about it, not just that it is bad policy, but also to reaffirm how

devastating it would be for the United States economy.

It shouldn't move forward. The President needs to stop this radical agenda and instead focus on reversing the depressing economic activity that we have seen in this country since he has been President because of these kinds of policies.

Let's get real economic growth. Let's bring those jobs back to the United States. Let's reject a carbon tax.

I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed my friend from Louisiana's impassioned presentation. It is too bad that the Committee on Ways and Means didn't actually sit down and go through the elements that would be in a balanced carbon tax. He is debating a cartoon version, not one that we worked on.

I am going to yield, in a moment, to one of the gentlemen who, earlier in this carbon debate several Congresses ago, has been involved with crafting a realistic carbon tax.

We had the reference to the inability to move the cap-and-trade, which I don't think is as good as a carbon tax. It failed because there were a minority of the Senate who were opposed to allowing it to go forward. It wasn't that we didn't have a majority that were interested. In the Senate, you can have a veto with 41 people who are decided that they are not going to allow things to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). He has been a student of a carbon tax, who has listened to those people across the political spectrum and has been a champion of a reasonable, thoughtful approach to promote American innovation.

I would just point out the areas where we have had the greatest job growth in the energy sector have not been petroleum or coal. It has been solar and wind. A carbon tax would help accelerate that by leveling the playing field and allowing the forces of economics to dictate the next steps.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be on the floor and join in this debate.

I must, along with my colleague from Oregon, express frustration. This body should be about the vitality of ideas. Whatever those ideas are, in a democracy, there ought to be the willingness to express them.

Mr. BLUMENAUER has detailed, at length, the lack of public hearings. Listen, I get it. This is a messaging opportunity. This has no force of law. All this does is say what the sensibilities are of the Congress.

Now, what does the public think of the sensibilities of the Congress? What the public thinks is that we are all bluster and no solution and that we never take the time to sit down and measure twice and then cut. We just simply don't do that in our committees.

And so the vitality of ideas, a very noble idea expressed by a Republican, Mr. Inglis, many sessions ago and embraced by many conservative economists in the Reagan, in the Nixon, and in the Bush administrations about providing certainty in terms of what we need to do and a revenue stream that has this at its core: tax pollution—tax pollution—at its source, and pass the savings on to the consumers.

We know the volumes that are produced. We know the science behind this. There should be an open and clear-eyed debate on this; but not only a debate about the pros and cons, but how about something refreshing for the American people—a solution. It may not be the bill that I proposed or that Bob Inglis proposed or that any number of people have embraced, but you have major companies, including major oil companies that will be taxed, say, no, this is a sensible way for us to embrace this, and we are enjoined by the very people who this would tax and by conservative economists who say, yeah, we ought to take a look at this not only from the standpoint of the certainty that it will provide, but the known certainty of what pollution does. And it is not just about climate change. It is about the health of the air that we breathe, what we are poisoning in the atmosphere for our children, what happens with respect to the effects of asthma and what happens in terms of the people in coal mines from black lung disease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. These debilitating diseases scream out for the Congress not to have a message opportunity that may or may not advantage one side or the other in the realm of politics, but how about a solution?

How about us doing what MIKE KELLY suggested, to work together in the committee to come up with a positive solution as to how to address this? Pass the savings along to the consumer. Develop a revenue system that will, in fact, allow us to rebuild our country that is crumbling around us.

Let's take those steps and the responsibility that we all have to the citizens to provide them with solutions, not bluster.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BOUSTANY on these two concurrent resolutions that are being offered today. I appreciate the time.

I recall in this debate here that there was a whole movie back in the 1960s called "If It's Tuesday, This Must Be Belgium." Well, if it is tax-raising time, this must be Washington, D.C., because there are more schemes all the

time to come hit not just big, evil corporations and big energy producers; this always ends up hitting the bottom line of American working families and the economy.

The President's plan to raise a tax on each and every barrel of oil produced by \$10 translates out to 25 cents at the pump. We heard earlier some of my colleagues talk about what the carbon tax would mean to working families—much more than they can afford in this bad economy and a time where the jobless rate is higher than is even measurable by this administration.

This continues the antidomestically produced energy narrative of this administration. It only hurts U.S. energy jobs and takes productive U.S. fields, such as what we have in California, out of production that are on the margins of being profitable. Instead of having domestically produced energy, we are going to shift more of that burden to other sources: foreign energy or the need for exploring more here or offshore.

Why don't we allow the profitable energy and oilfields we have in California and this country to continue to be productive and not hamper them with another additional tax that will take them out of production and rely more on foreign oil?

Now, how popular is this amongst regular people? In my own district, we conducted a survey recently where people actually took time to send postcards back into my office that came in at approximately a 90 percent rate in opposition to this \$10-per-barrel oil tax, which they understand means 25 cents, again, per gallon at the gas pump.

This really, really hurts all Americans. It hurts working families, people on the lower end of the income scale, but even more so, districts like mine that are very rural and all the other rural districts around this country where people have to travel farther to get to their work, to take their kids to school or to healthcare appointments, their ball games, maybe even save up occasionally in this economy for a travel vacation they might like to take and visit the beauty of America.

□ 1000

So the rural economy is even more devastated by this—the rural economy that also would be productive with energy—with these schemes that are being pondered.

Additionally, there are other ideas, like a tax on every mile driven, which is being contemplated at some level here federally as well as in my own State. Tax people for every mile they drive, tax them at the gas pump, tax them for carbon. Again, this hits real people in America, not just some idea of a big, evil corporation.

The answer in Washington always seems to be more government and taxation that hurts working families. Perhaps first, these dollars should be channeled into projects that people can use. Not more environmental projects, but

more highways, more bridges, more water storage. Not boondoggles like we have in California, such as the high-speed rail money pit, or the cost of frivolous environmental measures that drive up the costs of construction projects and sometimes even completely eliminate them.

We talk about a green economy a lot, especially on that side of the floor over there. Why don't we focus on a green economy that is not based on importing solar panels from China or wind machines from Europe? How about we get out and do the forestry that is needed to be done to thin the forests?

We are talking about the air we breathe. Each summer, for months, the air is brown in northern California—lots of California—and lots of the Western States from forests that are burning because they are not managed, because they are not thinned. Instead, they are overgrown.

That would be a green economy. We could turn this into biomass if you want to have real energy that works for the equation of renewable energy. Channel that effort into that instead of chasing these wind machines and solar panels.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I support H. Con. Res. 112 and H. Con. Res. 89, to send a message that this is more job-killing taxes and schemes that will fix our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LAMALFA. It is the freedom to explore for and produce low-cost domestic energy that will help Americans and our economy to recover once again.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a gentleman who brings his private sector business success to commonsense solutions in policy.

Mr. DELANEY. I want to thank my friend from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, my friends on the other side of the aisle are making four points.

The first point they are making is that they don't believe in science, because the science around climate change is unassailable.

The second point they are making is that they don't worry about American prosperity, because from an economic perspective and national security, the military, we should be reminded, has called climate change a threat multiplier. This is a very significant risk to long-term American prosperity.

The third point they are making is that they don't believe in the power of markets to change behavior at its core. They are not acknowledging the power of a capitalistic economic model to change people's behavior.

And the fourth thing they are saying is that they don't trust U.S. businesses to innovate into opportunities and around challenges.

These are extraordinary statements. And contrast that with our approach. I have a piece of legislation called the Tax Pollution, Not Profits Act, which puts in place a carbon pricing mechanism, which has been proven to be the most effective way—more effective than a regulatory approach—to change behavior and reverse some of the trends and bend the curve on climate change.

We take the revenues that are generated by that bill and we use it to offset all of the costs that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say exist through tax credits to individuals. We set aside money to take care of the retirement of all the coal workers in the United States of America for the rest of their lives, and then we take the remaining revenues and we pay for a significant and substantial cut to business taxes.

So this piece of legislation, unlike what my colleagues are proposing, has a double bottom line. It will reverse the negative effects of climate change and the threat to our prosperity, and it is a pro-growth policy because it puts money back in the economy and it makes a bet on U.S. businesses that they can innovate and grow into opportunities and around challenges. It is reflective of the view of businesses in 2016, not the view of businesses from the 1950s.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my friend, who has spent a lot of time thinking about these environmental issues and acting on them.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to these two resolutions.

The first one, H. Con. Res. 89, says that a carbon tax would necessarily be detrimental to the United States economy. This is false. Plain and simple.

The truth is that we can and we must design carbon pollution reduction strategies to spur advancements in clean energy technology, reduce carbon pollution, and fight climate change.

These strategies, including a carbon tax or a fee, can easily be designed to be revenue-neutral, and we know from long experience at the State and Federal level that fighting pollution is good for jobs and good for the economy. California is a perfect example. If anyone has questions about this, come to California, where you will see that climate leadership is actually also good economics.

It doesn't seem to matter to my colleagues who have offered these resolutions. In the year 2016, they continue to deny the reality of climate change. Literally, our friends across the aisle

are the last policymakers on the planet Earth to hold this view. Even in other oil-producing companies, the conservative parties in those countries acknowledge climate change, and they have positions in their party platforms that acknowledge we need to do something about it.

Now, the other resolution, H. Con. Res. 112, similarly demonstrates a lack of leadership by opposing President Obama's proposal to finance infrastructure investments. Those who don't support the President's infrastructure financing mechanism, I think, have a responsibility to offer their own solutions for our infrastructure crisis. This bill doesn't do that. Instead, it simply describes a desire to support Big Oil.

So here we have it: climate denial; the party that doesn't want to fill vacancies on the Supreme Court; a party that doesn't want to do its job to respond to public health crises, like Zika; a party that prefers not to offer any solutions on our critical infrastructure funding needs.

Is this how we are going to make America great again?

I don't think so. Let's move forward in the 21st century and not let our energy and infrastructure policies be driven by 18th century thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose both of these bills.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we are here debating H. Con. Res. 89, which purports to express the sense of Congress. But really, nothing could be further from the truth, because what it does is express the nonsense of Congress.

We are here witnessing the latest example of climate denial brought to the floor by the majority. The entire world agrees that climate change is a pressing problem, except this extreme wing of the Republican Party.

Climate change is already affecting people across the globe. As Dr. MCDERMOTT from Washington pointed out already, the nonpartisan CBO recently noted the increasing and enormous budgetary impact future storms will have on our Nation, and attributed the majority of this problem to climate change. And I am here to tell you these costs will fall disproportionately on low-income people, low-income communities, and people of color in our country.

Are we here on the floor debating a real solution brought forward by the majority? Are we here having hearings?

No, we are not. We are here debating a resolution cutting off a solution that economists from all corners of the Earth believe is the most efficient way to address climate change.

A properly designed price on carbon can improve the overall performance of the U.S. economy, protect competitive-

ness, create jobs, promote investment, and lead us toward American energy independence.

The gentleman from Oregon is right: instead of debating this resolution, we should be having hearings discussing ways that we can sensibly lead the transition to renewable fuels and clean energy sources.

Even big oil companies like Royal Dutch Shell and BP have voiced support for carbon taxes in recent years, acknowledging that climate change is real and that we should be doing something about it.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 89, and let's start a real debate, a sensible debate on this existential threat to our Nation and to the globe.

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

I really appreciate this little window of an opportunity to talk about a carbon tax. I hope that the day will come when we will have an opportunity to have that discussion in a robust and thoughtful way in our Ways and Means Committee. Heaven knows it is important.

Lots of people have opinions and ideas. I think we would benefit from it, but I hope that we will have that discussion after we hear from a balanced, wide-ranging group of independent experts across the spectrum to be able to give us meaningful information about it.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Greg Dotson, who is the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS,

Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Later this week, the U.S. House of Representatives will consider H. Con. Res. 89, a resolution that rejects the pricing of carbon pollution. On behalf of the Center for American Progress, I am writing to urge you to oppose this resolution. It is time for Congress to develop sensible policies that address the serious and potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change. Science informs us that we need an urgent solution to this problem. Although the current Administration has made historic progress on climate change, it is clear that we need to do more to achieve additional carbon pollution reductions and lead the world in responding to this global challenge.

Top economic advisors to both Democratic and Republican Presidents have expressed their support for putting a price on carbon as an effective and efficient approach for reducing pollution. Joseph Stiglitz, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) under President Bill Clinton, has stated, "Economic efficiency requires that those who generate emissions pay the cost, and the simplest way of forcing them to do so is through a carbon tax." Gregory Mankiw, former Chairman of the CEA under President George W. Bush, has stated, "Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."

In fact, carbon pollution is already priced in a significant portion of the world. In total, about 40 national jurisdictions and more than 20 cities, states, and regions on

five continents—representing almost a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions—have placed a price on carbon. In the United States, 25 percent of the population lives in a jurisdiction where carbon pollution is currently priced and where one-third of the country's economic activity takes place. The price on carbon in California is the highest of any state in the country at almost \$13 per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent, and yet the California economy is projected to grow at a faster pace than the rest of the United States over the next two years.

In recent years, momentum to expand the adoption of carbon pricing policies has been growing. More than 400 investors with more than \$24 trillion in assets have called on governments to establish "stable, economically meaningful carbon pricing." Already, more than 1,000 businesses apply a price on carbon to inform their investments and operations or plan to do so in the next two years. In addition, at the United Nations climate talks in Paris last December, governments, businesses, and nongovernmental organizations announced the new Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition to accelerate and expand the adoption of carbon pricing worldwide.

In order to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, the United States needs to consider all possible tools at its disposal, including the effective market-based mechanisms of carbon pricing. Members of Congress need to work together on a bipartisan basis to find ways to cut carbon pollution rather than advance polarizing measures that take useful tools off the table. I urge you to reject this ill-advised resolution.

Sincerely,

GREG DOTSON,
Vice President for Energy Policy,
Center for American Progress.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Let me just read a couple of items from Mr. Dotson's letter.

He points out that "top economic advisors to both Democratic and Republican Presidents have expressed their support for putting a price on carbon as an effective and efficient approach for reducing pollution."

He cites Gregory Mankiw, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President George W. Bush, who says: "Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."

"In fact, carbon pollution is already priced in a significant portion of the world. In total, about 40 national jurisdictions and more than 20 cities, states, and regions on five continents—representing almost a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions—have placed a price on carbon. In the United States, 25 percent of the population lives in jurisdictions where carbon pollution is currently priced and where one-third of the country's economic activity takes place."

That is in America right now. There is no acknowledgment of that in this debate. We could have talked about that in the committee.

"The price on carbon in California," referenced by my friend, Mr. HUFFMAN, "is the highest of any state in the country at almost \$13 per ton . . . yet the California economy is projected to grow at a faster pace than the rest of the United States over the next two years."

They reference the fact that "more than 400 investors with more than \$24

trillion in assets have called on governments to establish 'stable, economically meaningful carbon pricing.' Already, more than 1,000 businesses apply a price on carbon to inform their investments and operations or plan to do so in the next two years. In addition, at the United Nations climate talks in Paris last December, governments, business, nongovernmental organizations announced the new Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition to accelerate and expand the adoption of carbon pricing worldwide," in keeping with what we heard from Prime Minister Modi in this Chamber just 2 days ago.

□ 1015

Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle are not involved with our being able to discuss this in depth, being able to bring in the experts, being able to work together to design a pricing mechanism that avoids some of the cartoon characteristics that they establish here. We had that chance, and we haven't done it.

But this will not be the last word. This meaningless resolution will undoubtedly pass today. It is not going to have any impact in terms of the long term. The long term, we are on a path to price carbon, and we have the capacity to do so in a thoughtful and an effective way, like the conservative leaders, whose correspondence I put into the RECORD earlier, suggest.

It can be revenue neutral. It can be effective. It can help reverse the more damaging effects of climate change, and it is a way to promote economic opportunity and global competitiveness.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on this.

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

You know, although my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made this a conversation about climate change—which I agree that we can have and we should have in another venue, and that is in the committee structure—this is about a President who decided on his own, without coming to Congress to discuss this tax, this \$10 tax on a barrel of gasoline, because he was unable to get this carbon tax, when, by the way, the House and the Senate were both in his own party, he couldn't even get this passed. So this is a discussion for another day about climate change, which we can all have, and have in a very gentle way.

However, let me sum up what this would do if this were to pass, the impact that this carbon tax would have on the American people:

It would drive up the cost of energy, which would most affect those at the lower income.

It would destroy well-paying jobs in the energy industry, well-paying jobs. Right now, when we look at what our loss of jobs are here in this country, we have the lowest rate of jobs in 6 years.

Number three, it would directly hit working families the most, those at the very lowest income, and especially those who are elderly.

None of these help to grow our economy and get our economy moving or people back to work or raise their incomes. Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 89.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from opponents of H. Con. Res. 89:

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 89. This resolution is the latest example of climate action denial being advanced by extreme members of the House of Representatives. Instead of listening to the national security experts, faith leaders, scientists, energy innovators, health professionals and many others who are sounding the alarm on climate change and have implored our nation's elected officials to support action, Rep. Scalise and the co-sponsors of H. Con. Res. 89 appear to be looking for another way to say "no." The sponsors of the resolution have no plan to address climate change and have opposed every proposal to do something about the planet's gravest environmental problem. Many of them don't even accept the scientific fact that climate change is occurring.

H. Con. Res. 89 ignores the huge costs that our country is already experiencing due to climate change—costs that fall disproportionately on low-income communities and communities of color. It is clear this resolution is meant to put the interests of the polluting fossil fuel companies ahead of the American public's best interest.

Instead of holding another just-for-show vote against climate action, the U.S. House of Representatives should be debating how it can best position our country to lead the global transition to clean energy sources. Last year more than half of the world's new energy came from renewable energy sources and the landmark Paris climate agreement sends a powerful signal to investors that this trend toward low-carbon energy will accelerate. More and more countries and hundreds of forward-looking companies are adopting policies to limit carbon pollution and correct the markets failure to capture the health and environmental costs of burning fossil fuels.

At a time when the American taxpayer is already paying to move vulnerable American communities to higher ground because of climate-driven sea level rise, we have no time to waste on empty resolutions that seek to take potential climate solutions off the table.

Sincerely,

Center for Biological Diversity, Clean Water Action, Earthjustice, Environment America, Environmental Defense Action Fund, Fresh Energy, League of Conservation Voters, League of Women Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Union of Concerned Scientists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED \$10 TAX ON EVERY BARREL OF OIL

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

Whereas raising revenue and spending money are powers reserved to Congress by the Constitution;

Whereas according to global economists, the United States oil and gas industry is currently experiencing the worst industry decline since similar commodity price collapses in the 1980s and 1990s forced oil companies to slash payrolls and dividends;

Whereas global oil production exceeds demand by more than one million barrels a day, and Iran has promised to provide an additional 500,000 barrels a day to the world market, now that several sanctions have been lifted after the recent implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action;

Whereas the price of a barrel of oil is currently around \$30, less than a third of the \$90-plus it was selling for 18 months ago; which would mean the President's proposal would be equivalent to a 33.3 percent tax, making the United States Federal excise tax on oil the highest of any domestic product;

Whereas this tax could translate into as much as an additional 25 cents on a gallon of gas, when the Federal tax on gasoline is currently 18.40 cents per gallon;

Whereas the oil and gas industry accounts for significant employment and is an even more significant driver of investment spending and growth along the supply chain, ranging from aggregates to steelmaking and specialist equipment;

Whereas more than 258,000 people employed in oil and gas extraction and support activities globally, including more than 100,000 across the United States, have lost their jobs since October 2014;

Whereas every lost oil and gas job leads to an additional 3.43 jobs cut in other sectors;

Whereas that means the 114,000 job losses in the oil and gas sector wiped out an additional 391,000 jobs in other sectors last year and sliced economic growth to about 2.1 percent from 2.6 percent;

Whereas more layoffs are virtually certain in the months ahead in oil and gas production, as well as along the supply chain and in petroleum-dependent economies, as the continued price slump filters through to even less drilling activity;

Whereas the number of rigs drilling for oil and gas has fallen from over 1,900 in October 2014, to 744 at the end of November 2015, and just 619 at the end of January 2016, according to oilfield services firm Baker Hughes;

Whereas manufacturers, for example, announced 37,221 layoffs in the past 12 months;

Whereas shipments of steel in the United States—used to make oil and gas pipelines—were down 11.4 percent through the first 11 months of 2015 and the industry announced more than 12,000 layoffs during the past year, according to the American Steel and Iron Institute;

Whereas believing that oil companies will pay the fee with no effect on consumer prices requires also believing that the producers won't pass their increased cost on to refiners, who won't in turn pass their costs on to the public; in other words, requires suspending belief in basic economics;

Whereas this tax could also put American oil companies, at a competitive disadvantage with foreign oil companies, as imported oil may not face the same treatment;

Whereas the domestic midstream and downstream stages of oil and gas production will be at a competitive disadvantage to their global competitors due to a \$10 higher cost for every barrel of oil;

Whereas in combination with a stronger dollar, slowing growth in international markets, and an overaccumulation of inventories through much of the economy, the oil slump is creating headwinds for manufacturers, freight firms, and the wider economy; and

Whereas the oil and natural gas industry anchors our economy in terms of jobs, economic activity, and even State and local tax revenue in a challenging price environment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress finds that—

(1) any new tax placed on the struggling oil and gas industry will further prevent growth and development throughout the sector and encourage additional layoffs; and

(2) the effect of a \$10 tax on each barrel of oil sold in the United States—

(A) would raise the price of oil, and by extension gasoline; and

(B) would result in a decrease in the consumption of oil.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a new tax should not be placed on oil, and

(2) in considering future policy, Congress should carefully review the detrimental impacts of placing any new taxes on any industry that has seen a slash in jobs, revenue, and production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 112, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Obama administration, in its budget proposal, proposed a \$10.25 tax on each barrel of oil. This will severely harm

America's already struggling energy industry, but it will have a very detrimental impact throughout the American economy, and that is why I introduced H. Con. Res. 112, sending a very clear message that Congress and the American people refuse to allow this administration to fund an environmental agenda on the backs of working families.

It is pretty simple. At \$10.25 per barrel of oil, this increase would not only add significantly to the cost of a gallon of gasoline at the pump, certainly disproportionately hurting fixed-income families, seniors, and so forth, it would also have a detrimental impact on job creation, on wages, and on the Nation's overall economic health.

This also would effectively act as an export tax on oil, just as we opened up the door to export crude oil to allow American producers to have market access worldwide, just like our Iranian opponents worldwide currently have the luxury to do.

Why would we tie up the hands of American energy producers and allow the Iranians and OPEC to dominate world markets? Wrong.

Secondly, at a time when, in Louisiana and Texas and other States on the coast, we understand how important our environment, our economy and energy policies are, we are looking to use revenue sharing to help us rebuild coastline and marsh and replenish our beaches, the administration opposes this. They have listed that in their budget proposal.

This tax is a tax on hardworking American families. It is a tax on American competitiveness; it is a tax on American innovation; it is a tax on our energy security; and it is a tax on the very foundation of our national security.

Now, the oil and gas industry has watched as market conditions have changed because of slow growth globally—low demand and abundant supply thanks to American innovation, largely. We have seen the oil price drop from \$115 a barrel in November of 2014 to as low as \$27 a barrel in January 2016. Right now, prices are hovering around \$48, \$49, \$50 a barrel. This industry is struggling. This is the industry that took us out of recession with job creation and economic growth.

Now, I know in my home State of Louisiana, just last year, we lost 11,700 jobs alone in Louisiana in the oil and gas sector, 5,500 in my hometown of Lafayette alone. Even worse, globally, over 250,000 people have lost their jobs.

Of course, if you look at what happened in the first quarter of this year, the revised statistics on economic growth, 0.8 percent. How is American business going to create value and jobs with that kind of growth, that kind of private sector growth?

Not only that, just last week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics release showed