- 1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
- 2 RPTS ALDINGER
- 3 HIF119.000
- 4 MARKUP ON H.R. 2042, THE RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT; AND
- 5 H.R. 2045, THE TARGETING ROGUE AND OPAQUE LETTERS (TROL) ACT
- 6 OF 2015
- 7 WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2015
- 8 House of Representatives,
- 9 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 10 Washington, D.C.

11 The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m., in 12 Room 2123 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred 13 Upton [Chairman of the Committee] presiding. Members present: Representatives Upton, Barton, 14 15 Whitfield, Shimkus, Pitts, Walden, Murphy, Burgess, 16 Blackburn, Scalise, Latta, McMorris Rodgers, Harper, Lance, 17 Guthrie, Olson, McKinley, Pompeo, Kinzinger, Griffith, 18 Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Ellmers, Bucshon, Flores, Brooks,

19	Mullin, Hudson, Collins, Cramer, Pallone, Rush, Eshoo, Green,
20	DeGette, Capps, Doyle, Schakowsky, Butterfield, Matsui,
21	Castor, Sarbanes, McNerney, Welch, Lujan, Tonko, Yarmuth,
22	Clarke, Loebsack, Schrader, Kennedy, and Cardenas.
23	Staff present: Nick Abraham, Legislative Associate,
24	Energy and Power; Gary Andres, Staff Director; Charlotte
25	Baker, Deputy Communications Director; Ray Baum, Senior
26	Policy Advisor for Communications and Technology; Leighton
27	Brown, Press Assistant; Allison Busbee, Policy Coordinator,
28	Energy and Power; Karen Christian, General Counsel; James
29	Decker, Policy Coordinator, Commerce, Manufacturing, and
30	Trade; Graham Dufault, Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and
31	Trade; Melissa Froelich, Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing,
32	and Trade; Tom Hassenboehler, Chief Counsel, Energy and
33	Power; Brittany Havens, Oversight Associate, Oversight and
34	Investigations; Kirby Howard, Legislative Clerk; A.T.
35	Johnson, Policy Coordinator, Energy and Power; Peter Kielty,
36	Deputy General Counsel; Paul Nagle, Chief Counsel, Commerce,
37	Manufacturing, and Trade; Mary Neumayr, Senior Energy
38	Counsel; Tim Pataki, Professional Staff Member; Graham
39	Pittman, Legislative Clerk; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff
40	Member, Oversight; Olivia Trusty, Professional Staff,
41	Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Greg Watson, Staff

42 Assistant; Jessica Wilkerson, Oversight Associate, Oversight 43 and Investigations; Michelle Ash, Democratic Chief Counsel, 44 Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Jen Berenholz, Democratic 45 Chief Clerk; Christine Brennan, Democratic Press Secretary; 46 Jeff Carroll, Democratic Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel, 47 Democratic Deputy Clerk; Lisa Goldman, Democratic Counsel; 48 Michael Goo, Democratic Chief Counsel, Energy and 49 Environment; Caitlin Haberman, Democratic Professional Staff 50 Member; Brendan Hennessey, Democratic Policy and Research 51 Advisor; Ashley Jones, Democratic Director, Outreach and Member Services; Rick Kessler, Democratic Senior Advisor and 52 53 Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Adam Lowenstein, 54 Democratic Policy Analyst; John Marshall, Democratic Policy Coordinator; Tim Robinson, Democratic Chief Counsel; and Ryan 55 56 Skukowski, Democratic Policy Analyst.

- 57 H.R. 2042

58 The {Chairman.} So the committee will come to order. 59 At the conclusion of opening statements yesterday, the 60 chair called up H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, and 61 the bill was open for amendment at any point. Are there any 62 bipartisan amendments to the bill? Seeing none, are there 63 any other amendments? 64 Mr. {Tonko.} Yes. 65 The {Chairman.} Answer is yes. Mr. {Tonko.} Mr. Tonko to start--66 67 The {Chairman.} Mr. Tonko, do you have an amendment? 68 Mr. {Tonko.} Yes, Mr. Chair, I do. 69 The {Chairman.} And the clerk will report the title of 70 the amendment. 71 The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2042, Ratepayer 72 Protection Act of 2015, offered by Mr. Tonko of New York. 73 [The amendment of Mr. Tonko follows:]

The {Chairman.} And the amendment will be considered as read. And the gentleman will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment, and the staff will distribute the amendment.

79 Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a question for Counsel, but I would also be happy to leave--happy to have the chair or the subcommittee chair answer. Under the bill, are there any standards that apply to a governor's decision to opt-out of a federal plan?

84 The {Chairman.} Mary?

85 {Counsel.} The bill sets out a process for a governor 86 to make a determination, including a consultation with other 87 state officials within the state.

88 Mr. {Tonko.} Are there standards in that?

89 {Counsel.} There are not specific standards set forth.
90 Mr. {Tonko.} Okay, I know a governor has to make a
91 determination that implementation of the federal plan will
92 cause an adverse ratepayer or reliability impact, but--

93 {Counsel.} Um-hum.

94 Mr. {Tonko.} --I don't believe--is there a judicial 95 review of that determination?

96 {Counsel.} Um-hum. There are standards set forth for

97 the governor's determination in the legislation.

98 Mr. {Tonko.} But is there a judicial review? 99 {Counsel.} There is not an explicit provision--100 Mr. {Tonko.} Okay. 101 {Counsel.} --triggering judicial review. 102 Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you. Well, I believe that, you 103 know, we need to know if that -- if there would be a judicial 104 review, would it be in state or federal court, what standards 105 would apply, would EPA have to develop a federal plan or 106 would a governor be able to make a determination to opt-out 107 before EPA developed a federal plan. 108 So with that, I do have that amendment at the desk, and 109 my amendment would make the governor's decision to opt-out of 110 a federal plan subject to judicial review. It would also 111 strike Section 2 of the bill, which automatically extends 112 compliance times for the EPA Clean Power Plan by however long the litigation takes, regardless of the merits or outcome of 113 114 the legal challenges. 115 Mr. Chair, the underlying bill allows--{Voice.} Mr. Chair--116

117 Mr. {Tonko.} --a governor to opt-out--

118 The {Chairman.} Gentleman is recognized.

119 Mr. {Tonko.} Thank you, Mr. Chair. The underlying bill

120 allows a governor to opt-out of both a state plan and a 121 federal plan. This gives a governor the power to decide that 122 a federal law simply does not apply to his or her state. 123 This provision effectively amends the Clean Air Act, and 124 upsets the current federal state balance, which gives states 125 the flexibility to develop their own plan for reducing carbon 126 emissions, but says that EPA must step in with a federal plan 127 if the state fails or refuses to act. This bill purports to 128 empower a governor to make a determination that 129 implementation of the federal plan would have an adverse 130 impact on ratepayers or reliability. A governor does have to 131 notify EPA of its determination, but EPA is powerless to do a 132 thing about it. In fact, nobody can do anything about it 133 under this legislation. Basically, a governor is given the 134 absolute power to decide that the state does not have to 135 comply with any of the requirements of the Clean Power Plan, 136 so any governor can declare that he or she just doesn't want 137 to follow federal law. What kind of precedent, I would ask, 138 does that set?

My amendment aims to make this determination process a little less absolute by making such a determination subject to judicial review. That way, a federal court could decide if the federal implementation plan would have the adverse

impact the governor, indeed, says it would have. EPA and 143 144 many states are working hard, and will continue to work hard 145 to make sure that ratepayers and electric reliability will 146 not experience significant adverse impacts. Under my 147 amendment, if that is the case, then the governor would not 148 be allowed to opt-out of the plan unless a court agreed. 149 In offering my amendment, I want to call attention to 150 the fact that this bill gives the governor the ability to 151 opt-out of federal law without any checks and balances. This 152 bill truly is a just-say-no bill for states and governors 153 that don't care about taking action on manmade climate 154 change, and don't want to actually analyze or respond to 155 EPA's Clean Power Plan. Adoption of my amendment won't fix 156 this bad bill, and so I will continue to oppose it. 157 And I want everyone to understand that even though the 158 language of the bill suggests that a governor would only opt-159 out due to ratepayer reliability impacts, the reality is the language is completely unenforceable. A governor can make 160

161 such a determination without any analysis, and nobody can do 162 a thing about it.

163 So with that, I yield back, and ask support for the 164 amendment.

165 Mrs. {Blackburn.} [Presiding] The gentleman yields

166 back. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

167 Mr. {Whitfield.} I would just like to make a comment. The whole purpose of this bill is to provide checks and 168 169 balance against a very extreme, radical action of EPA. And I 170 would like--Mr. Tonko, I would like to ask you the question, 171 the--I mean I don't know the answer so I am asking you, is 172 there a precedent for this action that you are taking in this 173 legislation? Can you give me an example of another situation 174 where a state governor takes action that is deemed a final 175 federal agency action?

Mr. {Tonko.} I think the actions here are based on technical merit, and I believe that this makes for a situation where judicial review would guarantee that this is just not whim; it is based on analytical quantification, which I think is very important. We are dealing with a technical matter here. It is, perhaps, unlike other situations.

183 Mr. {Whitfield.} But I would just say that we don't 184 view the EPA as the sole and exclusive domain of scientific 185 evidence, or the correct procedural in coming to a 186 conclusion, and we think that governors, through their 187 agencies, have a lot of experts, and this legislation directs 188 them to consult with various agencies of the State

189 Government.

190 Mr. {Tonko.} If the gentleman would yield?

191 Mr. {Whitfield.} Yes, I would be happy to.

Mr. {Tonko.} I believe that the impacts of this opting out of one state can have an effect on other states that are addressing their carbon emission situation. So as a national agenda, the impact of state-to-state here would be severe and perhaps setting back the overall commitment--

Mr. {Whitfield.} But we were not requiring states to opt-out or even make a decision that they are adversely affected on their rates and/or their reliability. This is such an extreme action by EPA. They, in effect, are shifting ultimate authority for energy planning and decision-making from the states to the Federal Government, which has never been done before.

204 And so our legislation simply--and furthermore, EPA 205 generally gives states 3 years for state implementation 206 plans. This time, even though it is radical and extreme, 207 they are giving them 13 months. So we are simply saying with 208 this legislation, it is so controversial, let's let the courts render a decision first, and those states--I mean I am 209 210 sure that California is not going to say their rates and 211 reliability is going to be adversely affected, but there are

212 many states who have already filed suit, and this legislation 213 simply gives them an opportunity to respond to a radical, 214 unprecedented action by EPA. 215 And so for that reason, I would respectfully oppose the 216 gentleman's amendment, and would yield back--does anyone else 217 want to--218 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman is yielding back his 219 time. Is there anyone else that wants to use the balance of 220 that time? If not, the gentleman yields back. 221 Is there anyone else seeking time? 222 Mr. {Rush.} Madam Chairman. 223 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman is recognized for 5 224 minutes. 225 Mr. {Rush.} Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last 226 word in support of Mr. Tonko's amendment. 227 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman is recognized for 5 228 minutes. Mr. {Rush.} Madam Chairman, this amendment highlights 229 230 the true nature of this legislation, which is a little more 231 than a thinly-veiled excuse for states to do nothing about climate change. Under the bill, a governor can decide to 232 233 block EPA from implementing a federal plan to reduce carbon 234 pollution, even if a state has failed to act. A governor is

235 given unrestricted power which can be used at his own 236 Though the bill does require the governor to discretion. 237 make some cursory determination on the adverse impacts on 238 ratepayers and reliability before opting-out, the bill says 239 absolutely nothing about requiring the governor's 240 determination to be based on any factual facts or any 241 analysis. He must consult with various state agencies, but 242 they have absolutely no power to object substantively or to 243 reverse his determination--his or her determination. Τn 244 fact, nothing in the bill even requires that there be an actual state or federal plan available for review before the 245 246 governor makes his determination. And if the governor has 247 already determined that he--that the requirements of neither 248 a state nor a federal plan should apply to sources in his 249 state, why should a state or EPA go to the trouble of 250 developing a federal plan at all? That itself would be a 251 huge waste of resources.

Madam Chairman, this legislation is unnecessary, is premature, and it would be extremely disruptive to the careful planning process that the EPA is developing in cooperation with the states. Any legitimate issue regarding rate or reliability impacts of a state, or of a federal plan, would be worked out long in advance. That is the job of

258 FERC. That is the job of the states, the RTOs, and the 259 utilities.

As witnesses before our subcommittee have testified, 260 261 implementation of environmental regulations have never been 262 the source of major rate or reliability issues. This rule 263 would be no different, especially given the flexibility and 264 the long-term compliance time frames the Clean Power Plan 265 provides. Therefore, there should be no objections to making 266 a governor's decision to opt-out of a federal plan subject to 267 judicial review if there really is a problem, and that--then that decision will hold up in court. Governors should not be 268 269 given unbridled authority to reject the requirements of a 270 federal law.

271 Mrs.--Madam Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to 272 support this fine amendment, the Tonko Amendment.

I yield back.

274 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman yields back. Is there275 -gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

276 Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Madam Chairman, and I will be 277 brief.

278 You know, Laurence Tribe, you know, said it best in a 279 hearing that, you know, burning the Constitution is not an 280 energy policy. And under the Federal Power Act, states have

281	previously and exclusive jurisdiction over intrastate
282	electricity matters. FERC Commission Clark testified that
283	the Clean Power Plan would result in a comprehensive, mother-
284	may-I relationship with EPA that has never before existed.
285	This is not cooperative federalism; this is coercive
286	federalism.
287	States, not the EPA, should have the last word when it
288	comes to the affordability and reliability of their
289	electricity systems. I ask my colleagues to vote no on the
290	amendment.
291	And I yield back my time.
292	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Gentleman yields back.
293	Are there others seeking recognition? If there is no
294	further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment.
295	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
296	All those opposed, no.
297	The noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.
298	Are there other amendments?
299	Mr. {Rush.} Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
300	desk.
301	Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman is recognized. The
302	clerk will report the amendment.
303	The {Clerk.} Which number amendment please?

304 Mr. {Rush.} 03.

305 The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2042, Ratepayer

306 Protection Act of 2015, offered by Mr. Rush of Illinois.

307 [The amendment of Mr. Rush follows:]

309 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment. 310 311 Mr. {Rush.} Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, according to the national climate 312 313 assessment, we can either invest now to address the worst 314 impacts of climate change, or we can pay even more dearly in 315 the future with more expensive and costly damages affecting 316 everything from negative health impacts to wear-and-tear of 317 our infrastructure and water systems, to stressing our 318 national security to the nth degree, up to and including 319 negatively impacting our overall long-term economic growth. 320 Madam Chairman, as part of President Obama's Climate 321 Action Plan to cut carbon pollution and help mitigate the 322 disastrous effects of climate change, the Clean Power Plan 323 will allow the EPA to use its existing authority under the 324 Clean Air Act to control carbon pollution from some of the Nation's oldest, dirtiest and most inefficient power plants. 325 As we know, Madam Chairman, these power plants account 326 327 for the largest share of greenhouse gases from stationary sources in the country, and they are responsible for about 328 329 1/3 of the total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, with no

330 current federal limits on the amount of carbon pollution they

331 are allowed to emit.

Madam Chairman, the Clean Power Plan seeks to cut carbon emissions by 30 percent, compared with 2005 levels, by year 2030, and it gives states great flexibility when implementing the rule, based on their existing utility infrastructure and policies.

337 Madam Chairman, instead of allowing governors to just 338 say no to the Clean Power Plan without any accountability, my 339 amendment simply requires that a governor must certify that 340 within his state, any ratepayer increases associated with 341 implementing a state or federal plan will be greater than any 342 cost associated with responding to extreme weather events 343 associated with human-caused climate change, including 344 increased sea level or flooding, more frequent and intense 345 storms, more frequent and intense wildfires, and/or increased 346 drought.

Madam Chairman, before we go down this slippery slope and give governors the power to turn back the clocks on cooperative federalism that has been at the heart of a very successful environmental policy structure, we should at least make sure that we include at least a modest measure of accountability. The fact of the matter is that states and the Federal Government are already paying for extreme weather

354 events caused by climate change, and we should not allow individual governors to willy-nilly just say no to 355 356 implementing plans that would help to mitigate the risk of 357 these types of disasters. 358 Madam Chairman, this bill will set dangerous precedent, 359 both to the Clean Air Act and to overall public health, and 360 we--if it were ever to be enacted into law. So I urge all my 361 colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment 362 in order to ensure some sense of accountability, and to 363 protect the overall public interests. 364 With that, Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my 365 time. 366 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman yields back. 367 Are there others? The gentleman is recognized. 368 Mr. {Griffith.} Madam Chairman, thank you so much. 369 You know, I just want the EPA to follow the law. I 370 don't believe they are following the law. And so then we get 371 into these debates that I think are just distracting about all of these different issues that Mr. Rush has raised. 372 373 Now, this amendment would require certification by state 374 governors that costs to their ratepayers under EPA's 111(d) 375 rule, which I think they are in violation of the law on, 376 would exceed the costs associated with responding to extreme

377 weather events. Now, that is kind of interesting because 378 this would require the state governors to make a 379 certification on something that the EPA itself will not and 380 cannot do, which is to show any direct benefits on climate 381 change from their rule under this new Clean Power Plan under 382 rule 111(d).

383 We know from testimony of the EPA itself the 111(d) rule will not have an impact we can measure on climate events in 384 385 the United States. Just 2 weeks ago, Acting Assistant 386 Administrator McCabe indicated the EPA could not predict the 387 impact of the rule on any of its climate indicators. That 388 was in testimony in this room. This amendment is merely 389 distracting from the real issues that we are trying to 390 confront today, which are the complexities of the EPA's 391 pending rule, the legality of the EPA's pending rule, and the 392 feasibility of the pending rule.

393 These are real world impacts on real world people. 394 While we are playing games with the ratepayers, they are 395 playing games with the law. The risk is great to the 396 ratepayer. Let's at least first figure out whether or not 397 they even have the authority to go forward before we start 398 doing great damage to the ratepayers of the United States. 399 You know, State Corporation Commission of Virginia estimated

400 that it would be billions of dollars for just one of the 401 providers of electricity in Virginia to comply with this 402 rule. This is a real world consequence for real world 403 ratepayers. And maybe the fat cats can afford to pay it, but 404 the folks in my district back home who are struggling now to 405 pay their electric bills can't afford this. And I think that 406 it is a reasonable bill, and I think this amendment just 407 distracts from the real purposes of the bill, and it should 408 be voted--and I urge my colleagues to vote no. 409 Mr. {Whitfield.} Will the gentleman yield? 410 Mr. {Griffith.} I would yield. Yield to the gentleman. 411 Mr. {Whitfield.} Thank you very much. 412 I also want to make a comment. We went back and looked 413 at some of the debates in the records of the discussion of 414 the original Clean Air Act, and there were a couple of 415 occasions when they--there was a discussion about regulating CO2 under the Clean Air Act. And it was specifically 416 417 rejected by the--even former Congressman and chairman of this 418 committee, John Dingle, talked about it was never intended to 419 regulate CO2 under the Clean Air Act. And we find ourselves 420 in this position today because of the Massachusetts EPA 421 tailpipe decision, which has been now expanded to the rest of 422 our society.

423 So that was a decision--the court didn't say to do it, 424 the court said for EPA to analyze it and make a decision, 425 which they did. But this is so broad, and so moving in such 426 an expansive way, an extreme way, a radical way, that Congress needs to make a statement on this issue. And that 427 428 is what we are attempting to do today. And we are not even, 429 in this legislation, trying to repeal this regulation. We 430 are simply saying it is so outside the bounds of expectations 431 that we should allow the courts to render a decision before 432 states are put into this position. We know that some states 433 are supporting this, but we know many states are going to be 434 hurt in a dramatic way. Their economy is going to be 435 affected, their rates are going to go up, their reliability is going to be challenged, and we are simply saying EPA has 436 437 never, ever tried to regulate the electric generating and 438 transmission system before, but that is precisely what they 439 are doing in this regulation.

And so I would just reiterate what my friend from Virginia stated. EPA itself has said this regulation will not in any way dramatically affect or reduce climate change. And so at a time when the U.S. is taking these extreme actions, we have China announcing they are spending \$38 billion to build new coal plants in Pakistan, they are

446	negotiating with India to build up to 400 new coal plants in
447	India, and yet we unilaterally, because of commitments made
448	by this President in international agreements, are putting
449	America at a disadvantage.
450	And so I will say once again, we are not trying to
451	repeal; just trying to give states additional time. Even EPA
452	normally gives them up to 3 years, and now they are giving
453	them 13 months. So with that, I would respectfully oppose
454	the gentleman's amendment as well.
455	Mr. {Griffith.} And thank you, and I yield back.
456	Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman yields back.
457	Ms. Castor is seeking recognition for 5
458	{Voice.} Madam Chairman
459	Mrs. {Blackburn.}5 minutes.
460	{Voice.} I am sorry.
461	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Ms. Castor, you are recognized.
462	Ms. {Castor.} Thank you, Madam Chairman.
463	I move to strike the last word and speak in favor of the
464	Rush amendment.
465	Mrs. {Blackburn.} You are recognized for 5 minutes.
466	Ms. {Castor.} Thank you very much.
467	Colleagues, this is a very important amendment because
468	if this republican bill passes, to consumers and businesses

469 across America I would say hold on to your wallets, because 470 you are going to be asked to bear the increasing costs of the 471 changing climate, because this republican bill says, okay, 472 our formal policy out of the United States Congress, in the 473 face of scientific consensus and the changing climate, is to 474 do nothing, which is, in essence, to deny the problem and 475 ignore it. And that is going to be very costly to the United States of America. 476

477 You may want to get out your calculators because here are the increase in costs on our neighbors back home. 478 479 Property insurance, with increased extreme weather events, 480 their property insurance bills are going to continue to rise. 481 Whether it is flooding, whether it is tropical storms, 482 tornados, droughts, those kinds of things, the consumers and 483 businesses across the country are going to be paying more 484 when it comes to their property insurance. Flood insurance. 485 We had a huge policy debate last year on how we pay for flood 486 insurance in America. We came up with a pretty good 487 compromise, but there is still various--very serious 488 questions of what we are going to do along the coastlines of America. And in a state like Florida where we have an \$82 489 490 billion tourism industry, we rely on healthy coastlines and 491 beaches that are robust and inviting. And this is going to

492 be--we are going to pay more probably in the future.

493 Property taxes back home. As a Member of Congress, we 494 don't deal a lot with property tax issues, but you know what, 495 when salty water begins to intrude into our freshwater 496 drinking supplies, into our aquafers, property taxes are 497 going to rise to pay to protect drinking water supplies, 498 storm water systems at home, so these things continue to add 499 up.

500 Then what we do deal with here in Congress is increased 501 federal emergency aid when we have these emergency events. 502 Whether it is Super Storm Sandy, the drought in California, 503 where I believe my California colleagues can speak directly 504 to it. So this is an important amendment that we--so that we 505 consider all of the costs of the change in climate. And I 506 would recommend that this bill be tabled and put away because 507 otherwise you are just saying to consumers, we are going to 508 ignore it, you are going to bear increased costs, the costs 509 are going to increase year after year after year while we 510 stick our heads in the sand here in Washington. The changing 511 climate cannot be ignored. To do so is to heap--continue to heap huge costs on American families and businesses. 512

513 So I urge adoption of the Rush amendment, and yield back 514 my time.

515 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman is recognized--Mr. Bucshon is recognized 516 517 for 5 minutes. 518 Mr. {Bucshon.} Thank you. And I would just like to 519 reiterate to my colleague that just spoke that Administrator 520 McCarthy has acknowledged that there are unlikely to have a 521 meaningful impact on any of the indicators the agency uses to 522 track climate change. So even if you make the assumption 523 that all of the things just described will happen or are 524 true, this has been acknowledged by the EPA that this rule 525 will have no meaningful impact on the indicators the agency 526 uses to track climate change. 527 And I yield back. 528 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman is yielding back. 529 Are there others seeking recognition? If there is no 530 further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment. 531 All those in favor shall signify by saying aye. Mr. {Rush.} Roll call, Madam Chair. 532 533 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The gentleman has asked for a roll 534 call vote. The clerk will call the roll. 535 536 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton? 537 [No response.]

538	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Whitfield?
539	Mr.	{Whitfiel	d.}	No.
540	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Whitfield votes no.
541	Mr.	Shimkus?		
542	Mr.	{Shimkus.	} No	ο.
543	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Shimkus votes no.
544	Mr.	Pitts?		
545	Mr.	{Pitts.}	No.	
546	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Pitts votes no.
547	Mr.	Walden?		
548	[No	response.]	
549	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Murphy?
550	Mr.	{Murphy.}	No	
551	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Murphy votes no.
552	Mr.	Burgess?		
553	Mr.	{Burgess.	} No	0.
554	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Burgess votes no.
555	Mrs.	. Blackbur	n?	
556	Mrs.	. {Blackbu	rn.}	No.
557	The	{Clerk.}	Mrs	. Blackburn votes no.
558	Mr.	Scalise?		
559	[No	response.]	
560	The	{Clerk.}	Mr.	Latta?

561	Mr. {Latta.} No.
562	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes no.
563	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
564	[No response.]
565	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper?
566	Mr. {Harper.} No.
567	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes no.
568	Mr. Lance?
569	Mr. {Lance.} No.
570	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes no.
571	Mr. Guthrie?
572	Mr. {Guthrie.} No.
573	The {Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes no.
574	Mr. Olson?
575	Mr. {Olson.} No.
576	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes no.
577	Mr. McKinley?
578	Mr. {McKinley.} No.
579	The {Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes no.
580	Mr. Pompeo?
581	Mr. {Pompeo.} No.
582	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pompeo votes no.
583	Mr. Kinzinger?

584	Mr. {Kinzinger.} No.
585	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
586	Mr. Griffith?
587	Mr. {Griffith.} No.
588	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes no.
589	Mr. Bilirakis?
590	Mr. {Bilirakis.} No.
591	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
592	Mr. Johnson?
593	Mr. {Johnson.} No.
594	The {Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes no.
595	Mr. Long?
596	Mr. {Long.} No.
597	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes no.
598	Mrs. Ellmers?
599	[No response.]
600	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon?
601	Mr. {Bucshon.} No.
602	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes no.
603	Mr. Flores?
604	Mr. {Flores.} No.
605	The {Clerk.} Mr. Flores votes no.
606	Mrs. Brooks?

607	Mrs. {Brooks.} No.
608	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes no.
609	Mr. Mullin?
610	Mr. {Mullin.} No.
611	The {Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes no.
612	Mr. Hudson?
613	Mr. {Hudson.} No.
614	The {Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes no.
615	Mr. Collins?
616	[No response.]
617	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer?
618	[No response.]
619	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone?
620	[No response.]
621	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush?
622	Mr. {Rush.} Aye.
623	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes aye.
624	Ms. Eshoo?
625	Ms. {Eshoo.} Aye.
626	The {Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
627	Mr. Engel?
628	[No response.]
629	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green?

630	[No response.]
631	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette?
632	[No response.]
633	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps.
634	Mrs. {Capps.} Aye.
635	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes aye.
636	Mr. Doyle?
637	Mr. {Doyle.} Yes.
638	The {Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes aye.
639	Ms. Schakowsky.
640	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Aye.
641	The {Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.
642	Mr. Butterfield?
643	[No response.]
644	The {Clerk.} Ms. Matsui?
645	[No response.]
646	The {Clerk.} Ms. Castor?
647	Ms. {Castor.} Aye.
648	The {Clerk.} Ms. Castor votes aye.
649	Mr. Sarbanes?
650	Mr. {Sarbanes.} Aye.
651	The {Clerk.} Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
652	Mr. McNerney?

653	Mr.	{McNerney.} Aye.
654	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McNerney votes aye.
655	Mr.	Welch?
656	Mr.	{Welch.} Aye.
657	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Welch votes aye.
658	Mr.	Lujan?
659	Mr.	{Lujan.} Aye.
660	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Lujan votes aye.
661	Mr.	Tonko?
662	Mr.	{Tonko.} Aye.
663	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Tonko votes aye.
664	Mr.	Yarmuth?
665	Mr.	{Yarmuth.} Aye.
666	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Yarmuth votes aye.
667	Ms.	Clarke?
668	[No	response.]
669	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack?
670	Mr.	{Loebsack.} Aye.
671	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
672	Mr.	Schrader?
673	Mr.	{Schrader.} Aye.
674	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Schrader votes aye.
675	Mr.	Kennedy?

676	Mr. {Kennedy.} Aye.
677	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
678	Mr. Cardenas?
679	Mr. {Cardenas.} Aye.
680	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
681	Chairman Upton?
682	[No response.]
683	The {Clerk.} Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
684	Mrs. {McMorris Rodgers.} No.
685	The {Clerk.} Mrs. McMorris Rodgers votes no.
686	Mr. Walden?
687	Mr. {Walden.} No.
688	The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes no.
689	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Mr. Pallone? Okay.
690	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer?
691	Mr. {Cramer.} No.
692	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes no.
693	Ms. DeGette?
694	Ms. {DeGette.} Aye.
695	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes aye.
696	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Pallone?
697	Mr. {Pallone.} Pallone votes aye.
698	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes aye.

Mrs. {Blackburn.} Butterfield? 699 700 Mr. {Butterfield.} Butterfield, yes. 701 The {Clerk.} Mr. Butterfield votes aye. 702 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Are there others wishing to vote or 703 change the vote? 704 Clerk will report. 705 The {Clerk.} Madam Chairman, on that vote there were 19 706 ayes and 26 nays. 707 Mrs. {Blackburn.} The amendment is not agreed to. 708 At this time, we are going to recess for the Joint 709 Session. We will reconvene as soon as the session is 710 completed. I will remind all members we are on H.R. 2042 711 when we return. 712 We are adjourned. 713 [Recess.] 714 Mr. {Whitfield.} [Presiding] I would like to call this 715 markup to order. 716 We are--at the time of the recess, we were considering 717 amendments, and we have taken care of 2 amendments--718 considered 2, and so the Floor will be open if anyone has an 719 amendment that they would like to make to the bill. 720 Mr. {Pallone.} I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman. 721 Mr. {Whitfield.} For purposes of the gentleman from New

722 Jersey seeks recognition.

723	Mr. {Pallone.} I have an amendment at the desk which I
724	think is 06.
725	Mr. {Whitfield.} Will the clerk report the amendment?
726	The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2042, Ratepayer
727	Protection Act of 2015, offered by Mr. Pallone of New Jersey.
728	[The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]

Mr. {Whitfield.} Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispenses with, and the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

734 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose of my amendment is a simple one. It is to guarantee that the decision to opt-out of the Clean Power Plan and any federal implementation plan is one that reflects the people of that state, not just one individual.

739 As currently drafted, the legislation before us puts the 740 decision to opt-out of the Clean Power Plan solely in the 741 hands of a single individual in the form of a governor. I think we have already demonstrated that there are no 742 743 meaningful standards required, and no judicial review of any 744 governor's determination and decision to opt-out of the Clean 745 Power Plan under this legislation, nor is there any recourse 746 for neighboring or downwind states that are harmed by another state's decision not to comply. But if you and my republican 747 748 colleagues are determined to go down that road, let's at least make sure that the decision to ignore the Clean Power 749 750 Plan is a decision supported by the state as a whole and not 751 just by one individual. And the way to do that is to require

752 that a governor's decision to opt-out is supported not by a 753 judge or a federal official, but by that state's own 754 legislature.

755 The premise of my amendment is simple. A governor's decision under this legislation should be ratified by that 756 757 state's legislature in the form of a law. My amendment is 758 borne out of a very real situation we have faced in my home 759 state of New Jersey. In late 2011, Governor Chris Christie 760 is attempting to--was attempting to unilaterally withdraw our 761 state from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or RGGI; a 762 successful regional mechanism for managing carbon emissions 763 in a cost-effective manner. Governor Christie's actions were 764 taken without the support of the people of New Jersey, or the 765 approval of the state legislature in order to advance his own 766 personal agenda. As a result, according to a report last 767 month by the Acadia Center, or state has foregone some \$130 million in RGGI action proceeds, and could miss out on as 768 769 much as another \$359 million by 2020. This is money our 770 state could desperately use to invest in clean energy, 771 resiliency projects, or any number of other related issues. But we don't have that money, and the decision to forego 772 773 those hundreds of millions of dollars was made by Governor 774 Christie without even consultation with our legislature, let

775 alone its consent.

So that is why I believe that this legislation at least needs to include a check on runaway chief executives. In New Jersey, the legislature is keeping up the fight against what many believe was an unlawful and unilateral decision by Governor Christie to attempt to withdraw from RGGI.

781 My amendment is an attempt to make clear that state 782 legislatures across the country, as is the case in my home 783 state, have the opportunity to play an active role in this 784 critical process. My amendment first strikes the dangerous 785 and unnecessary ``invitation to endless litigation'' in 786 Section 2, because there is no need to delay the effective 787 date of a rule when you create a mechanism for opting out of 788 that rule. Next, my amendment simply adds a requirement that 789 once a governor checks the box on the--determination required 790 under this legislation, he or she must have that 791 determination ratified by the state's legislature in the form 792 of a law. My amendment doesn't attempt to add any other conditions on the determination, just ensures that the 793 794 elected state legislators, as well as the elected chief 795 executive, have the opportunity to play a role in affirming the decision to ignore the Clean Power Plan. 796

797 And so I urge all of you to consider carefully the

798 dangerous ramifications of vesting so much power in one 799 person, because if you do, you will see the need to pass my 800 amendment. 801 I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Mr. {Whitfield.} Gentleman yields back the balance of 802 803 his time. 804 I will recognize myself for 5 minutes to speak on the gentleman's amendment. 805 806 As the gentleman indicated, this amendment would 807 eliminate the ability of a governor to determine that a state 808 plan would result in significant adverse effects on 809 ratepayers, as well as affect the reliability. It would also 810 limit the governor's ability to make a determination 811 regarding a federal plan by requiring any determination be 812 approved by the state legislature. 813 As I had said earlier, we introduced this bill simply

814 because the actions by EPA have been so unprecedented, on top 815 of the fact that no one ever imagined that CO2 would be 816 administered or regulated under the Clean Air Act. And I 817 would like to remind everyone again that a number of lawsuits 818 have been filed by states, they are in federal court right 819 now, on this regulation. Now, we don't know--they may be 820 premature, they may not be ripe yet, but 17 State Attorney

821 Generals have specifically said that EPA is hiding behind a 822 fig leaf of federalism and flexibility, while, in effect, forcing major changes, in other words, mandating changes to 823 824 the state's administration of electricity consumption and 825 generation. Now, this has never been done before. 826 So with our legislation, the governor is the highest 827 elected office in each state. Our legislation is not trying 828 to repeal the regulation. We are simply providing additional 829 time for the states because, as I had said earlier, 830 generally, EPA gives 3 years on these regulations, and this 831 time, this complex, unprecedented regulation, they are giving 832 13 months to file a state implementation plan. So we want to 833 give the governors the opportunity to look closely at the 834 effect on ratepayers and on reliability. And our legislation 835 does not say governors may, it says governors shall. In 836 other words, they must do an analysis with the state EPA, the 837 state health officials, the state economic groups, the 838 reliability councils that are responsible in that state. And 839 then we don't even mandate that the governor take the action. 840 So I think it is really a reasonable approach. It is 841 simply giving more time, not repealing, giving the states an 842 opportunity to further analyze and not being rushed into a 843 state implementation plan. And for that reason, although I

844 have great admiration and respect for the gentleman from New 845 Jersey, I would respectfully oppose his amendment, and--846 Mr. {Pallone.} Mr. Chairman, could I just ask you to 847 yield for--848 Mr. {Whitfield.} Yeah, I would be happy to--849 Mr. {Pallone.} --a short time? 850 Mr. {Whitfield.} --vield. I would be happy to vield. 851 Mr. {Pallone.} I obviously don't agree with the whole 852 premise of the underlying legislation. 853 Mr. {Whitfield.} Yes. 854 Mr. {Pallone.} But all I am simply saying is, if you do 855 insist that, you know, that the state have this power, that 856 it not just be a decision by the governor. And again, 857 because in our state, the governor didn't even consult with 858 the legislature, and we had--we were part of this regional 859 agreement, which is one way of fulfilling the obligations of 860 the Clean Power Plan, and the governor simply opted out of it 861 without even consultation. So I am saying, given that even 862 though I don't agree with what you are trying to do with the underlying bill, I still think it makes sense that this not 863 864 just be a unilateral decision by the governor, but a joint 865 decision in the form of legislation that would be sponsored 866 by the legislature and then signed by the governor.

867 But I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 868 Mr. {Whitfield.} Gentleman yields back. 869 And I recognize the -- Mr. Cramer, do you seek -- can I 870 yield you time? 871 Mr. {Cramer.} Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I spent 10 years as an energy and utility 872 873 regulator in North Dakota. I was an elected public utilities 874 commissioner. In most states the commissioners are appointed 875 by governors. But, you know, if you are going to rely on 876 anybody, it would be the governor where the buck stops, this 877 is a representative government, representative democracy, and 878 he or she would consult the experts, as the chairman says, 879 and as the bill states. And in my case in North Dakota, I 880 can tell you the--ratemaking is a very complex science. It 881 involves resource planning. In many cases you are talking 882 about vertically integrated utilities, multi-jurisdictions 883 within just an--a distribution utility. You have diversity 884 of resources, you have regional transmission organizations 885 that are responsible for dispatching the grid. There--it is 886 very complex stuff, and I don't think you want legislators, 887 any more than you want, you know, Congress micromanaging 888 these things. You want it to be the people that are the 889 experts that you are going to defer to, and which a governor

would defer to in studying the implications of all of this, and can take--is in the best position and best equipped to take into consideration all the complexities of this rule and other rules. So I, you know, again, I respect the ranking member as well, but would certainly oppose this amendment and support the bill.

896 Mr. {Whitfield.} My time has expired. Does anyone seek 897 recognition to speak on the Pallone Amendment? Any--chair 898 recognized the gentleman from California for 5 minutes.

899 Mr. {McNerney.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

900 Mr. Chairman, I understand your frustration. I believe 901 I understand it. For one thing, you have repeatedly referred 902 to the 13 months as too short, and maybe it is, but if you 903 stick to that, we may get somewhere. The opt-out is what is 904 giving us heartburn on this side. And we are going to fight 905 it, and I think it is going to get fought on the Floor. I 906 don't think it is going to get past the White House.

907 This would be something--the time extension might be 908 something we could work with republicans on, as a suggestion, 909 but, you know, we are just repeating entrenched positions on 910 this and it is frustrating. It would be good to find a 911 language that we can agree on. To us, it looks like you are 912 going to try to kill the bill with the opt-out, and it looks

913 like it will also harm the Clean Air Act, which is a standard 914 that we hold in pretty high regard. So I would ask you to 915 sort of reconsider the basis of this bill, and maybe this 916 amendment, give the governor not total authority over the 917 state but work with the state legislature, might be a big--a 918 good way to start.

919 Mr. {Pallone.} Would the gentleman yield?

920 Mr. {McNerney.} Yes.

921 Mr. {Pallone.} I just wanted to point out, I guess you 922 guys already know it, but the problem in the case of New 923 Jersey, and I think it might happen elsewhere, is that the 924 state legislature had agreed, and a bill was signed into law, 925 that had New Jersey join a regional agreement, and that 926 regional agreement would be used by New Jersey, and by other 927 states that are part of it, to meet the standards that are 928 set forth by the EPA in the Clean Power Plan, and then the 929 governor just unilaterally decided, you know, we are not 930 going to do that anymore. So I understand that the gentleman talked about expertise, but I think that in this case, you 931 932 know, the legislature decided in their expertise that this 933 was a good way to go, and I think that this is something that 934 should be--if you really believe that this should be a 935 decision that is based on expertise and sort of a consensus,

936	it would make sense to not just let the governor
937	unilaterally, you know, get out of it. That is my whole
938	point. But again, I guessI think I am belaboring this,
939	so
940	Mr. {Whitfield.} Would the gentleman
941	Mr. {Pallone.}I
942	Mr. {Whitfield.} Would the gentleman yield
943	Mr. {McNerney.} Yes.
944	Mr. {Whitfield.}time to me? I wouldand now I am
945	speaking for myself, but I know many members on our side of
946	the aisle are very much concerned about these time limits,
947	and I personally am telling you that I would be happy to work
948	with you, Mr. Green, Mr. Pallone, anyone, as we go to the
949	Floor, even go into the Rules Committee with you if youif
950	we can come together with an amendment that would focus on
951	extending the time for states in some way. Maybe you don't
952	like the way we did it here, andbut if theyou all would
953	like to try to get together to come up with some language, I
954	personally will sit down with you, will sincerely try to work
955	with you, because I do believe it is a major concern, the
956	time.

957 Mr. {McNerney.} Well, thank you. I appreciate the 958 offer, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that we will find a way to

959 work together. Hopefully we will find something. It is just 960 that the opt-out seems to me to give a bad precedent, which 961 could be--which could have fall-down--or, you know, follow 962 through on other aspects of the Clean Air Act. So that is really what is giving us a lot of heartburn, in addition to 963 964 the actual implications. 965 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. Mr. {Whitfield.} Anyone on our side of the aisle seek 966 967 recognition to speak on the Pallone Amendment? 968 Okay, if there is no further discussion, then we will vote on the Pallone Amendment. 969 970 All in favor of the Pallone Amendment say aye. 971 All opposed, no. 972 In the opinion of the chair, the mays have it. The--so 973 the amendment is not agreed to. 974 Are there further amendments to the bill at this time? 975 Okay, for what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois seek 976 recognition? 977 Mr. {Rush.} Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the 978 desk, and--979 Mr. {Whitfield.} The clerk will report the amendment. 980 The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2042, Ratepayer 981 Protection Act of 2015, offered by Mr. Rush of Illinois.

982 [The amendment of Mr. Rush follows:]

1003

984 Mr. {Rush.} It is amendment--

Mr. {Whitfield.} Without objection, the reading of the 985 986 amendment is dispenses with, and the gentleman from Illinois 987 is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment. 988 Mr. {Rush.} I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. 989 Chairman, as the U.S. Surgeon General, Vivek Murthy, noted in the 2015 National Public Health Week, I will quote him, ``We 990 991 know that climate change means higher temperatures overall. 992 It also means longer and hotter heatwaves. Higher 993 temperatures can mean worse air in cities, and more smog and 994 more ozone. We know that more intense wildfires will mean 995 increased smoke in the air, and we know that earlier springs 996 and longer summers mean longer allergy seasons.'' In 997 addition, Mr. Chairman, the American Lung Association warns 998 us that the impacts of climate change contribute to 999 respiratory problems such as asthma attacks, while also 1000 leading to heatstroke and to premature deaths. 1001 Mr. Chairman, when implementing the Clean Power Plan 1002 would help to reduce carbon pollution by hundreds of millions

1004 and nitrogen oxides by hundreds of thousands of tons 1005 annually, and help to protect the health of our most

of tons, decreasing particle pollution such as sulfur dioxide

1006 vulnerable citizens such as children, older adults, and 1007 lower-income and minority communities. 1008 Mr. Chairman, instead of simply allowing governors to 1009 just say no to the Clean Power Plan, my amendment will 1010 require that a governor must certify that withdrawal from a 1011 state or federal implementation plan will not have a 1012 significant adverse effect on public health inputs, including 1013 avoiding asthma attacks and heart attacks, as well as fewer 1014 hospital admissions, and missed school days and work days. 1015 Mr. Chairman, not only do the vast majority of the 1016 American people believe that climate change is a serious 1017 problem, and that the government should take action to 1018 address it, but also the overwhelming majority of our 1019 Nation's doctors, they believe so also. Just last month, a 1020 study by the American Thoracic Society found that a huge 1021 margin--by a huge margin, most doctors believe that climate 1022 change is already negatively impacting their patients' 1023 health, with 77 percent of respondents reporting that 1024 increases in air pollution caused by climate change is making 1025 their patients' illnesses even more severe; a trend, that 1026 they add, that they expect will steadily increase in the 1027 future. These findings are in line with a similar study 1028 conducted by the National Medical Association, which last

1029	year found that older Americans, low-income communities, and
1030	the sick, would be all disproportionately impacted by climate
1031	change if we fail to act.
1032	Mr. Chairman, with 1 in 10 children in this country
1033	already suffering from respiratory diseases such as asthma,
1034	it is imperative that we act to mitigate the devastating
1035	impacts of climate change before we start to evensee even
1036	more additional illnesses, injuries and damages due to severe
1037	weather, allergic reactions, and heat-related health issues.
1038	Mr. Chairman, we should not allow governors to play
1039	politics with the Clean Power Plan, and the risk of causing
1040	even more harm to the public health.
1041	Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of
1042	the aisle to support this amendment.
1043	And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.
1044	The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back. Chair
1045	recognizes the gentleman from Indiana for 5 minutes.
1046	Mr. {Bucshon.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1047	I just want to clear up some of the information about
1048	what was quoted from the American Lung Association. Most of
1049	you know, I was a thoracic surgeon prior to coming to
1050	Congress, and I have reviewed their information extensively,
1051	and they are talking about particulate pollution as it

1052	relates to disease processes like asthma, and the reality is		
1053	most of the studies they quote in their particulate		
1054	information is fromhas been paid for by left-lead global		
1055	warming groups, in fairness. And I have met with the medical		
1056	director of the American Lung Association. So we are talking		
1057	about apples and oranges here, and really that information		
1058	has no applicability to the bill that we are discussing		
1059	today.		
1060	With that, I yield back.		
1061	Mr. {Whitfield.} Would the gentleman yield?		
1062	Mr. {Rush.} Would the gentleman yield?		
1063	Mr. {Bucshon.} I will yield.		
1064	Mr. {Rush.} And can you identify those leftwing		
1065	Mr. {Bucshon.} I yield to Chairman Whitfield.		
1066	The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields to the gentleman from		
1067	Kentucky, Mr. Whitfield.		
1068	Mr. {Whitfield.} Would the gentleman yield to the		
1069	gentleman from Illinois?		
1070	The {Chairman.} Will yield to the gentleman from		
1071	Illinois.		
1072	Mr. {Rush.} Would the gentleman		
1073	Mr. {Whitfield.} Sure. Okay, I want to makeone		
1074	comment I wanted to make. There has been a lot of discussion		

1075	about climate change and directand its effect on health.
1076	The point I would make is that the EPA has made it very
1077	clear, unequivocally clear, that their regulation would not
1078	have any significant impact on reducing climate change. So
1079	this bill of ours is certainly not going to do anything to
1080	weaken any EPA regulation relating to health. And the mere
1081	fact that EPA has acknowledged itself that its regulation is
1082	not going to have any significant impact on climate health,
1083	if you are saying climate change affects health, then there
1084	is no additional reason to do this. And the governors are
1085	already required to consult with public health officials.
1086	And I would yield back to the gentleman from Indiana, if
1087	he wants to yield to some other member.
1088	Mr. {Shimkus.} Would the gentleman yield?
1089	The {Chairman.} Gentleman from Indiana has the time.
1090	Gentleman yields to the gentleman from Illinois
1091	{Voice.} Yes.
1092	Mr. {Shimkus.} Yeah, thank you. And
1093	The {Chairman.}Mr. Shimkus.
1094	{Voice.} Let's
1095	Mr. {Shimkus.} I agree with my good friend from
1096	California, Mr. McNerney, that we are going to be in
1097	entrenchable opposites on this debate, and we will get

1098 through the discussion, but history is also instructive. 1099 When the Clean Air Act was passed, it was on 4 criteria 1100 pollutants. One of them was particulate matter, which is 1101 what my colleague from Indiana was mentioning. So 1102 particulate matter is also regulated under the Clean Air Act. 1103 The thing with carbon dioxide is it was based upon the 1104 Supreme Court ruling of Massachusetts v. EPA, which then gave 1105 the EPA the authority to say if there--if you can find 1106 endangerment to human health then you could regulate it. We 1107 are--that is what they ruled. We have concerns that the EPA, 1108 in determining what is endangerment to human health, didn't 1109 take specific individual health into consideration, but the 1110 health of the world population, and all these other activity, 1111 which we think is a pretty big stretch. That is why we--if 1112 the riders and--the House Members and the President, who 1113 passed the Clean Air Act, wanted it to be enshrined in law 1114 that carbon dioxide should be regulated, they would have 1115 passed it. It would have been part of a law. This provision 1116 was created by the judicial system and court cases. 1117 So now we have the EPA moving further on this, and now they have designed a system that breaks the traditional 1118 1119 balance between states and the national government involving 1120 the regulation of utilities, and pricing and distribution in

1121	their states. The testimony we had before this committee, or
1122	the subcommittee, is pretty clear, that this is illegal, this
1123	is unconstitutional, and that is what part of our fight is on
1124	this side. And we can have that fight, public opinion, we
1125	can move legislature, but the citizens of this country so far
1126	have empowered their elected members to, in essence, fight
1127	against the EPA moving into the direction that they are not
1128	by statute passed by a legislative branch, signed by the
1129	President, are enshrined. So that is part of our fight.
1130	I agree with my friend, Mr. McNerney, that I don't think
1131	we are going to come to any conclusion; we will just keep
1132	fighting until we have to finally get to the end of the boat.
1133	So with that, I yield back to my
1134	Mr. {Bucshon.} I yield back to the
1135	The {Chairman.} Gentleman's time has expired.
1136	Other members wishing to speak? The gentlelady from
1137	Florida had asked me forso gentlelady is recognized for 5
1138	minutes.
1139	Ms. {Castor.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1140	I would like to speak in favor of this other great Rush
1141	Amendment, and it is very important. Thebecause the bill
1142	before us is the Climate Change Denial Bill. It is a real
1143	disservice to America. It will heap costs on consumers. It

1144	really puts blinders on when it comes to the health of our	
1145		
1143	neighbors, and it isit essentially shirks responsibility	
1146	for addressing the costly impacts of climate change.	
1147	The bill we are considering today shows that my	
1148	republican friends' plan is to just say no, to let our	
1149	children and grandchildren suffer the effects of climate	
1150	change. Unfortunately, the republicans' plan is to stop any	
1151	meaningful action to reduce harmful carbon pollution from the	
1152	largest sources in the country. This position is	
1153	indefensible and it is costly. You are essentially thumbing	
1154	your nose at the Clean Air Act, giving states a free pass	
1155	when they refuse to comply with the requirements of the Clean	
1156	Power Plan. Under this bill, governors can just opt-out from	
1157	the Clean Air Act. That is very poor public policy.	
1158	Disregarding the health effects on increased carbon emissions	
1159	around the globe and in America is especially myopic. The	
1160	world's leading scientists agree that warming temperatures	
1161	that stem from human-caused climate change will contribute to	
1162	more frequent and intense extreme weather events and	
1163	wildfires. They say that these trends will worsen as the	
1164	temperatures rise. Scientists tell us that the signs of	
1165	climate change are already here. That is not news to the	
1166	Americans who already are experiencing those damaging	

1167 impacts, like many of my neighbors in the State of Florida. 1168 Fortunately, Pope Francis recently announced that he 1169 intends to devote a significant amount of time to educating 1170 people across the globe on the impacts of climate change. He 1171 is particularly concerned with the impacts of displacement, 1172 of populations, and health impacts on children.

1173 Just last year, the United States experienced 8 severe 1174 weather, flood and drought events, each causing at least \$1 1175 billion in damage across 35 states. Overall, these disasters 1176 caused more than \$19 billion in damage, and according to OMB, 1177 over the past decade, extreme weather and fire alone have 1178 cost taxpayers \$300 billion. These events have cost us all 1179 real money. These examples are just a shot--snapshot of the 1180 overwhelming costs that we can expect in the future with 1181 exacerbated climate change. That is why this bill of 1182 sticking your head in the same and ignoring it is the wrong 1183 way to go. We should be working together to address early 1184 the impacts of climate change, otherwise we are going to pay 1185 a lot more down the road.

1186 Mr. Rush's amendment is very important. It is a second 1187 amendment that says let's consider the real impacts of 1188 climate change, rather than just letting states off the hook. 1189 You cannot, and you should not, assume that just saying no to

1190 acting on climate will cost nothing. It is said that an 1191 ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and that is 1192 especially true for the cost of our rapidly changing climate. 1193 I urge a yes vote on the Rush Amendment, and yield the 1194 balance of my time to Mr. Rush. 1195 Mr. {Rush.} I want to thank the lady--the gentlelady 1196 from Florida for yielding. 1197 Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the 1198 aisle keep insisting that the EPA has admitted that the Clean 1199 Power Plan would do nothing to halt the threat of climate 1200 change. They are wrong. EPA has made no such admission. Ιf 1201 my colleagues on the other side want to keep insisting that 1202 they have made such an admission, then I would ask them to 1203 produce it in the record.

1204 Mr. Chairman, neither EPA Administrator McCarthy nor 1205 Assistant Administrator McCabe have made such a ridiculous 1206 admission. In fact, the EPA rule makes it clear that it is about climate change, and the EPA has said, and I quote, 1207 1208 ``Climate change is not just a problem for the future. We 1209 are facing its impacts today. Average temperatures have 1210 risen in most states since 1901, with 7 of the top 10 warmest 1211 years on record occurring since 1998. Climate and weather 1212 disasters in 2012 cost the American economy more than \$100

- 1213 billion.''
- 1214 Would someone yield--
- 1215 The {Chairman.} Gentleman's time has--the gentlelady's
- 1216 time has expired.
- 1217 Mr. {Rush.} Someone claim the time and yield?
- 1218 The {Chairman.} But--
- 1219 Mr. {Pallone.} Mr. Chairman, I could move to strike the 1220 last word so--
- 1221 The {Chairman.} Yeah, let me--yeah, okay. By unanimous 1222 consent, I will give the gentleman another minute.
- Mr. {Rush.} Power plants are the largest concentrated source of carbon dioxide emissions in the U.S., making up roughly 1/3 of all domestic greenhouse gas emissions. There are currently no national limits on carbon pollution levels. Nationwide by 2030, the Clean Power Plan will help cut carbon pollution from the power sector by approximately 30 percent from the 2005 levels.

Mr. Chairman, the EPA has estimated the climate benefits from the Clean Power Plan and its regulatory impact analysis, which was approved by the Office of Budget--Office of Management and Budget, indicates that, and I quote, ``In 2020, this proposal will yield monetized climate benefits of approximately \$17 million relative to the 2020 base case.''

1236 Mr. Chairman--

1237 The {Chairman.} Gentleman--

1238 Mr. {Rush.} --with that, I yield back.

1239 The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back.

1240 Chair would recognize the gentlelady from Washington

1241 State, Mrs. McMorris Rodgers.

Mrs. {McMorris Rodgers.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak in opposition to the amendment. And, you know, I have a lot of concerns too about the rule coming out of EPA, the 111(d) rule, and I have a lot of concerns about the impact it is going to have on my state, the impact that it is going to have, real economic impacts.

1248 I come from Washington State which has--is actually one 1249 of the cleanest, greenest states in the country; the great 1250 Pacific Northwest. We are largely hydropower, we have 1251 nuclear. Our one coal plant is actually being phased out. 1252 And I have yet to find someone who can explain the formula, 1253 because we get asked to reduce our carbon emissions more than 1254 any other state in the country. We are at the top of the 1255 list. And I believe that it really highlights that the rule is arbitrary and that we need answers, and we need to be 1256 1257 working together. We need to be working with the states, and 1258 we need to be giving the states more authority as we move

1259 forward.

1260 So I would urge opposition to this amendment.

1261 Mr. {Whitfield.} Would the gentlelady yield?

1262 Mrs. {McMorris Rodgers.} I would be happy to yield to 1263 the gentleman from Kentucky.

1264 Mr. {Whitfield.} One--we all recognize that EPA has 1265 made a lot of comments about climate change and its effects 1266 on a lot of different aspects of our atmosphere and every 1267 other identifying situation, but Administrator McCarthy 1268 acknowledged and has said that the impact of the Clean Power 1269 Plan on global temperatures or sea-rise levels is so small 1270 EPA has not even measured it. In response to questions for the record, EPA indicated that it did not model these impacts 1271 1272 even though it has done so for other rules. So they did not 1273 measure it for the--these impacts on this regulation.

And I remember the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Pompeo, specifically went through a line of questions with the Assistant Administrator, I think it was Ms. McCabe when she was here, asking her directly would this regulation dramatically impact the reduction of climate change, and she said no, and she said they had not measured it.

1280 So I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kansas if 1281 he would like to make a comment about it.

1282 Mr. {Pompeo.} Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I 1283 I have asked repeatedly with respect to this rule in did. 1284 particular if EPA has any science, any evidence that would 1285 indicate how many or which of the EPA's own climate 1286 indicators would be impacted by this rule, and if so, if they 1287 could tell us how much. And in each case I was told that 1288 they did not. In one case I was told that actually I wasn't 1289 asking the right question, and was told that the truth is 1290 this is just about global leadership. So we have been 1291 inquiring to try and find the science behind this rule, and 1292 what true health impacts it will have, and have been unable 1293 to get the answers from the agency for many, many months now. 1294 And I yield back. 1295 The {Chairman.} Gentlelady yields back. 1296 And the chair would recognize the gentlelady from 1297 Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, for 5 minutes. 1298 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1299 I was particularly struck by the gentleman from 1300 Indiana's remark about leftwing research informing, I quess, 1301 the Lung Association --1302 Mr. {Bucshon.} Will the gentlelady yield? 1303 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Yes. 1304 Mr. {Bucshon.} Funded by those organizations, not

- 1305 research done by.
- 1306 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Okay.
- 1307 Mr. {Bucshon.} There is a difference.
- 1308 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Okay.
- 1309 Mr. {Bucshon.} Thank you.
- 1310 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Even so--
- 1311 Mr. {Bucshon.} Yield back.

1312 Ms. {Schakowsky.} --funded by, that somehow, certainly, 1313 the implication was that it is tainted by these ideological 1314 organizations. And the letter that we received then must 1315 call into question not only a letter from the American Lung 1316 Association, which states very clearly the undersigned public 1317 health and medical organizations urge you to oppose the 1318 Ratepayer Protection Act, far from protecting Americans, this 1319 bill would put lives at risk by delaying and blocking 1320 critical clean air protections. It is signed by the Allergy 1321 and Asthma Network, the American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, American Thoracic Society, Asthma 1322 and Allergy Foundation of America, Healthcare Without Harm, 1323 1324 National Association of County and City Health Officials, 1325 National Association of Hispanic Nurses, Trust for America's 1326 Health. And I think that the idea that all of these 1327 organizations have somehow been snookered by leftwing-funded

1328 organizations, that this causes a problem for health, I kind 1329 of take this personally because my son--my grandson, rather, 1330 has asthma, relies on, what do you call them, inhalers. And 1331 to your point, again, to the gentleman from Indiana, it says 1332 not only would the Clean Power Plan give states flexible 1333 tools to reduce the carbon pollution that causes climate 1334 change, these crucial tools would also lower other deadly 1335 pollutants at the same time; preventing up to 6,600 premature 1336 deaths, and 150,000 asthma attacks every year by 2030. 1337 So it seems to me that the gentleman's amendment, which 1338 would provide a guarantee for me that if my governor, for 1339 example, back home in Illinois, decides he wants to delay EPA

1340 protections, I would be able to have some sort of guarantee 1341 that it would not have an adverse impact on health outcomes 1342 in my district or in my family, and I would like to be able 1343 to have that guarantee that this amendment would provide. 1344 And I think that really smearing the--these organizations of 1345 great integrity by questioning their conclusions because of 1346 ideology is really out of line.

1347 And I am prepared to yield to anybody who--on our side 1348 who like to speak to this. Otherwise then--

1349 Mr. {Bucshon.} Will the gentlelady yield for--

1350 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Then I yield back. Yes, I would

1351 yield to the gentleman.

1352 Mr. {Bucshon.} Yeah. The information on potential 1353 improvements in health are based on computer modeling, you 1354 may or may not know that, not based on actual patient data. 1355 And the computer models have been shown to be inaccurate for 1356 decades. So there is no actual patient data, and that is--it 1357 is referring to particulates, and we can dispute--we are 1358 talking about CO2 today. 1359 Ms. {Schakowsky.} I also--1360 Mr. {Bucshon.} So on the particulate side, you know, 1361 you can make a fair argument, but on the CO2 side there is no 1362 data to support it. And it is based on--these projections on 1363 lives saved are based on computer models--1364 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Okay, so--1365 Mr. {Bucshon.} --not on actual patients--1366 Ms. {Schakowsky.} So reclaiming my time--1367 Mr. {Bucshon.} But they are false. Ms. {Schakowsky.} If the gentleman wants to go on 1368 1369 record in saying that CO2 pollution has nothing to do with 1370 climate or health effects, then so be it, but I think that this is a moment in time when this committee actually has an 1371 1372 opportunity to do something to stem the overwhelming climate 1373 change that we are seeing, you know, talk to people in

1374	California about today's effect of climate change on the		
1375	drought thatthe rising sea levels, et cetera, I mean I		
1376	think at this point in history, for us to be sitting in this		
1377	committee and arguing that CO2 pollution isyou know, that		
1378	the computer models are wrong and that there is no effect on		
1379	climate is absolutely ridiculous.		
1380	And I do yield back my time.		
1381	The {Chairman.} Gentlelady yields back.		
1382	I think we are prepared to vote.		
1383	Mr. {Pallone.} Well, I think Mrif I could just		
1384	strike the last word and yield some time to Mr. Rush.		
1385	Mr. {Rush.} Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that we		
1386	are reallythis is a new low for this great committee. I		
1387	mean I		
1388	{Voice.} Would up now.		
1389	Mr. {Rush.} I have heard arguments on the other side		
1390	that are pretty alarming because theywitnesses come before		
1391	this subcommittee or frombefore this committee, and they		
1392	come withtrying to reach and satisfy the levels of		
1393	expectation for the American citizens, and also members of		
1394	the committee. They make certain statements. They are		
1395	treated fairly rudely in many indications by members on		
1396	either side, they are asked questions, and before the witness		

1397 can answer the questions then they are cut off for all kind 1398 of reasons, and they are treated so very, very rudely. But 1399 then the same individuals have the gall to come before the 1400 full committee here and try to put words in the mouth the 1401 witnesses; words that they didn't say. They twisted the 1402 words -- they twist the words around, and the record is pretty 1403 clear that these words, these--this revision of what the 1404 witnesses actually said, but these revisions don't meet--1405 don't answer or don't even fully truly testify to what these 1406 witnesses said at the witness table. And I speak directly to 1407 Ms. McCarthy, or let's go to--Mr. Pompeo, and I remember this 1408 real clearly--Pompeo, he asked Ms. McCabe some questions and 1409 he kept cutting her off, and then he indicated Ms. -- he asked 1410 a question, let's get to health. You are talking about 1411 asthma, how many fewer asthma cases as a result of the Clean 1412 Power Plan? Ms. McCabe: We predict that there will be 1413 thousands of fewer exacerbated asthma. How many? What is 1414 the report? What is the study that shows exactly how many 1415 asthma--how many fewer asthma? Ms. McCabe answered, these 1416 particulars are laid out in our regulatory impact analysis. 1417 How much more increased snowpack as a result of the Clean 1418 Power Plan? Listen to this answer. That is not something 1419 that we predicted, and that is not something that you can

1420 predict from, and she was cut off.

1421 So this is just an indication. I have here Senate 1422 testimony with Administrator McCarthy, same kind of format. 1423 So, Mr. Chairman, let us cease to put words and to indicate 1424 meaning that our witnesses before this committee did not say, 1425 and certainly did not mean, just for--just to buttress our 1426 own arguments. Let the witnesses' testimony speak for 1427 themselves. There is no way that the EPA have said to this 1428 committee, to the subcommittee, some of the things that are 1429 being testified or that are being said today, and the quotes 1430 that are being guoted.

1431 So, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have reached, again, 1432 an all-time low. Here we are putting words, revising 1433 testimony, and human--certain appearances that are not there 1434 as it relates to the position of the EPA on climate change. 1435 And I think that we should cease that.

1436 And I yield back. Or the gentleman--I thank the 1437 gentleman for yielding me the time.

1438 Mr. {Pallone.} I yield back. Thank you.

1439 The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back.

1440 Mr. {Pallone.} I ask for a roll call when we--

1441 The {Chairman.} Roll call is asked.

1442 Let me just say, it is my understanding that we are

1443	likely to have only one more amendment. It is the
1444	expectation that we are going to have votes at the House
1445	Floor, a series of votes, at about 1:15. So my hope is that
1446	weroll call vote is asked for here, I am hoping that we can
1447	dispense withif it is only one more minute, and then get to
1448	finaland finish this bill prior to votes on the Floor.
1449	So with that, the debate has ended. The clerk will call
1450	the roll.
1451	The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton?
1452	[No response.]
1453	The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield?
1454	Mr. {Whitfield.} No.
1455	The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield votes no.
1456	Mr. Shimkus?
1457	Mr. {Shimkus.} No.
1458	The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus votes no.
1459	Mr. Pitts?
1460	Mr. {Pitts.} No.
1461	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts votes no.
1462	Mr. Walden?
1463	Mr. {Walden.} No.
1464	The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes no.
1465	Mr. Murphy?

1466	Mr. {Murphy.} No.
1467	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy votes no.
1468	Mr. Burgess?
1469	Mr. {Burgess.} No.
1470	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess votes no.
1471	Mrs. Blackburn?
1472	[No response.]
1473	The {Clerk.} Mr. Scalise?
1474	Mr. {Scalise.} No.
1475	The {Clerk.} Mr. Scalise votes no.
1476	Mr. Latta?
1477	Mr. {Latta.} No.
1478	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes no.
1479	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
1480	[No response.]
1481	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper?
1482	Mr. {Harper.} No.
1483	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes no.
1484	Mr. Lance?
1485	Mr. {Lance.} No.
1486	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes no.
1487	Mr. Guthrie?
1488	Mr. {Guthrie.} No.

1489	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes no.
1490	Mr.	Olson?
1491	[No	response.]
1492	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McKinley?
1493	Mr.	{McKinley.} No.
1494	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes no.
1495	Mr.	Pompeo?
1496	Mr.	{Pompeo.} No.
1497	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Pompeo votes no.
1498	Mr.	Kinzinger?
1499	Mr.	{Kinzinger.} No.
1500	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
1501	Mr.	Griffith?
1502	Mr.	{Griffith.} No.
1503	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes no.
1504	Mr.	Bilirakis?
1505	Mr.	{Bilirakis.} No.
1506	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
1507	Mr.	Johnson?
1508	Mr.	{Johnson.} No.
1509	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes no.
1510	Mr.	Long?
1511	Mr.	{Long.} No.

1512	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes no.
1513	Mrs. Ellmers?
1514	Mrs. {Ellmers.} No.
1515	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Ellmers votes no.
1516	Mr. Bucshon?
1517	Mr. {Bucshon.} No.
1518	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes no.
1519	Mr. Flores?
1520	[No response.]
1521	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks?
1522	Mrs. {Brooks.} No.
1523	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes no.
1524	Mr. Mullin?
1525	Mr. {Mullin.} No.
1526	The {Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes no.
1527	Mr. Hudson?
1528	Mr. {Hudson.} No.
1529	The {Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes no.
1530	Mr. Collins?
1531	Mr. {Collins.} No.
1532	The {Clerk.} Mr. Collins votes no.
1533	Mr. Cramer?
1534	Mr. {Cramer.} No.

1535	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes no.
1536	Mr. Pallone?
1537	Mr. {Pallone.} Aye.
1538	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes aye.
1539	Mr. Rush?
1540	Mr. {Rush.} Aye.
1541	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes aye.
1542	Ms. Eshoo?
1543	Ms. {Eshoo.} Aye.
1544	The {Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
1545	Mr. Engel?
1546	[No response.]
1547	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green?
1548	Mr. {Green.} Aye.
1549	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green votes aye.
1550	Ms. DeGette?
1551	Ms. {DeGette.} Aye.
1552	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes aye.
1553	Mrs. Capps.
1554	Mrs. {Capps.} Aye.
1555	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes aye.
1556	Mr. Doyle?
1557	Mr. {Doyle.} Yes.

1558	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes aye.
1559	Ms.	Schakowsky.
1560	Ms.	{Schakowsky.} Aye.
1561	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.
1562	Mr.	Butterfield?
1563	[No	response.]
1564	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Matsui?
1565	Ms.	{Matsui.} Aye.
1566	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Matsui votes aye.
1567	Ms.	Castor?
1568	Ms.	{Castor.} Aye.
1569	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Castor votes aye.
1570	Mr.	Sarbanes?
1571	Mr.	{Sarbanes.} Aye.
1572	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
1573	Mr.	McNerney?
1574	Mr.	{McNerney.} Aye.
1575	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McNerney votes aye.
1576	Mr.	Welch?
1577	Mr.	{Welch.} Aye.
1578	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Welch votes aye.
1579	Mr.	Lujan?
1580	Mr.	{Lujan.} Aye.

1581	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Lujan votes aye.
1582	Mr.	Tonko?
1583	Mr.	{Tonko.} Aye.
1584	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Tonko votes aye.
1585	Mr.	Yarmuth?
1586	[No	response.]
1587	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Clarke?
1588	Ms.	{Clarke.} Aye.
1589	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Clarke votes aye.
1590	Mr.	Loebsack?
1591	Mr.	{Loebsack.} Aye.
1592	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
1593	Mr.	Schrader?
1594	Mr.	{Schrader.} Aye.
1595	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Schrader votes aye.
1596	Mr.	Kennedy?
1597	Mr.	{Kennedy.} Aye.
1598	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
1599	Mr.	Cardenas?
1600	Mr.	{Cardenas.} Aye.
1601	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
1602	Chai	Irman Upton?
1603	The	{Chairman.} Votes no.

1604	The {Clerk.} Chairman Upton votes no.
1605	The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast a vote?
1606	Gentleman
1607	The {Clerk.} Olson.
1608	The {Chairman.}from Texas?
1609	Mr. {Olson.} No.
1610	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes no.
1611	The {Chairman.} Mr. Olson.
1612	Other members wishing to cast a vote?
1613	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
1614	Mr. Barton? How is Mr. Barton recorded?
1615	Mr. {Barton.} The Chair will
1616	The {Chairman.} It is youryou are an independent
1617	thinker.
1618	The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes no.
1619	The {Chairman.} Clerk will report the tally.
1620	The {Clerk.} Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 20
1621	ayes and 28 nays.
1622	The {Chairman.} Twenty ayes, 28 nays. The amendment is
1623	not agreed to.
1624	Are there further amendments to the bill? Gentleman
1625	from New Jersey has an amendment at the desk.
1626	Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an

1627 amendment at the desk that is--

1628 The {Chairman.} Number--1629 Mr. {Pallone.} 05. 1630 The {Chairman.} 05. 1631 Mr. {Pallone.} Deals directly with climate change. 1632 The {Chairman.} Clerk will report the title of the 1633 amendment. 1634 The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2042, Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, offered by Mr. Pallone of New Jersey. 1635 1636 [The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]

1638 The {Chairman.} And the amendment is considered as 1639 read, and the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in 1640 support of his amendment. 1641 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1642 My amendment deals directly with the issue of climate 1643 change. It is identical to the one recently offered by 1644 Senator Bennet and approved during the budget process. It is simple enough, and I quote, ``The Federal Government should 1645 1646 promote national security, economic growth, and public health 1647 by addressing human-induced climate change through the 1648 increased use of clean energy, energy efficiency, and reductions in carbon pollution.'' 1649 1650 This clear and concise language passed with the support 1651 of 7 republican Senators, along with all the democratic 1652 Senators. Republican senators like Dean Heller, Mark Kirk, 1653 and Rob Portman. It includes the Chair of the Senate Energy 1654 Committee, Senator Murkowski, who is from Alaska, where the 1655 impacts of climate change are undeniable. But let me start 1656 by quoting pro-coal Senator Manchin who said, and I quote, ``There is no question that climate change is real, and that 1657 1658 billions of people have impacted the world's climate. This 1659 amendment supports investment in clean energy technology,

1660 including advanced fossil energy, and supports energy 1661 efficiency which reduces carbon, while saving consumers 1662 money. We can protect the environment for future generations 1663 while ensuring that we have affordable and reliable energy 1664 sources today.''

1665 Mr. Chairman, I think we should be clear about where 1666 members of this esteemed committee stand on the reality of 1667 human-induced climate change, and whether or not it needs to 1668 be addressed. Senators have had to stand up and be counted, 1669 and let's do the same here. Some on your side of the aisle 1670 have said that they are not climate deniers, and this should 1671 be a very easy vote for them, but it would not surprise me if 1672 some or all on the republican side oppose this amendment. 1673 Last week, it was voted down on party lines in the 1674 subcommittee.

1675 But let me be clear, this amendment is the simple sense 1676 of the Congress. It doesn't change the substance of the 1677 bill. It is for anyone who believes in human-induced climate 1678 change, regardless of their views on various approaches, to 1679 deal with the problem. You can vote for this amendment and 1680 still oppose the Clean Power Plan, if that is what you want 1681 to do. But if you vote against this amendment, it can only 1682 mean that you are against any solution to climate change.

1683 So thank you, and I yield back.

1684 Mr. {Whitfield.} [Presiding] The gentleman yields 1685 back.

1686 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia for 5 1687 minutes.

1688 Mr. {Griffith.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, one of the problems with this debate today is that everybody wants to talk about this as if it were a climate change bill. This is not a climate change bill, this is a let's-follow-the-law bill.

In 1995, the Clean Air Act was interpreted in regard to 1694 111(d) by the EPA. Now, understand 1995 there wasn't some 1695 rightwing republican in charge of the White House or the EPA. 1696 That would be the Clinton Administration. And they 1697 interpreted, they couldn't use 111(d) and use 112 to regulate 1698 clean power or any other kind of power in the country. You 1699 had to use one or the other. You could choose.

Then we flash forward to 2008, and we had the case of New Jersey v. EPA, 517 F.3d 574, in which it--the court rules this requires vacation of CAMR's regulations for both new and existing EGUs. EPA promulgated the CAMR regulations under-for existing EGUs, that is electric generation units, and CAMR refers to the Clean Air Mercury Rule, they regulated

1706	under Section 111(d), but under EPA's own interpretation of
1707	the section, it cannot be used to regulate sources listed
1708	under Section 112. EPA, thus, concedes that if EGUs remain
1709	listed under 112, they cannot be used to do the CAMR rule.
1710	Further, in 2010, in a Supreme Court caseand that case came
1711	out of the D.C. Circuit, in a Supreme Court case, the court
1712	noted there is an exception, EPA may not employ 7411(d),
1713	which is what we111(d), if existing stationary sources of
1714	the pollutant in question are regulated under the National
1715	Ambient Air Quality Standard Program, or the Hazardous Air
1716	Pollutants Program, 112, or 7412 as they put it in there.
1717	And then they reference the code section. All we are asking
1718	is that we give some flexibility to the states to say, hey,
1719	if you think there is a great harm to your ratepayers, let's
1720	wait until after the courts have determined whether the EPA
1721	has authority because, frankly, I do not believe they have
1722	authority. The Supreme Court footnoted it, the D.C. Circuit,
1723	not appealed by the EPA, D.C. Circuit in 2008 said they can't
1724	do it both ways. EPA has now come up with this unique,
1725	unusual theory of law that says we can suddenly change what
1726	has been the law for 20 years and come up with something new.
1727	Didn't come through Congress, it is just the way we
1728	reinterpret it. Ladies and gentlemen, this bill is about

1729 following the law. This amendment goes the other direction. 1730 It wants to make it--everybody think this is a climate change 1731 bill. That is not what this bill is. What we are saying is 1732 if you are going to ask the states, like my home State of 1733 Virginia, to spend just on one of their electric companies 1734 \$5.5 to \$6 billion, according to the Virginia State 1735 Corporation Commission, for just one of the power companies 1736 to deal with this rule, that is going to be passed on to the 1737 ratepayer. The threat to the ratepayer is great, and we need 1738 to give the ratepayer some protection here because the threat 1739 from this rule is great to the ratepayer. And, you know, one 1740 of the things we talked about a minute ago was--were the 1741 health concerns, and one of the interesting things about the 1742 EPA is they have never looked at what happens when people 1743 can't afford their electric bill to their health. I would 1744 submit it is negative. They have never put that in the 1745 balance. 1746 So with that, I would yield to the gentleman from West

1747 Virginia.

1748 Mrs. {Blackburn.} [Presiding] The gentleman from West 1749 Virginia.

1750 Mr. {McKinley.} Thank you. I don't know if I can do 1751 this in a minute and 1/2, but let me just quickly--we should

1752 look at the issues that we have been discussing about health. 1753 I am just curious, maybe some folks on the other side of the 1754 aisle have some superior information or privileged 1755 information that we are not--has--I have been asking for 4 1756 years from the EPA they--when they have testified here time 1757 and time again. How do you differentiate from the outdoor 1758 air quality from indoor air quality, when the EPA itself has 1759 said the indoor air quality is probably 100 times worse than 1760 our outdoor air quality? And when we look at what the 1761 chamber--or, excuse me, what the American Lung Association or 1762 what other groups have put out, we know the health conditions 1763 in our homes and our offices--keep in mind, we spend 90 1764 percent of our time indoors. Sixty percent of our time is in 1765 our homes. We are confronted with formaldehyde, pesticides, 1766 dust mites, pollen, there are so many issues on the inside, I 1767 just simply ask, when we deal with asthma, how do you know 1768 that you are getting a problem that has been exacerbated by 1769 outdoor air quality when you spend 90 percent of your time 1770 indoors? The American Lung Association supports this 1771 concern, others have done it, the EPA has done it, but yet we continue to fight out outdoor air quality, when it is our 1772 1773 indoor air quality is where we face our biggest problem. 1774 And then I will just close with the fact that--just keep

1775	in mind, as we said during testimony, if you shut down air
1776	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Gentleman's time has expired.
1777	Gentleman yield back?
1778	Mr. {McKinley.} YieldI will yield back.
1779	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Gentleman yields back.
1780	Mr. {Rush.} Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I
1781	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Mr. Rush?
1782	Mr. {Rush.} I move to strike the last word.
1783	Mrs. {Blackburn.} You are recognized for 5 minutes.
1784	Mr. {Rush.} Madam Chair, I support Ranking Member
1785	Pallone's amendment. This amendment could becould not be
1786	more timely because, as demonstrated by the recent poll
1787	conducted by the New York Times, Stanford University and the
1788	Resources for the Future, an overwhelming majority of
1789	Americans, a whopping 81 percent, believe that climate change
1790	is caused by human activity, and a staggering 74 percent of
1791	the Americans believe that the Federal Government should be
1792	doing a substantial amount to combat climate change, both
1793	inside our homes and outside of our homes.
1794	Mr. ChairmanMadam Chairman, how can this committee or
1795	jurisdictionthis committee possibly act to address what may
1796	be the most serious threat to ourthat our Nation faces if
1797	the members who make up this committee cannot even admit that

1798 manmade climate change exists, and that there is a problem? 1799 As the elected representatives of the American people, we 1800 should be leading on this issue, rather than allowing our own 1801 parochial interests cause us to delay an ignore a problem 1802 that the overwhelming majority of scientists tell us is 1803 happening; that Mother Nature herself is showing us is 1804 currently happening, and that the American people themselves 1805 know to be happening.

1806 Over the past few years, Madam Chairman, we have 1807 experienced more and more frequent extreme weather events due 1808 to climate change, with disastrous effects being felt in 1809 communities all across this Nation. In fact, no region has 1810 been safe from the impacts of climate change, with almost annual wildfires and heat waves in the West and Southwest, 1811 1812 perennial flooding along the coast, and damaging and costly 1813 droughts, and crop loss from the West to the Plains and to 1814 the Midwest.

1815 Madam Chairman, just saying no, either to climate change 1816 or the plans for mitigating the risk of climate change, to 1817 outside environment to inside environment, and the Clean 1818 Power Plan would do is not a strategy. Mr. Pallone's 1819 amendment is an opportunity for all members to affirm that--1820 their beliefs in human-induced climate change, and agree that

1821	the government should play a role in the reduction of carbon
1822	emissions, no matter what state they come from. This is a
1823	similar statement of fact, and it should be an easy vote.
1824	Even a majority of the Senate, including 7 republican
1825	Senators, and many pro-coal democratic Senators were able to
1826	agree to the exact same language that we have before us here
1827	today in the Pallone Amendment. Instead of authorizing
1828	states to do nothing to reduce harmful carbon emissions, let
1829	us come together today and show the American people that we
1830	understand that manmade climate change is real, it is
1831	happening, and we understand that as leaders, we must do
1832	something about it before it is too late.
1833	I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Pallone
1834	Amendment. Should not be a hard vote for those who believe
1835	in taking action to fight human-induced climate change.
1836	With that, I yield back.
1837	Mr. {Whitfield.} Mr. Chairman.
1838	The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back.
1839	The chair would recognize the gentleman from Kentucky.
1840	Mr. {Whitfield.} I just want to make a couple of
1841	comments. First of all, I don't think there is anyone in
1842	this room, even on our side of the aisle, that does not
1012	

acknowledge that there is climate change. We do differ with

1844 the President on the priority that he places on it. We think 1845 that there are other issues that are more pressing worldwide 1846 right now than climate change. And to be truthful, this 1847 markup is not about a climate change; this markup is about 1848 the EPA trying to take direct revolutionary control of the 1849 way electricity is produced in America. And we don't need 1850 for the government to do much more than it is doing in 1851 climate change already. A report to the United Nations in 2014 said that the Obama Administration identified 60 federal 1852 1853 programs that are working on greenhouse gases and climate 1854 They reported that they are spending \$22 billion in change. 1855 2013 alone. They intend to spend \$77 billion by the year-between 2008 and 2013. They have 18 federal agencies 1856 1857 involved in climate change-related activities. So it is not 1858 that we don't recognize the climate is changing; there is 1859 simply a difference in priority. And this legislation is not 1860 about climate change, it is about trying to stop EPA taking 1861 over the way electricity is produced in America.

And with that, I would--unless someone else would--I would like to yield time to--I hope that you all forgive me for my enthusiastic response there, but I just wanted to say it. So I yield back the balance of my time.

1866 The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back.

1867 Chair would recognize the gentlelady from Illinois, Ms.1868 Schakowsky, for 5 minutes.

1869 Ms. {Schakowsky.} This amendment is really basic. It 1870 expresses the sense of Congress that we should promote 1871 national security, economic growth, and that we should 1872 promote these by addressing the threat of climate change, and 1873 including public health.

1874 The Pentagon says that climate change poses immediate 1875 risks to our national security. The Risky Business Project, 1876 coauthored by republican former Treasury Secretaries Hank 1877 Paulson and George Schultz, and former CEO of Cargill, 1878 Gregory Page, found that ``Over time, weather extremes will 1879 become the new normal.'' And they refer to decimating 1880 thousands of miles of coastland, our agricultural sector, and 1881 industries from construction to tourism. Scientists are now 1882 as certain that global warming is a real manmade threat as 1883 they are that cigarettes kill. They are more certain about 1884 climate change than they are--that vitamins make you healthy, 1885 or that dioxin in superfund sites is dangerous. That is what 1886 we call consensus, and yet many of my colleagues on the other 1887 side of the aisle say the jury is still out. And as I have 1888 said before, history will judge climate deniers harshly. 1889 And, frankly, I say to my friend across the aisle from

1890 Kentucky, and those who make climate change and dealing with 1891 it a low priority as well, at a time when we can really do 1892 something about it, and maybe even worse, your grandchildren 1893 will not look kindly on your failure to recognize this threat 1894 at a time when we can make a difference. So I think everyone 1895 should consider, before you put anti-science statements on 1896 the permanent record, you ought to rethink your positions. 1897 This is an easy vote. I urge my colleagues to support this 1898 amendment.

1899 And I yield back. And I--actually, I yield to the 1900 gentlewoman from Colorado.

1901 Ms. {DeGette.} Thank you very much.

1902 I just want to point out to Mr. Whitfield's comment, I 1903 am happy to know that our colleagues on the other side of the 1904 aisle recognize that climate change exists, and as I read 1905 this particular amendment, I don't think it is a very radical amendment. It basically says it is the sense of Congress 1906 1907 that we should promote national security, economic growth, 1908 and public health by addressing climate change. And I think 1909 that is probably why there was bipartisan support for this 1910 concept in the Senate, because it is something we should be 1911 able to work on across the aisle. We might have different 1912 ideas about how we are going to work on climate change, but

1913 really, this is something we don't want to get wrong. We 1914 should really start working on this now, and I would think 1915 something that is a pretty moderate, reasonable sense of 1916 Congress would be exactly the way to start. 1917 I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I yield back to 1918 Ms. Schakowsky. 1919 Ms. {Schakowsky.} Anyone else? Yes, I yield to the 1920 gentlewoman from California. 1921 Ms. {Eshoo.} I thank the gentlewoman. I have listened to the discussion here the better part 1922 1923 of today, and I have to tell you it makes me sad. Why? 1924 Because this committee, of all the committees in the 1925 Congress, has the broadest, deepest, most powerful 1926 jurisdictions to help bring about change and good in our 1927 country. And I have to say that I think we are squandering 1928 I think that we are squandering it. it. 1929 I am going to dig back and hand out to all the members, 1930 because there are so many new members on the committee on 1931 both sides of the aisle, to several years ago when Ed Markey 1932 was on the committee and myself, and we did a joint hearing 1933 because I had an assignment at the House Intelligence 1934 Committee, and so it was Energy and Commerce and HIPSI, and 1935 the whole issue was about the climate changing and the

1936 impacts not only in our country but around the world, and 1937 what a national security threat it posed. All of our 1938 witnesses were from the military. So I want to pass--I am 1939 going to get that and pass it out. I hope you will take the 1940 time to read it, honestly. And that may be something that 1941 helps to open the door of peoples' minds to start thinking, 1942 to have a deeper and broader appreciation that this is our 1943 time, this is our generation that has a responsibility for 1944 the next one, and for whatever years we have left on the face 1945 of this earth. We are the stewards of it, but I really think that we need to--maybe we should have some breakout small 1946 1947 working sessions where people are not really shouting past 1948 one another, and see if we can create a better climate for 1949 change without our committee. 1950 So I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. 1951 The {Chairman.} Gentlelady's time has expired. 1952 Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing 1953 none, the vote occurs on the amendment offered by Mr. 1954 Pallone. We will have a roll call vote. The clerk will call the 1955 1956 roll. 1957 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton? 1958 Mr. {Barton.} No.

1959	The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes no.
1960	Mr. Whitfield?
1961	Mr. {Whitfield.} No.
1962	The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield votes no.
1963	Mr. Shimkus?
1964	[No response.]
1965	Mr. Pitts?
1966	Mr. {Pitts.} No.
1967	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts votes no.
1968	Mr. Walden?
1969	[No response.]
1970	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy?
1971	[No response.]
1972	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess?
1973	Mr. {Burgess.} No.
1974	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess votes no.
1975	Mrs. Blackburn?
1976	Mrs. {Blackburn.} No.
1977	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Blackburn votes no.
1978	Mr. Scalise?
1979	[No response.]
1980	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta?
1981	Mr. {Latta.} No.

1982	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes no.
1983	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
1984	[No response.]
1985	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper?
1986	Mr. {Harper.} No.
1987	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes no.
1988	Mr. Lance?
1989	Mr. {Lance.} No.
1990	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes no.
1991	Mr. Guthrie?
1992	Mr. {Guthrie.} No.
1993	The {Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes no.
1994	Mr. Olson?
1995	Mr. {Olson.} No.
1996	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes no.
1997	Mr. McKinley?
1998	Mr. {McKinley.} No.
1999	The {Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes no.
2000	Mr. Pompeo?
2001	Mr. {Pompeo.} No.
2002	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pompeo votes no.
2003	Mr. Kinzinger?
2004	Mr. {Kinzinger.} No.

2005	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
2006	Mr. Griffith?
2007	Mr. {Griffith.} No.
2008	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes no.
2009	Mr. Bilirakis?
2010	Mr. {Bilirakis.} No.
2011	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
2012	Mr. Johnson?
2013	Mr. {Johnson.} No.
2014	The {Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes no.
2015	Mr. Long?
2016	Mr. {Long.} No.
2017	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes no.
2018	Mrs. Ellmers? Mrs. Ellmers?
2019	Mrs. {Ellmers.} No.
2020	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Ellmers votes no.
2021	Mr. Bucshon?
2022	Mr. {Bucshon.} No.
2023	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes no.
2024	Mr. Flores?
2025	[No response.]
2026	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks?
2027	Mrs. {Brooks.} No.

2028	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes no.	
2029	Ar. Mullin?	
2030	Ar. {Mullin.} No.	
2031	The {Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes no.	
2032	Ir. Hudson?	
2033	Ar. {Hudson.} No.	
2034	The {Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes no.	
2035	Ar. Collins?	
2036	Ar. {Collins.} No.	
2037	The {Clerk.} Mr. Collins votes no.	
2038	Ar. Cramer?	
2039	Ar. {Cramer.} No.	
2040	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes no.	
2041	Ar. Pallone?	
2042	Ar. {Pallone.} Aye.	
2043	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes aye	•
2044	Ar. Rush?	
2045	Ar. {Rush.} Aye.	
2046	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes aye.	
2047	4s. Eshoo?	
2048	As. {Eshoo.} Aye.	
2049	The {Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes aye.	
2050	Mr. Engel?	

2051	[No response.]
2052	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green?
2053	Mr. {Green.} Aye.
2054	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green votes aye.
2055	Ms. DeGette?
2056	Ms. {DeGette.} Aye.
2057	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes aye.
2058	Mrs. Capps.
2059	Mrs. {Capps.} Aye.
2060	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes aye.
2061	Mr. Doyle?
2062	Mr. {Doyle.} Yes.
2063	The {Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes aye.
2064	Ms. Schakowsky.
2065	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Aye.
2066	The {Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.
2067	Mr. Butterfield?
2068	Mr. {Butterfield.} Aye.
2069	The {Clerk.} Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
2070	Ms. Matsui?
2071	Ms. {Matsui.} Aye.
2072	The {Clerk.} Ms. Matsui votes aye.
2073	Ms. Castor?

2074	Ms.	{Castor.}	Aye.
2075	The	{Clerk.}	Ms. Castor votes aye.
2076	Mr.	Sarbanes?	
2077	Mr.	{Sarbanes	.} Aye.
2078	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
2079	Mr.	McNerney?	
2080	Mr.	{McNerney	.} Aye.
2081	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. McNerney votes aye.
2082	Mr.	Welch?	
2083	Mr.	{Welch.}	Aye.
2084	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Welch votes aye.
2085	Mr.	Lujan?	
2086	Mr.	{Lujan.}	Aye.
2087	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Lujan votes aye.
2088	Mr.	Tonko?	
2089	Mr.	{Tonko.}	Aye.
2090	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Tonko votes aye.
2091	Mr.	Yarmuth?	
2092	Mr.	{Yarmuth.]	} Aye.
2093	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Yarmuth votes aye.
2094	Ms.	Clarke?	
2095	Ms.	{Clarke.}	Aye.
2096	The	{Clerk.}	Ms. Clarke votes aye.

2097	Mr. Loebsack?
2098	Mr. {Loebsack.} Aye.
2099	The {Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
2100	Mr. Schrader?
2101	Mr. {Schrader.} Aye.
2102	The {Clerk.} Mr. Schrader votes aye.
2103	Mr. Kennedy?
2104	Mr. {Kennedy.} Aye.
2105	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
2106	Mr. Cardenas?
2107	Mr. {Cardenas.} Aye.
2108	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
2109	Chairman Upton?
2110	The {Chairman.} Votes no.
2111	The {Clerk.} Chairman Upton votes no.
2112	The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast votes?
2113	Dr. Murphy?
2114	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy votes no.
2115	The {Chairman.} Mr. Walden?
2116	Mr. {Walden.} No.
2117	The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes no.
2118	The {Chairman.} Mr. Shimkus?
2119	Mr. {Shimkus.} No.

- 2120 The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus votes no.
- 2121 The {Chairman.} Dr. Murphy, we are going to vote on
- 2122 final in a second.

2123 Other members wishing to cast a vote? Seeing none, the 2124 clerk will report the tally.

2125 The {Clerk.} Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were 23 2126 ayes and 28 nays.

2127 The {Chairman.} Twenty-three ayes, 28 nays. The

2128 amendment is not agreed to.

2129 Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none,

2130 the question now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 2042 to

2131 the House. And we will have a roll call vote.

2132 All those in favor will say aye.

2133 All those opposed, say no.

2134 And roll call vote. Clerk will call the roll.

2135 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton?

2136 Mr. {Barton.} Aye.

2137 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes aye.

2138 Mr. Whitfield?

2139 Mr. {Whitfield.} Aye

2140 The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield votes aye.

2141 Mr. Shimkus?

2142 Mr. {Shimkus.} Aye.

2143	The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus votes aye.
2144	Mr. Pitts?
2145	Mr. {Pitts.} Aye
2146	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts votes aye.
2147	Mr. Walden?
2148	Mr. {Walden.} Aye.
2149	The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes aye.
2150	Mr. Murphy?
2151	Mr. {Murphy.} Aye.
2152	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy votes aye.
2153	Mr. Burgess?
2154	Mr. {Burgess.} Aye.
2155	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess votes aye.
2156	Mrs. Blackburn?
2157	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Aye.
2158	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Blackburn votes aye.
2159	Mr. Scalise?
2160	[No response.]
2161	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta?
2162	Mr. {Latta.} Aye.
2163	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes aye.
2164	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
2165	[No response.]

2166	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Harper?
2167	Mr.	{Harper.} Aye.
2168	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes aye.
2169	Mr.	Lance?
2170	Mr.	{Lance.} Aye.
2171	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes aye.
2172	Mr.	Guthrie?
2173	Mr.	{Guthrie.} Aye.
2174	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes aye.
2175	Mr.	Olson?
2176	Mr.	{Olson.} Aye.
2177	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes aye.
2178	Mr.	McKinley?
2179	Mr.	{McKinley.} Aye.
2180	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes aye.
2181	Mr.	Pompeo?
2182	Mr.	{Pompeo.} Aye.
2183	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Pompeo votes aye.
2184	Mr.	Kinzinger?
2185	Mr.	{Kinzinger.} Aye.
2186	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes aye.
2187	Mr.	Griffith? Mr. Griffith?
2188	Mr.	{Griffith.} Aye.

2189	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes aye.
2190	Mr. Bilirakis?
2191	Mr. {Bilirakis.} Aye.
2192	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.
2193	Mr. Johnson?
2194	Mr. {Johnson.} Aye.
2195	The {Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes aye.
2196	Mr. Long?
2197	Mr. {Long.} Aye.
2198	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes aye.
2199	Mrs. Ellmers? Mrs. Ellmers?
2200	Mrs. {Ellmers.} Aye.
2201	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Ellmers votes aye.
2202	Mr. Bucshon?
2203	Mr. {Bucshon.} Aye.
2204	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
2205	Mr. Flores?
2206	[No response.]
2207	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks?
2208	Mrs. {Brooks.} Aye.
2209	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes aye.
2210	Mr. Mullin?
2211	Mr. {Mullin.} Aye.

2212	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes aye.
2213	Mr.	Hudson?
2214	Mr.	{Hudson.} Aye.
2215	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes aye.
2216	Mr.	Collins?
2217	Mr.	{Collins.} Aye.
2218	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Collins votes aye.
2219	Mr.	Cramer?
2220	Mr.	{Cramer.} Aye.
2221	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes aye.
2222	Mr.	Pallone?
2223	Mr.	{Pallone.} No.
2224	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes no.
2225	Mr.	Rush?
2226	Mr.	{Rush.} No.
2227	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes no.
2228	Ms.	Eshoo?
2229	Ms.	{Eshoo.} No.
2230	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes no.
2231	Mr.	Engel?
2232	[No	response.]
2233	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Green?
2234	Mr.	{Green.} No.

2235	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green votes no.
2236	Ms. DeGette?
2237	Ms. {DeGette.} No.
2238	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes no.
2239	Mrs. Capps.
2240	Mrs. {Capps.} No.
2241	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes no.
2242	Mr. Doyle?
2243	Mr. {Doyle.} No.
2244	The {Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes no.
2245	Ms. Schakowsky.
2246	Ms. {Schakowsky.} No.
2247	The {Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes no.
2248	Mr. Butterfield?
2249	Mr. {Butterfield.} No.
2250	The {Clerk.} Mr. Butterfield votes no.
2251	Ms. Matsui?
2252	Ms. {Matsui.} No.
2253	The {Clerk.} Ms. Matsui votes no.
2254	Ms. Castor?
2255	Ms. {Castor.} No.
2256	The {Clerk.} Ms. Castor votes no.
2257	Mr. Sarbanes?

2258	Mr.	{Sarbanes.} No.
2259	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Sarbanes votes no.
2260	Mr.	McNerney?
2261	Mr.	{McNerney.} No.
2262	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McNerney votes no.
2263	Mr.	Welch?
2264	Mr.	{Welch.} No.
2265	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Welch votes no.
2266	Mr.	Lujan?
2267	Mr.	{Lujan.} No.
2268	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Lujan votes no.
2269	Mr.	Tonko?
2270	Mr.	{Tonko.} No.
2271	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Tonko votes no.
2272	Mr.	Yarmuth?
2273	Mr.	{Yarmuth.} No.
2274	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Yarmuth votes no.
2275	Ms.	Clarke?
2276	Ms.	{Clarke.} No.
2277	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Clarke votes no.
2278	Mr.	Loebsack?
2279	Mr.	{Loebsack.} No.
2280	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack votes no.

2281	Mr. Schrader?
2282	Mr. {Schrader.} No.
2283	The {Clerk.} Mr. Schrader votes no.
2284	Mr. Kennedy?
2285	Mr. {Kennedy.} No.
2286	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes no.
2287	Mr. Cardenas?
2288	Mr. {Cardenas.} No.
2289	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes no.
2290	Chairman Upton?
2291	The {Chairman.} Votes aye.
2292	The {Clerk.} Chairman Upton votes aye.
2293	The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast a vote?
2294	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
2295	The {Clerk.} Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 28
2296	ayes and 23 nays.
2297	The {Chairman.} Twenty-eight ayes, 23 nays. The bill,
2298	H.R. 2042, is approved. And without objection, yeah, we will
2299	correct theall right, so it has passed.

- 2300 H.R. 2045
- 2301 The {Chairman.} The chair now calls up H.R. 2045, and 2302 asks the clerk to report.
- 2303 The {Clerk.} H.R. 2045, to provide that certain bad
- 2304 faith communications in connection with the assertion of a
- 2305 United States patent are unfair or deceptive acts or
- 2306 practices, and for other purposes.
- 2307 [The bill follows:]

2309	The {Chairman.} And without objection, the first
2310	reading of the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open
2311	for amendment at any point.
2312	I would note that we are closing on the House Floor with
2313	speakers, so I think rather doing an amendment, we will
2314	adjourn and come back after the 2 votes that we have in the
2315	House.
2316	So with that, the committee stands adjourned.
2317	[Recess.]
2318	The {Chairman.} We are going to wait a few minutes
2319	before we restart, wait until we have a quorum. We just had
2320	votes on the Floor. I know there are some peopleokay, we
2321	will reconvene. When we recessed, we called up H.R. 2045,
2322	and the clerk reported the title of the bill.
2323	And let me ask if there are any bipartisan amendments to
2324	the bill? Seeing none, are there any other amendments to the
2325	bill? And I would recognize the gentlelady from California.
2326	Is the amendment at the desk?
2327	Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2328	The {Chairman.} And the clerk
2329	Ms. {Eshoo.} I do have an amendment at the desk. It is
2330	Bad Faith 01.

2331	The {Chairman.} 01? The clerk will report the title of
2332	the amendment.
2333	The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2045, offered by Ms.
2334	Eshoo.
2335	[The amendment of Ms. Eshoo follows:]
2336	*************** INSERT 7 ***********************************

The {Chairman.} And the amendment will be considered as read, and the gentlelady will be offered 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

2340 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

2341 Patent trolls and the abusive demand letters they send 2342 represent a very serious threat and a drain. The drain is on 2343 our national economy, the threat is to--is the negative 2344 impact on innovation. And I commend Representative Burgess 2345 for his good faith effort to address this problem--to try and 2346 address the problem, and I want to work with him to produce 2347 legislation that stops this. And the bill that preempts 2348 strong state consumer protection laws and leaves loopholes 2349 for abusers to exploit them really does not provide the kind 2350 of hammer I think that we need to effectively stomp out this 2351 well-documented problem. I am very familiar with it. Very 2352 familiar with it in my congressional district, which is a 2353 Silicon Valley district.

Now, the gentleman in--from Texas and I share a common goal. We want to stop patent trolls and the abusive demand letters that they send. Under the bill's current bad faith requirement though, the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission, would have to prove, excuse me, would have to prove in court

2359 that the sender of an abusive demand letter made knowingly 2360 false or knowingly misleading statements, that they made the 2361 statements with reckless disregard as to the false or 2362 misleading nature of the statements, or made the statements 2363 with an awareness of high probability that they were meant to 2364 deceive, and the sender intentionally avoided the truth. 2365 Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this is a 2366 very, very high evidentiary bar, and it is nearly impossible 2367 to meet in many of the demand letter cases we have seen to 2368 date. A case in point in the National Association of 2369 Realtors. During their testimony before the committee, and 2370 in an April 23 letter to the committee, they stated the 2371 following. ``Recipients of demand letters can be harmed by 2372 misrepresentations for omissions regardless of whether the 2373 party making them knows them to be false or misleading.'' 2374 So this amendment aligns the bill with a much tougher 2375 standard to address unfair or deceptive acts or practices. Now, many times, there are members that don't want something 2376 2377 to be tougher. The only way that you are going to put a stop 2378 to these abuses of the demand letters is to have the 2379 toughest, most enforceable law on the books. So simply put, 2380 the vague and deceptive unfair practices of patent trolls, 2381 and this is something Congress really needs to take very

2382 seriously. I mean they are really putting a severe dent in 2383 our economy. This has to stop.

2384 Now, the Judiciary Committee has something on patent 2385 trolls, we are doing this here, and really overall, what this 2386 means is that we need legislation that provides really 2387 effective enforcement. If you don't have effective 2388 enforcement then really I think that we are wasting our time. 2389 And that is not a diminution of the author of the bill, but that that section of the bill, I think is really left 2390 2391 wanting.

2392 So for all of these reasons, I am urging my colleagues 2393 to support the amendment. I would be happy to work with Mr. 2394 Burgess to really beef-up this section. I don't know what 2395 the genesis was to make it weaker, but weaker is not going to 2396 do. You really need teeth in this thing, and again, what is 2397 in the bill sets a very, very high evidentiary bar which is 2398 nearly impossible to meet in so many of the demand letter 2399 cases that we have seen in my office to date and in my 2400 district, and from other parts of the country as well. 2401 So I don't know if anyone would like me to yield them 2402 any time, but if not, I yield back, and thank you. 2403 The {Chairman.} Gentlelady yields back.

2404 Other members wishing to speak? Dr. Burgess, recognized

2405 for 5 minutes.

2406 Mr. {Burgess.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Move to strike 2407 the requisite number of words to speak in opposition to the 2408 amendment.

2409 Mr. Chairman, you know, there is a significant body of 2410 law that preserves the patent holder's rights to assert their 2411 patents in good faith. Imposing a bad faith requirement 2412 helps to ensure that the legislation will not be vulnerable 2413 to a challenge on First Amendment grounds.

2414 We are required here to balance competing interests, and 2415 sometimes that is different--difficult. We have the 2416 legitimate interests of patent holders, and we have the 2417 recipients of letters from people who are exercising fraud, 2418 and the appropriate balance was a bad faith threshold. We 2419 don't want to make it harder for legitimate patent holders to 2420 protected their federally granted and constitutionally 2421 protected property rights. Without the bad faith threshold, 2422 those patent holders would live in fear of Federal Trade 2423 Commission or a State Attorney General taking an action 2424 against them for what might amount to a simple mistake. 2425 Requiring bad faith is essential to distinguishing bad actors 2426 from those who make innocent mistakes, or have legitimate 2427 reasons for not disclosing certain information enumerated in

2428 the bill.

2429 Where a letter doesn't meet the bad faith standard 2430 because of an innocent mistake or otherwise there is--and 2431 there is otherwise consumer harm, the FTC can and should, and 2432 should, use its Section 5 injunctive authority. A bad faith 2433 standard does not undermine the bill's effectiveness in 2434 targeting truly abusive demand letter practices, and it is 2435 expressing--expressly reserves existing Federal Trade 2436 Commission Section 5 authority to go after any new, false or 2437 deceptive practices that may be used in the future. 2438 Standards similar to the bad faith standard used here can be 2439 found in Federal Trade Commission cases involving when the 2440 officer of a company liable for restitution, the False Claims 2441 Act or Fair Credit Reporting Act, bankruptcy and intentional 2442 discrimination in employment, among others.

2443 The hard-fought agreement is based on FTC law. The 2444 phrase reckless indifference and awareness of a high 2445 probability also comes from the world of FTC enforcement. I 2446 would emphasize that since the beginning of the year, in 2447 fact, I will go back further because this bill was heard in a markup last year in the subcommittee, it has been no surprise 2448 2449 to anyone that this bill was coming forward. We indeed have 2450 had 2 hearings; 1 general hearing and 1 legislative hearing,

2451 leading up to the subcommittee markup last week. This 2452 information has been out there and available to all 2453 stakeholders. Of course, there is willingness on the part of 2454 myself and on the part of the committee staff to work in good faith with members who--and constituents who feel they have 2455 2456 difficulty with this, but we truly believe this is the best 2457 way to provide an enforceable standard. 2458 And, Mr. Chairman, I will yield--I will be happy to 2459 yield to the gentleman from Virginia. 2460 Mr. {Griffith.} Thank you, I appreciate you yielding. 2461 I have some concerns, as you have just stated, and I was 2462 sitting here doing the what-if or the put case situation. So 2463 if Mom invents a gizmo and then she dies, leaving children 2464 and a--maybe even of different fathers, and then you have a 2465 battle over the estate, one could send something that 2466 misrepresented their interest, but not be doing so in bad 2467 faith, but send it thinking that they are the heir to the patent. They could send out a letter, this would make them 2468 liable for being a troll, in spite of the fact that it was 2469 2470 their ancestor that actually invented the gizmo to begin with. I think you have to come up with something. Maybe 2471 2472 what you have now isn't exactly right, but certainly, we have 2473 to come up with something.

2474	So I would ask that we vote no on the amendment until we
2475	have all the language worked out to make sure that we are not
2476	stepping on, as Mr. Burgess said, the First Amendment rights,
2477	or just the rights of a person who thinks they own the
2478	patent, and has a legitimate claim maybe to the patent, but
2479	finds to that they don't at a later time.
2480	I yield back.
2481	Mr. {Burgess.} And certainly
2482	The {Chairman.} Would the gentleman yield?
2483	Mr. {Burgess.} Yes.
2484	The {Chairman.} And let me just say, you know, this is
2485	a very complex issue, we all know that, and I am not
2486	convinced that the bill that we have is perfect, but I think
2487	we are going to have some time to work on this before it
2488	moves ever to the Floor. So I justwe are going to be very
2489	open with working with different parties, but we are putting
2490	our stake in the ground and we will continue to work, you
2491	know, in the probably months ahead to try and get this
2492	resolved.
2493	Mr. {Barton.} Would the gentleman yield for point of
2494	personal privilege?
2495	The {Chairman.} It is no longer my time, but I will

114

2496 ask unanimous consent the gentleman get another 2 minutes

2497 and--

2498 Mr. {Barton.} Ask unanimous--I want to yield to 2499 Congressman Gus Bilirakis of Florida. He has a distinguished 2500 visitor in the audience, and I would like him to introduce 2501 him.

2502 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate it 2503 very much, Mr. Barton.

I have--it is an honor for me to introduce my father, Congressman Mike Bilirakis, who served on this committee for 2506 22 years, and was the vice chairman of the committee. Thank 2507 you. Welcome, Dad. God bless you.

2508 The {Chairman.} The good news is he looks just the 2509 same, as we all do. Yeah, better.

All right, gentleman's time has expired. And are there other members wishing to seek time on the amendment? The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

2513 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to 2514 speak in support of Ms. Eshoo's amendment, but let me just 2515 tell--let me just say that Mike Bilirakis, your son, has very 2516 ably continued in your tradition, and I know it most because 2517 of the Hellenic Caucus where he continues to champion 2518 Hellenic issues, so I just wanted to say that.

I also wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciated

2520 your remarks about Ms. Eshoo's amendment, and the possibility 2521 of working together with Ms. Eshoo to try to improve the 2522 bill. But in the meantime, I wanted to speak in support of 2523 the amendment. Multiple stakeholders testified about the 2524 problems created by misleading patent assertion letters, 2525 which include unjustified demands for licensing fees, and 2526 threats of cost of litigation, and these unfair and deceptive 2527 acts by so-called patent trolls can frustrate innovation, and 2528 they can burden entities and individuals who purchase or use 2529 even the most common kinds of technology, such as bank ATMs, 2530 Wi-Fi or document scanners. This legislation was brought 2531 forward to incentivize enforcement against bad actors, but 2532 unfortunately, some provisions in the bill may actually 2533 hinder the FTC's ability to protect consumers. Currently, 2534 the FTC and State Attorney Generals can bring cases on a 2535 finding of deception, and they do not have to collect 2536 evidence to prove knowledge or intent. And consumer 2537 protection laws focus on the effect of unfair or deceptive acts on the consumer, and consumers can be harmed by 2538 2539 misrepresentations regardless of whether the party making the 2540 assertions knows that they are false. But this bill would 2541 require the FTC and State Attorney Generals to prove 2542 knowledge or intent, in addition to proving a violation, and

2543 the enforcing agency must collect evidence that proves 2544 knowledge or intent. So even in the cases for which it is 2545 clear to all that the sender of the letters is a bad actor, 2546 the enforcers may not be able to bring a case. The bad faith 2547 requirement is hurdle that almost certainly makes it too 2548 difficult for the agency to bring cases, and I think is a 2549 disincentive to enforcement and it is not a step forward. 2550 Under Ms. Eshoo's amendment, which strikes the bad faith 2551 requirement, the burden of proving unfair or deceptive acts 2552 is consistent with traditional consumer protection laws. Ιt 2553 reflects the recognition and enforcement actions for unfair 2554 and deceptive practices and the sending of demand letters are 2555 just like every other standard, unfair and deceptive practice 2556 case. So if we are going to legislate, we must ensure that 2557 the legislation is effective, and this amendment would ensure 2558 that the TROL Act is effective, and that is why I would urge 2559 support for the amendment, and as--and also to work to try to 2560 correct the problem in the future, as you have suggested. 2561 So I yield back, unless someone else wants part of my 2562 time. Sure, I yield to Ms. Eshoo. 2563 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you. Let me just add this to the 2564 layer of things that I mentioned in introducing the

amendment. If -- we all want to defend patents. If you want

2565

2566 strong defense of solid patents, then you want strong 2567 enforcement for these bad actors who are the patent trollers, 2568 and their abusive demand letters. So, you know, I salute 2569 anyone that introduces legislation that wants to remedy this, 2570 but it is a--what is set in the bill--in the underlying bill 2571 is a very weak standard. It is a very weak standard, the bad 2572 faith standard. And it sets the bar so high for evidence 2573 that it is like have a sieve and you have really giant holes 2574 in it. You pour the spaghetti in the sieve, the noodles come 2575 out, not just the water that you are trying to drain out of 2576 it. And I don't think that is the intent here from anyone on 2577 either side of the aisle. So I congratulate Mr. Burgess for 2578 wanting to do something about it. My only intention here is 2579 to make it strong enough so that the patent is--the patent 2580 holder is really--is protected.

And I want to place in the record, Mr. Chairman, let's see, 1, 2, 3 letters of support here. One from the National Association of Realtors, another United for Patent Reform, and the other the Association for Convenience and, get this, Joe Barton, Petroleum Retailing. How is that? And this United for Patent Reform--

2587Mr. {Barton.}Why are you calling me out?2588Ms. {Eshoo.}Well, no, because you would like it,

2589 because it has got petroleum in it. These are your friends. 2590 These are your friends. But I--just on a serious note, the 2591 coalition--this coalition includes a cross-section of 2592 America's Main Street businesses. They are retailers, 2593 restaurants, home builders, grocers, realtors, hotel owners, 2594 and convenience store, and some of the country's most well-2595 known technology companies. So this is not a partisan thing. This is--we need a tough standard. 2596 2597 And, Mr. Chairman, thank you for saying what you said in 2598 being willing to work to make the bill the best bill we could 2599 put forward. I don't think it is because I don't think this 2600 section is as strong as it can be, but obviously, I will work 2601 with you. Thank you. 2602 The {Chairman.} Time has expired. 2603 Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? 2604 Gentleman from Texas, Mr. Barton. Mr. {Barton.} Well, thank you. Thank you, Mr. 2605 Chairman. And welcome, Mr. Bilirakis. It is good to have 2606 2607 you back. With that applause, don't think about running in

2608 the primary against your son now. We love you but we love

2609 him too. He is doing a good job.

2610 Mr. Chairman, I was almost prepared to vote for Ms.
2611 Eshoo's amendment until she called me out about it, but

2612 having said that, I have an amendment to that same issue, 2613 that of the 6 items in her amendment, 4 of them are in my 2614 amendment. So I share the same concerns. The amendment that 2615 I am going to offer at the appropriate time in the markup 2616 addresses the same issue in a slightly different way, and I 2617 think in a slightly better way. But the gentlelady from 2618 California has correctly identified one of the imperfections 2619 in the subcommittee bill. I am not on the subcommittee, and 2620 I respect the work product of the subcommittee. They have 2621 tried to thread the needle, but this issue of bad faith, the 2622 groups that are supporting the subcommittee print by and 2623 large, Mr. Chairman, are groups that have legitimate issues 2624 with patents, but they are not groups that, to my knowledge, 2625 have ever sent one of these mass demand letters. The group 2626 that we are trying to help, that actually is the recipient of 2627 these demand letters, as you well know, all oppose the 2628 current subcommittee print because, in their mind, they are 2629 not receiving adequate protection against these, I don't want 2630 to say frivolous, but these damaging demand letters, would be 2631 a good word.

2632 So I am not going to support the gentlelady's amendment 2633 at this time, but I do support what she is attempting to do, 2634 and I hope later in the markup to offer an amendment that

2635 addresses it, and I will explain at that point in time how it 2636 is different and why I think it is slightly better. 2637 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield to you or 2638 yield back to anybody that needs the time. 2639 The {Chairman.} Anybody wishing the time? 2640 Mr. {Barton.} I will yield to Ms. Schakowsky, if she 2641 wants to take my time. 2642 Ms. {Schakowsky.} I am happy to, and I thank you for 2643 that. 2644 I do support the gentlelady's amendment, but I also 2645 really support the idea that we are going to--we may be able 2646 to work together to make this better and to address it. 2647 The proving knowledge of--and intent is a very high 2648 threshold, as the author of this amendment has said. For 2649 example, if there is a failure to include basic and essential 2650 information in a demand letter that causes actual harm, well, 2651 then it doesn't really matter what the intent of the sender 2652 really had in mind. All that matters is that the 2653 communication sent from a patent assertion entity 2654 misrepresents or falsely states facts that must be included under the bill, which are made very clear. That allows 2655 2656 action to be taken against bad actors without having to prove 2657 their mindset at the time the demand letters were sent. And,

2658 you know, legitimate patent holders should be able to 2659 identify themselves and include information related to the patent that has allegedly been infringed upon. 2660 What 2661 technology infringes the patent, how the technology infringes 2662 the patent, how the patent holder can be contacted to address 2663 this issue, very basic information. It is not a heavy burden 2664 for someone who is seeking financial or legal restitution for 2665 legitimate patent infringement. So I certainly am going to 2666 support the gentlelady's amendment at this time, and hope 2667 that at a future time we can work out something that we can 2668 all agree on. 2669 The {Chairman.} Yields back the time. 2670 Gentleman from Texas yields back. Other members wishing 2671 to speak on the amendment? Gentleman from California, Mr.

2672 McNerney.

Mr. {McNerney.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I am a patent holder and I want to see the little guy protected. We certainly want to stop--or find a way to stop the tolls. They are really wrecking up the system, but I think Ms. Eshoo's amendment, and perhaps Mr. Barton's will go a long way in satisfying that need.

2679 So I support the amendment. Andi yield back.

2680 The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back.

2681	Other members wishing to speak? Seeing none, the vote
2682	occurs on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from
2683	California.
2684	{Voice.} Roll call.
2685	The {Chairman.} All those in favor, say aye.
2686	Roll call is asked for. Clerk will call the tally.
2687	The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton?
2688	Mr. {Barton.} Aye.
2689	The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes aye.
2690	Mr. Whitfield?
2691	[No response.]
2692	The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus?
2693	[No response.]
2694	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts?
2695	Mr. {Pitts.} No.
2696	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts votes no.
2697	Mr. Walden?
2698	[No response.]
2699	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy?
2700	Mr. {Murphy.} No.
2701	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy votes no.
2702	Mr. Burgess?
2703	Mr. {Burgess.} No.

2704	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess votes no.
2705	Mrs. Blackburn?
2706	Mrs. {Blackburn.} No.
2707	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Blackburn votes no.
2708	Mr. Scalise?
2709	[No response.]
2710	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta?
2711	Mr. {Latta.} No.
2712	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes no.
2713	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
2714	[No response.]
2715	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper?
2716	Mr. {Harper.} No.
2717	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes no.
2718	Mr. Lance?
2719	Mr. {Lance.} No.
2720	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes no.
2721	Mr. Guthrie?
2722	Mr. {Guthrie.} No.
2723	The {Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes no.
2724	Mr. Olson?
2725	Mr. {Olson.} No.
2726	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes no.

2727	Mr. McKinley?
2728	Mr. {McKinley.} No.
2729	The {Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes no.
2730	Mr. Pompeo?
2731	[No response.]
2732	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger?
2733	Mr. {Kinzinger.} No.
2734	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
2735	Mr. Griffith?
2736	Mr. {Griffith.} No.
2737	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes no.
2738	Mr. Bilirakis?
2739	Mr. {Bilirakis.} No.
2740	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
2741	Mr. Johnson?
2742	Mr. {Johnson.} No.
2743	The {Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes no.
2744	Mr. Long?
2745	Mr. {Long.} No.
2746	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes no.
2747	Mrs. Ellmers?
2748	Mrs. {Ellmers.} No.
2749	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Ellmers votes no.

2750	Mr. Bucshon?
2751	Mr. {Bucshon.} No.
2752	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes no.
2753	Mr. Flores?
2754	Mr. {Flores.} No.
2755	The {Clerk.} Mr. Flores votes no.
2756	Mrs. Brooks?
2757	Mrs. {Brooks.} No.
2758	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes no.
2759	Mr. Mullin?
2760	Mr. {Mullin.} No.
2761	The {Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes no.
2762	Mr. Hudson?
2763	Mr. {Hudson.} No.
2764	The {Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes no.
2765	Mr. Collins?
2766	Mr. {Collins.} No.
2767	The {Clerk.} Mr. Collins votes no.
2768	Mr. Cramer?
2769	Mr. {Cramer.} No.
2770	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes no.
2771	Mr. Pallone?
2772	Mr. {Pallone.} Aye.

2773	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes aye.
2774	Mr. Rush?
2775	Mr. {Rush.} Aye.
2776	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes aye.
2777	Ms. Eshoo?
2778	Ms. {Eshoo.} Aye.
2779	The {Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
2780	Mr. Engel?
2781	[No response.]
2782	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green?
2783	[No response.]
2784	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette?
2785	Ms. {DeGette.} Aye.
2786	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes aye.
2787	Mrs. Capps.
2788	Mrs. {Capps.} Aye.
2789	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes aye.
2790	Mr. Doyle?
2791	Mr. {Doyle.} Yes.
2792	The {Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes aye.
2793	Ms. Schakowsky.
2794	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Aye.
2795	The {Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

2796	Mr.	Butterfield?	
2797	Mr.	{Butterfield.} Aye.	
2798	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Butterfiel	d votes aye.
2799	Ms.	Matsui?	
2800	Ms.	{Matsui.} Aye.	
2801	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Matsui vot	ces aye.
2802	Ms.	Castor?	
2803	Ms.	{Castor.} Aye.	
2804	The	{Clerk.} Ms. Castor vot	tes aye.
2805	Mr.	Sarbanes?	
2806	Mr.	{Sarbanes.} Aye.	
2807	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Sarbanes v	votes aye.
2808	Mr.	McNerney?	
2809	Mr.	{McNerney.} Aye.	
2810	The	{Clerk.} Mr. McNerney v	votes aye.
2811	Mr.	Welch?	
2812	Mr.	{Welch.} Aye.	
2813	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Welch vote	es aye.
2814	Mr.	Lujan?	
2815	Mr.	{Lujan.} Aye.	
2816	The	{Clerk.} Mr. Lujan vote	es aye.
2817	Mr.	Tonko?	
2818	Mr.	{Tonko.} Aye.	

2819	The {Clerk.} Mr. Tonko votes aye.
2820	Mr. Yarmuth?
2821	[No response.]
2822	The {Clerk.} Ms. Clarke?
2823	Ms. {Clarke.} Aye.
2824	The {Clerk.} Ms. Clarke votes aye.
2825	Mr. Loebsack?
2826	Mr. {Loebsack.} Aye.
2827	The {Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
2828	Mr. Schrader?
2829	[No response.]
2830	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy?
2831	Mr. {Kennedy.} Aye.
2832	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
2833	Mr. Cardenas?
2834	Mr. {Cardenas.} Aye.
2835	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
2836	Chairman Upton?
2837	The {Chairman.} Votes no.
2838	The {Clerk.} Chairman Upton votes no.
2839	Mr. {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast vote?
2840	Mr. Whitfield?
2841	Mr. {Whitfield.} No.

- 2842 The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield votes no.
- 2843 The {Chairman.} Mr. Walden?
- 2844 Mr. {Walden.} No.
- 2845 The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes no.
- 2846 The {Chairman.} Mr. Shimkus?
- 2847 Mr. {Shimkus.} No.
- 2848 The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus votes no.
- 2849 The {Chairman.} And how is Mr. Barton recorded?
- 2850 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton is recorded as aye.
- 2851 Mr. {Barton.} Mr. Chairman, I have been correctly told-
- 2852 -been told that I said I would vote no, and I always keep my
- 2853 word so I want to change to no.
- 2854 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes no.
- 2855 The {Chairman.} Mrs. Kathy McMorris Rodgers?
- 2856 Mrs. {McMorris Rodgers.} No.
- 2857 The {Clerk.} Mrs. McMorris Rodgers votes no.
- 2858 The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast a vote?
- 2859 Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
- 2860 The {Clerk.} Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 19 2861 ayes and 29 nays.
- 2862 The {Chairman.} Nineteen ayes, 29 nays. The amendment 2863 is not agreed to.
- 2864 Are there further amendments to the bill?

- 2865 Mr. {Barton.} Mr. Chairman.
- 2866 The {Chairman.} Gentleman from Texas.
- 2867 Mr. {Barton.} Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
- 2868 desk. I think it is Barton 14.
- 2869 The {Chairman.} Clerk will report the title of the
- amendment.
- 2871 The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2045, offered by Mr.
- 2872 Barton of Texas.
- 2873 [The amendment of Mr. Barton follows:]

2875The {Chairman.}And the amendment will be considered as2876read, and the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in

2877 support of his amendment.

2878 Mr. {Barton.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2879 This amendment addresses the same issue that Ms. Eshoo's 2880 amendment just addressed. It does it in a slightly different 2881 way. The issue of bad faith and who bears the burden is at 2882 the crux of the disagreement between the proponents of the 2883 subcommittee bill and the opponents of the subcommittee bill. 2884 The amendment that is now before the full committee is an 2885 amendment that was drafted by majority staff and offered to 2886 the stakeholders that are in opposition to the bill. They 2887 rejected it when it was offered because they felt that it put 2888 too high of a burden of proof on the recipients of these 2889 demand letters.

What this amendment does is take the offer that subcommittee staff--majority staff made to the stakeholders in opposition and add some language to it that puts the burden of proof in these frivolous demand letters on the sender of the letter. In other words, if I want to send a demand letter claiming infringement of my patent, in that letter, first, I have to tell the truth, second, I have to

2897 show what the infringement is, and I have to believe when I 2898 send the letter that what I am saying is factually correct. 2899 If the recipient of the demand letter doesn't believe those 2900 are true, they simply alert the FTC, and the FTC has the 2901 option of conducting an investigation to determine where the 2902 facts are, but the burden of proving there is an infringement 2903 is on the sender of the letter.

2904 I think if this amendment were to be voted on and 2905 accepted, the opposition, which is numerous and growing, and 2906 includes some of the largest grassroots stakeholders, 2907 activists groups in the country, like the realtors and the 2908 home builders and the restaurant owners and the credit 2909 unions, I could go on and on, I believe that they would go 2910 from opposing to supportive. And the people that are 2911 currently supporting the bill, Mr. Chairman, are not harmed 2912 by this amendment. I had an opportunity to talk to an 2913 individual who has numerous patents and who is the director 2914 of one of the most prestigious medical research hospitals in 2915 the country, and he had a concern about my amendment but when 2916 I explained it, and I asked him, have you ever sent a demand 2917 letter to 10,000 people, and he said, never, never. I 2918 believe that those that support the current bill would be 2919 happy with this.

2920 So what I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if you and 2921 Dr. Burgess, with Ms. Eshoo and others on the minority side, 2922 will agree that if I withdraw this amendment, that there will 2923 be a good faith effort to bring the stakeholders from both 2924 sides into a meeting where we meet, hear both sides, and try 2925 to reach a middle ground that is acceptable to both sides. 2926 This is a solvable problem. There is nobody in this 2927 committee that supports these trolls sending thousands of 2928 letters to people with some nebulous claim of patent 2929 infringement, hoping that a small percentage will decide to 2930 send money and not fight it. We are united in that. I don't 2931 claim this amendment I am offering is perfect, but I do think 2932 it goes to improve the subcommittee print, and with your support and Dr. Burgess' and Mr. Pallone's and Ms. Eshoo's 2933 2934 and others, I think we can solve this problem before you take 2935 the bill any further. And if you will make that commitment, 2936 I will be more than happy to withdraw the amendment. 2937 The {Chairman.} Well, let me--if the gentleman will yield, I will make that commitment. I do think that, with 2938 2939 some time, we can work this out to the satisfaction of most, 2940 if not all, of the parties. I commend you and Ms. Eshoo too 2941 for your work. I know that even last night, you were meeting 2942 for hours after--

2943 Mr. {Barton.} And the committee staff voluntarily 2944 participated in did an outstanding job.

2945 The {Chairman.} And we are not quite there yet, but I 2946 am certainly led to believe that we have a good amount of 2947 time before this bill will reach the Floor, which will allow 2948 us to work in earnest to find a--an agreement that all of us, 2949 I think, can support, and would work to make that germane on 2950 the Floor and as part of our bill, which his likely to be an 2951 amendment on the Floor, but absolutely extend my sincere word 2952 that we will work very closely on this, because this if not 2953 perfect, I know that, but we have some time to work on it. 2954 Mr. {Barton.} Okay. Well, I would like to see if there

2955 is any discussion--

2956 The {Chairman.} Yeah.

2957 Mr. {Barton.} --but at the appropriate time, I will2958 withdraw it.

2959 The {Chairman.} And maybe--would you like to yield your 2960 remaining time of which--

2961 Mr. {Barton.} My negative time?

2962 The {Chairman.} --your magic 2 seconds to the 2963 gentlelady from California?

2964 Ms. {Eshoo.} [Audio malfunction in hearing room.]
2965 Mr. {Barton.} One, two. Mine works.

2966 Ms. {Eshoo.} [Audio malfunction in hearing room.] So I 2967 look forward to working with Mr. Barton, Mr. Upton, anyone 2968 from my side, our ranking member, and see what we can bring 2969 back to, you know, to the committee on this, because [audio 2970 malfunction in hearing room.] 2971 The {Chairman.} Gentleman withdraw his amendment? 2972 Mr. {Barton.} If there is no other discussion, Mr.--2973 The {Chairman.} Right. Mr. {Pallone.} Mr. Chairman, if I could just strike the 2974 2975 last word. 2976 The {Chairman.} Gentleman from New Jersey is recognized 2977 to strike the last word. 2978 Mr. {Collins.} New York, but that is close. 2979 The {Chairman.} No, no, no, no, I am going to New 2980 Jersey first and then to you. I see you here, but although I 2981 looked at you, I was listening to Mr. Pallone. Yeah. 2982 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you. I just wanted to associate 2983 myself with the remarks that Ms. Eshoo made and with Mr. 2984 Barton as well. I do think that even with the Barton 2985 amendment the way it is set forth we still have the bad faith 2986 requirement, and I would like to remove that requirement 2987 altogether. 2988 So again, I wouldn't have opposed this, but I want

2989	members to know that it doesn't resolve, you know, the
2990	fundamental issue with the bill, so I still would urge
2991	members to vote no on final passage while we are trying to
2992	work this out. But I do appreciate the fact, Mr. Chairman,
2993	that you and Mr. Barton are going to try to work with us on
2994	it.
2995	Can I ask a question though? If we are going toif we
2996	are working this out, why do we need to pass the bill today?
2997	The {Chairman.} Time will help us. Time will help us.
2998	Mr. {Pallone.} Yeah, but I am saying does itgiven
2999	that we are all in such good spirits here, why do we need to
3000	move to pass the bill?
3001	The {Chairman.} I think that is the Blackburn candy
3002	that passed down heredown the aisle.
3003	Mrs. {Blackburn.} That is right. I have more.
3004	Mr. {Pallone.} You have more? Okay. All right, well,
3005	in any case, let's work together, but at this point, the
3006	obviously, I would encourage members to vote no on final.
3007	The {Chairman.} Gentleman from New York is recognized.
3008	Mr. {Collins.} Yeah, I am sorry about that mistake. I
3009	mean there are times people think the New York Jets are
3010	actually the New York Jets and the New Jersey Jets, so that
3011	was part of that confusion there.

3012 As the representative of the only New York football 3013 team, the Buffalo Bills. But I want to thank the gentleman 3014 from Texas for introducing this. I have many of the same 3015 concerns. Someone that has spent my entire life in the 3016 business world, my worry is that the issue of intent, the 3017 burden falls on the person who received the demand letter, 3018 and to prove intent is a very difficult, if not impossible, 3019 hurdle to get across. So I am very happy to hear The 3020 Chairman agree to try to work through this so that we tighten 3021 down a little bit and put the onus where it should be; on the 3022 person sending the letters, and not on the poor innocent 3023 victim who is receiving these letters. So again, thank you 3024 for acknowledging this is an issue we need to address, and 3025 certainly I would like to put my 2 cents worth in at the 3026 right opportunity.

3027 And I yield back.

3028 The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back. Does the 3029 gentleman from Texas withdraw his amendment?

3030 Mr. {Barton.} Mr. Chairman, I do withdraw the 3031 amendment.

3032 The {Chairman.} Amendment is withdrawn.

3033 Are there further amendments to the bill? Gentlelady 3034 from Illinois has an amendment. Schakowsky.

3035	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an
3036	amendment at the desk. Common_01.
3037	The {Chairman.} Clerk will report the title of the
3038	amendment.
3039	The {Clerk.} Amendment to H.R. 2045, offered by Ms.
3040	Schakowsky.
3041	[The amendment of Ms. Schakowsky follows:]

3043 The {Chairman.} And the amendment will be considered as 3044 read, and the gentlelady is recognized for 5 minutes in 3045 support of her amendment.

Ms. {Schakowsky.} The draft bill includes a savings clause in Section 4(a)(2) that reflects the intent to preserve state common law and state general consumer protection laws. And I agree with Chairman Burgess that this law should not preempt common law or state consumer protection laws.

3052 Here is the problem. The language in the preemption 3053 provision itself plainly preempts state common law. The 3054 terms ``requirement, standard, and other provision' having 3055 the force and effect of law'' have been held by the U.S. 3056 Supreme Court to encompass common law. So these 2 paragraphs 3057 are in direct conflict with each other. I don't think we 3058 should be voting on a draft bill that contains inconsistent 3059 or actually conflicting language. So unless we correct the 3060 language, the preemption provision will, at best, be open for 3061 unnecessary litigation, and ultimately left to judicial 3062 interpretation, which may not reflect the intent of the 3063 drafters.

3064 Therefore, the amendment I am offering today simply

3065	makes the intent to preserve common law clear. It removes
3066	the conflicting language and closes the door for protracted
3067	legal battles over the intended scope of the preemption, and
3068	we should strive to limit inconsistencies whenever possible.
3069	We must ensure that federal legislation does not weaken
3070	consumer protections by, I think, unintentionally limiting
3071	the state enforcement authority.
3072	And I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.
3073	The {Chairman.} Does the gentlelady yield back?
3074	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Yes, I am sorry. And I yieldor to
3075	anyone.
3076	The {Chairman.} Frank, do you want to
3077	Mr. {Pallone.} Couldwould the gentlewoman yield to
3078	me?
3079	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Yes, of course.
3080	Mr. {Pallone.} I justI don't want to repeat what Ms.
3081	Schakowsky said, but I think that, you know, basically, she
3082	is correct and she is saying that the preemption language
3083	contradicts the savings clause, and her amendment ensures
3084	that the intent, which I believe is the intent to preserve
3085	common law and state general consumer protection law, is
3086	preserved. So I would urge my colleagues to join us in
3087	supporting this amendment. Youit is her

3088	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Reclaiming my time. In some ways,
3089	you could consider this kind of a technical amendment that
3090	makes the bill consistent, and does what seems to bean idea
3091	that has been expressed on both sides of the aisle, that
3092	common law should be protected. And
3093	Mr. {Pallone.} The gentleman from Vermont
3094	Ms. {Schakowsky.}I yield back.
3095	Mr. {Pallone.} Do you want time? Did you want to
3096	yield?
3097	Ms. {Schakowsky.} I am sorry, didPete
3098	{Voice.} Well, how much time?
3099	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Mr. Welch, did you want time?
3100	Mr. {Welch.} Yeah. Thank you.
3101	I will support the amendment. I am frustrated and
3102	disappointed in the bill. Ithis is a problem we all know
3103	exists, and here is what has happened. We had 2 competing
3104	groups in here. We had some of the companies that had very
3105	valuable patents that they legitimately want to protect. We
3106	had a lot of the small guys, including like low-income,
3107	nonprofits, who were on the receiving end of the patent
3108	trolls, that are pumped out by ``lawyers'' that operate
3109	basically out of shopping centers or in trailers, just kind
3110	of reach out and rip off people. And we had to find a

3111 balance because the big patent holders, with legitimate 3112 patent protection requirements, don't want to have a standard 3113 that will, in any way, even possibly interfere with what they 3114 see as their rights.

3115 On the other hand, the patent trolls, without strong 3116 legislation, are going to continue to essentially prey on the 3117 small companies and the nonprofits. And the question is where is the balance? And here is the deal. We didn't 3118 3119 strike the balance. The big companies, they can protect it, 3120 they have a muscled-up patent department. If one of those 3121 shopping center lawyers sends a letter to one of these big 3122 companies, they have a whole operation with really smart 3123 lawyers, really well-funded systems, where they are going to 3124 crush that patent troll. But if is the Lincoln Street 3125 nonprofit and they get the letter, they are terrified. It is 3126 literally somebody making \$20,000 a year and volunteering an 3127 immense amount of time to help disabled kids, or it is a 3128 small business with folks that don't have a patent law 3129 operation. So should we have the balance be a little bit 3130 more on the side of the little guy, the nonprofit, or are we 3131 going to resolve every benefit of the doubt in favor of these 3132 companies that, yes, they have legitimate patent protection 3133 needs, but they have an enormous capacity to protect them?

3134 So I would like to see us go back to the drawing board 3135 on the bill and try to help out the folks in all of our 3136 districts who are just getting hammered by patent troll 3137 abuse. 3138 I yield back. 3139 The {Chairman.} Gentlelady's time has expired. 3140 Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? Dr. 3141 Burgess is recognized for 5 minutes. 3142 Mr. {Burgess.} Mr. Chairman, I do believe the 3143 appropriate way to address this issue is at the federal 3144 level, and set a national standard that is enforced by the 3145 Federal Trade Commission and State Attorneys General. 3146 This issue epitomizes the impact of interstate commerce 3147 on local businesses. A patent assertion entity sending 3148 thousands of letters from one location across the country 3149 should not be able to hide, depending upon which states have 3150 passed laws and what standards are set in those laws. We are talking about a federally conferred right created by the 3151 3152 Constitution. The effectiveness of existing state laws is 3153 still unclear. It is very possible that the federal courts 3154 will find that the states are preempted from acting in this 3155 space as a result of some previously established legal 3156 doctrines.

3157	And, Mr. Chairman, if I could, I also want to take a
3158	moment andI know I introduced these at the subcommittee
3159	level, but for the benefit of people here at the full
3160	committee level, I have letters of support for the underlying
3161	bill from the Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform, The
3162	American Conservative Union, The American Intellectual
3163	Property Law Association, The Eagle Forum, and The Innovation
3164	Alliance, and I would ask unanimous consent those be inserted
3165	into the record.
3166	The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back?
3167	Mr. {Burgess.} I ask unanimous consent that these
3168	letters
3169	The {Chairman.} Without objection.
3170	[The information follows:]

3172 Mr. {Burgess.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will yield 3173 back. 3174 The {Chairman.} Gentleman yields back. 3175 Other members wishing to speak on the bill? Gentleman 3176 from Washington. 3177 Mr. {Schrader.} Close enough. Oregon. 3178 Would just like to reiterate briefly what Peter Welch 3179 said. You have a conservative blue dog democrat agreeing 3180 with a liberal wild fanatic from Vermont that is on the more 3181 passionate side, and I think that speaks volumes. This is 3182 something I think we all want to get resolved. Didn't quite 3183 happen in the way that some of us would have liked. I 3184 appreciate the good efforts. I agree with Mr. Burgess, we 3185 need a federal solution to this because this is federal law, 3186 and should have a federal solution to it at the end of the 3187 day. But it doesn't quite strike the right balance, and 3188 sorry for that, I would like to work on this bill a little 3189 bit more. 3190 And I yield back.

3191 The {Chairman.} Thank the gentleman from the good State 3192 of Oregon.

3193 Other members wishing to speak? Gentleman from New

3194 Jersey.

3195 Mr. {Lance.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3196 I want to commend Dr. Burgess on all the work that he 3197 has done on this bill, and I associate myself with his 3198 remarks. It seems to me that a patchwork of state laws is 3199 not the most effective way to address this issue, and really, 3200 the effectiveness of existing state laws is still unclear. 3201 It is quite possible that the federal courts will find that 3202 the states are preempted from acting in this space as a 3203 result of the Noerr-Pennington Doctrine, and if this were to 3204 happen, it would leave states only able to act in the event 3205 of sham litigation, and that only applies if the patent 3206 assertion is objectively baseless. And, of course, this is 3207 an extremely high burden to carry, and was rejected as a 3208 standard by both the FTC and the recipient community very 3209 early in our negotiations.

3210 Seems to me, the 50 state laws with different court 3211 interpretations will add expense and complication to an 3212 already complicated field, and it has the potential of 3213 hurting innovation. Moreover, mistakes, innocent though they 3214 might be, will inevitably be made, adding additional costs. 3215 I support setting a single national standard that will 3216 ensure that we act to stop patent trolls. We are not adding

3217	to the compliance burden or confusion for businesses.
3218	And, Mr. Chairman, I also note that the TROL Act's
3219	preemption clause only preempts common law expressly related
3220	to the transmission or contents of communications relating to
3221	the assertion of patent rights. I think that this is a good
3222	bill. I encourage further discussions, but I shall be
3223	supporting it, and I certainly support the tremendous work
3224	the chairman of the subcommittee, Dr. Burgess, has done.
3225	And finally, Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with my
3226	colleague from the State of New York, Mr. Collins, that the
3227	only football team in New York is the Buffalo Bills, and we
3228	in New Jersey have 2 football teams; the Giants and the Jets.
3229	The {Chairman.} Gentleman's time is rapidly expiring.
3230	Are there other members wishing to speak on the
3231	amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment.
3232	Those in favor will say aye.
3233	{Voice.} Roll call.
3234	The {Chairman.} A roll call is asked for.
3235	Clerk will call the roll.
3236	The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton?
3237	[No response.]
3238	The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield?
3239	[No response.]

149

3240	The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus?
3241	Mr. {Shimkus.} No.
3242	The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus votes no.
3243	Mr. Pitts?
3244	Mr. {Pitts.} No.
3245	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts votes no.
3246	Mr. Walden?
3247	[No response.]
3248	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy?
3249	Mr. {Murphy.} No.
3250	The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy votes no.
3251	Mr. Burgess?
3252	Mr. {Burgess.} No.
3253	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess votes no.
3254	Mrs. Blackburn?
3255	Mrs. {Blackburn.} No.
3256	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Blackburn votes no.
3257	Mr. Scalise?
3258	[No response.]
3259	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta?
3260	Mr. {Latta.} No.
3261	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes no.
3262	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?

3263	Mrs. {McMorris Rodgers.} No.
3264	The {Clerk.} Mrs. McMorris Rodgers votes no.
3265	Mr. Harper?
3266	Mr. {Harper.} No.
3267	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes no.
3268	Mr. Lance?
3269	Mr. {Lance.} No.
3270	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes no.
3271	Mr. Guthrie?
3272	[No response.]
3273	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson?
3274	Mr. {Olson.} No.
3275	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes no.
3276	Mr. McKinley?
3277	Mr. {McKinley.} No.
3278	The {Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes no.
3279	Mr. Pompeo?
3280	[No response.]
3281	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger?
3282	[No response.]
3283	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith?
3284	Mr. {Griffith.} No.
3285	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes no.

3286	Mr. Bilirakis?
3287	Mr. {Bilirakis.} No.
3288	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
3289	Mr. Johnson? Mr. Johnson?
3290	Mr. {Johnson.} No.
3291	The {Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes no.
3292	Mr. Long?
3293	Mr. {Long.} No.
3294	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes no.
3295	Mrs. Ellmers?
3296	Mrs. {Ellmers.} No.
3297	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Ellmers votes no.
3298	Mr. Bucshon?
3299	Mr. {Bucshon.} No.
3300	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes no.
3301	Mr. Flores?
3302	Mr. {Flores.} No.
3303	The {Clerk.} Mr. Flores votes no.
3304	Mrs. Brooks?
3305	Mrs. {Brooks.} No.
3306	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes no.
3307	Mr. Mullin?
3308	Mr. {Mullin.} No.

3309	The {Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes no.
3310	Mr. Hudson?
3311	[No response.]
3312	The {Clerk.} Mr. Collins?
3313	Mr. {Collins.} No.
3314	The {Clerk.} Mr. Collins votes no.
3315	Mr. Cramer?
3316	Mr. {Cramer.} No.
3317	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes no.
3318	Mr. Pallone?
3319	Mr. {Pallone.} Aye.
3320	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes aye.
3321	Mr. Rush?
3322	Mr. {Rush.} Aye.
3323	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes aye.
3324	Ms. Eshoo?
3325	Ms. {Eshoo.} Aye.
3326	The {Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
3327	Mr. Engel?
3328	[No response.]
3329	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green?
3330	Mr. {Green.} Aye.
3331	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green votes aye.

3332	Ms. DeGette?
3333	Ms. {DeGette.} Aye.
3334	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes aye.
3335	Mrs. Capps.
3336	Mrs. {Capps.} Aye.
3337	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes aye.
3338	Mr. Doyle?
3339	Mr. {Doyle.} Yes.
3340	The {Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes aye.
3341	Ms. Schakowsky.
3342	Ms. {Schakowsky.} Aye.
3343	The {Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.
3344	Mr. Butterfield?
3345	Mr. {Butterfield.} Aye.
3346	The {Clerk.} Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
3347	Ms. Matsui?
3348	Ms. {Matsui.} Aye.
3349	The {Clerk.} Ms. Matsui votes aye.
3350	Ms. Castor?
3351	Ms. {Castor.} Aye.
3352	The {Clerk.} Ms. Castor votes aye.
3353	Mr. Sarbanes?
3354	[No response.]

3355	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. McNerney?
3356	Mr.	{McNerney	.} Aye.
3357	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. McNerney votes aye.
3358	Mr.	Welch?	
3359	Mr.	{Welch.}	Aye.
3360	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Welch votes aye.
3361	Mr.	Lujan?	
3362	Mr.	{Lujan.}	Aye.
3363	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Lujan votes aye.
3364	Mr.	Tonko?	
3365	[No	response.	l
3366	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Yarmuth?
3367	[No	response.	l
3368	The	{Clerk.}	Ms. Clarke?
3369	Ms.	{Clarke.}	Aye.
3370	The	{Clerk.}	Ms. Clarke votes aye.
3371	Mr.	Loebsack?	
3372	Mr.	{Loebsack.	.} Aye.
3373	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
3374	Mr.	Schrader?	
3375	Mr.	{Schrader	.} Aye.
3376	The	{Clerk.}	Mr. Schrader votes aye.
3377	Mr.	Kennedy?	

3378	Mr. {Kennedy.} Aye.
3379	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
3380	Mr. Cardenas?
3381	Mr. {Cardenas.} Aye.
3382	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
3383	Chairman Upton?
3384	The {Chairman.} Votes no.
3385	The {Clerk.} Chairman Upton votes no.
3386	The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to vote?
3387	Gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Sarbanes?
3388	Mr. {Sarbanes.} Aye.
3389	The {Clerk.} Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
3390	The {Chairman.} GentlemanMr. Guthrie?
3391	Mr. {Guthrie.} No.
3392	The {Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes no.
3393	The {Chairman.} Mr. Walden?
3394	Mr. {Walden.} Walden votes no.
3395	The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes no.
3396	The {Chairman.} Mr. Kinzinger?
3397	Mr. {Kinzinger.} No.
3398	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
3399	The {Chairman.} Mr. Whitfield?
3400	Mr. {Whitfield.} No.

3401 The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield votes no. 3402 The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast a vote? 3403 Mr. Tonko? 3404 Mr. {Tonko.} Yes. 3405 The {Clerk.} Mr. Tonko votes aye. 3406 The {Chairman.} Other members? Seeing--Mr. Barton, how 3407 does Mr. Barton vote? No. Mr. Barton votes no. 3408 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes no. 3409 The {Chairman.} The clerk will report the tally. I 3410 think we--she is tallying up, I think that was the last 3411 amendment, so we will go right to final and roll call. 3412 Right? Yeah. 3413 Mr. {Hudson.} Mr. Chairman. The {Chairman.} Mr. Hudson. Mr. Hudson--3414 3415 Mr. {Hudson.} No. 3416 The {Chairman.} --votes no. The {Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes no. Mr. Chairman, on 3417 3418 that vote there were 21 ayes and 29 nays. 3419 The {Chairman.} Twenty-one ayes, 29 nays. The 3420 amendment is not agreed to. 3421 Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, 3422 the question now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 2045 to 3423 the House. And we will have a roll call vote.

3424 All those in favor will say aye. 3425 Those opposed, say no. 3426 The clerk will call the roll. 3427 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton? 3428 Mr. {Barton.} Aye. 3429 The {Clerk.} Mr. Barton votes aye. Mr. Whitfield? 3430 3431 Mr. {Whitfield.} Aye. 3432 The {Clerk.} Mr. Whitfield votes aye. 3433 Mr. Shimkus? 3434 Mr. {Shimkus.} Aye. 3435 The {Clerk.} Mr. Shimkus votes aye. Mr. Pitts? 3436 3437 Mr. {Pitts.} Aye. 3438 The {Clerk.} Mr. Pitts votes aye. 3439 Mr. Walden? Mr. {Walden.} Aye. 3440 3441 The {Clerk.} Mr. Walden votes aye. 3442 Mr. Murphy? 3443 Mr. {Murphy.} Aye. 3444 The {Clerk.} Mr. Murphy votes aye. 3445 Mr. Burgess? 3446 Mr. {Burgess.} Aye.

3447	The {Clerk.} Mr. Burgess votes aye.
3448	Mrs. Blackburn?
3449	Mrs. {Blackburn.} Aye.
3450	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Blackburn votes aye.
3451	Mr. Scalise?
3452	[No response.]
3453	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta?
3454	Mr. {Latta.} Aye.
3455	The {Clerk.} Mr. Latta votes aye.
3456	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers?
3457	Mrs. {McMorris Rodgers.} Aye.
3458	The {Clerk.} Mrs. McMorris Rodgers votes aye.
3459	Mr. Harper?
3460	Mr. {Harper.} Aye.
3461	The {Clerk.} Mr. Harper votes aye.
3462	Mr. Lance?
3463	Mr. {Lance.} Aye.
3464	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lance votes aye.
3465	Mr. Guthrie?
3466	Mr. {Guthrie.} Aye.
3467	The {Clerk.} Mr. Guthrie votes aye.
3468	Mr. Olson?
3469	Mr. {Olson.} Aye.

3470	The {Clerk.} Mr. Olson votes aye.
3471	Mr. McKinley?
3472	Mr. {McKinley.} Aye.
3473	The {Clerk.} Mr. McKinley votes aye.
3474	Mr. Pompeo?
3475	[No response.]
3476	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger?
3477	Mr. {Kinzinger.} Aye.
3478	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kinzinger votes aye.
3479	Mr. Griffith?
3480	Mr. {Griffith.} Aye.
3481	The {Clerk.} Mr. Griffith votes aye.
3482	Mr. Bilirakis?
3483	Mr. {Bilirakis.} Aye.
3484	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.
3485	Mr. Johnson?
3486	Mr. {Johnson.} Aye.
3487	The {Clerk.} Mr. Johnson votes aye.
3488	Mr. Long? Mr. Long?
3489	Mr. {Long.} Yes.
3490	The {Clerk.} Mr. Long votes aye.
3491	Mrs. Ellmers?
3492	Mrs. {Ellmers.} Aye.

3493	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Ellmers votes aye.
3494	Mr. Bucshon?
3495	Mr. {Bucshon.} Aye.
3496	The {Clerk.} Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
3497	Mr. Flores?
3498	Mr. {Flores.} Aye.
3499	The {Clerk.} Mr. Flores votes aye.
3500	Mrs. Brooks?
3501	Mrs. {Brooks.} Aye.
3502	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Brooks votes aye.
3503	Mr. Mullin?
3504	Mr. {Mullin.} Aye.
3505	The {Clerk.} Mr. Mullin votes aye.
3506	Mr. Hudson?
3507	Mr. {Hudson.} Aye.
3508	The {Clerk.} Mr. Hudson votes aye.
3509	Mr. Collins?
3510	Mr. {Collins.} Aye.
3511	The {Clerk.} Mr. Collins votes aye.
3512	Mr. Cramer?
3513	Mr. {Cramer.} Aye.
3514	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cramer votes aye.
3515	Mr. Pallone?

3516	Mr. {Pallone.} No.
3517	The {Clerk.} Mr. Pallone votes no.
3518	Mr. Rush?
3519	Mr. {Rush.} No.
3520	The {Clerk.} Mr. Rush votes no.
3521	Ms. Eshoo?
3522	Ms. {Eshoo.} No.
3523	The {Clerk.} Ms. Eshoo votes no.
3524	Mr. Engel?
3525	Mr. {Engel.} No.
3526	The {Clerk.} Mr. Engel votes no.
3527	Mr. Green?
3528	Mr. {Green.} No.
3529	The {Clerk.} Mr. Green votes no.
3530	Ms. DeGette?
3531	Ms. {DeGette.} No.
3532	The {Clerk.} Ms. DeGette votes no.
3533	Mrs. Capps? Mrs. Capps?
3534	Mrs. {Capps.} No.
3535	The {Clerk.} Mrs. Capps votes no.
3536	Mr. Doyle?
3537	Mr. {Doyle.} No.
3538	The {Clerk.} Mr. Doyle votes no.

3539	Ms. Schakowsky.
3540	Ms. {Schakowsky.} No.
3541	The {Clerk.} Ms. Schakowsky votes no.
3542	Mr. Butterfield?
3543	Mr. {Butterfield.} No.
3544	The {Clerk.} Mr. Butterfield votes no.
3545	Ms. Matsui?
3546	Ms. {Matsui.} No.
3547	The {Clerk.} Ms. Matsui votes no.
3548	Ms. Castor?
3549	Ms. {Castor.} No.
3550	The {Clerk.} Ms. Castor votes no.
3551	Mr. Sarbanes?
3552	Mr. {Sarbanes.} No.
3553	The {Clerk.} Mr. Sarbanes votes no.
3554	Mr. McNerney?
3555	Mr. {McNerney.} No.
3556	The {Clerk.} Mr. McNerney votes no.
3557	Mr. Welch?
3558	Mr. {Welch.} No.
3559	The {Clerk.} Mr. Welch votes no.
3560	Mr. Lujan?
3561	Mr. {Lujan.} No.

3562	The {Clerk.} Mr. Lujan votes no.
3563	Mr. Tonko?
3564	Mr. {Tonko.} No.
3565	The {Clerk.} Mr. Tonko votes no.
3566	Mr. Yarmuth?
3567	[No response.]
3568	The {Clerk.} Ms. Clarke?
3569	Ms. {Clarke.} No.
3570	The {Clerk.} Ms. Clarke votes no.
3571	Mr. Loebsack?
3572	Mr. {Loebsack.} No.
3573	The {Clerk.} Mr. Loebsack votes no.
3574	Mr. Schrader?
3575	Mr. {Schrader.} No.
3576	The {Clerk.} Mr. Schrader votes no.
3577	Mr. Kennedy?
3578	Mr. {Kennedy.} No.
3579	The {Clerk.} Mr. Kennedy votes no.
3580	Mr. Cardenas?
3581	Mr. {Cardenas.} No.
3582	The {Clerk.} Mr. Cardenas votes no.
3583	Chairman Upton?
3584	The {Chairman.} Votes aye.

3585	The {Clerk.} Chairman Upton votes aye.
3586	The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast a vote?
3587	Mr. Scalise?
3588	The {Clerk.} Mr. Scalise?
3589	Mr. {Scalise.} Aye.
3590	The {Clerk.} Mr. Scalise votes aye.
3591	The {Chairman.} Other members wishing to cast a vote?
3592	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
3593	The {Clerk.} Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 30
3594	ayes and 22 nays.
3595	The {Chairman.} Thirty ayes, 22 nays. The bill is
3596	favorably reported. And without objection, staff is
3597	authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the
3598	bills reported by the committee today. So ordered.
3599	Pursuant to House Rule 1121, all members will be given 2
3600	calendar days to file written and signed views of the bills
3601	approved by the committee today.
3602	Without objection, the committee stands adjourned.
3603	[Whereupon, at 3:28 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]