



## Appendix D. Summary of Key Climate Related Votes in Congress

To identify members of Congress as “pro-climate science” or “anti-climate science” we looked at their votes on the following pieces of legislation in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

### House of Representatives

#### **2011 – Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011 – HR 910**

HR 910 amends the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas (GHG) to address climate change. It excludes GHGs from the definition of “air pollutant” for purposes of addressing climate change (thereby overruling the Supreme Court). Votes **for** this Act were deemed to demonstrate an “**anti-climate science**” position, as they directly reject the scientific findings established by the EPA. This bill passed the House. *Vote results can be found here: <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2011/roll249.xml>*

#### **2011 – H.AMDT.245 to HR 910—Waxman “accept the science” Amdt.**

This amendment sought to add a new section with respect to Congressional Acceptance of Scientific Findings: “Congress accepts the scientific findings of the Environmental Protection Agency that climate changes is occurring, is caused largely by human activities, and poses significant risks for public health and welfare.” Votes against this amendment are deemed “anti-climate science.” Votes **for** this amendment explicitly demonstrate a “**pro-climate science**” position. This amendment failed. *Vote results can be found here: <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2011/roll236.xml>*

#### **2009 – H.R. 2454 – American Clean Energy and Security Act**

The American Clean Energy and Security (ACES) Act would reduce global warming pollution 17% from 2005 levels by 2020 and 83% by 2050 by establishing an economy-wide cap-and-trade program. Additionally, it would mandate that 20% of American electricity consumption come from clean, renewable sources like solar and wind power, with a portion coming from gains in efficiency, by 2020. A vote **for** this bill was considered to demonstrate a “**pro-climate science**” position. The House voted to adopt the American Clean Energy and Security Act by a vote of 219-212. *Access full vote results here: <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2009/roll477.xml>*

#### **2007 – H.Amdt. 174 to H.R. 2082 – National Intelligence Estimate on Climate Change**

H.R. 2082, the 2008 Intelligence Authorization bill, called for a National Intelligence Estimate on the security implications of climate change. The estimate would examine the political, social, economic and agricultural consequences of global warming over the next three decades. Representative Peter Hoekstra (R-MI) offered an amendment to strike this provision from the bill. The House rejected the amendment by a 185-230 vote (House roll call vote 337). A vote for this amendment was deemed an “anti-climate science” position. *Access full vote results here: <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2007/roll337.xml>*

#### **2007 – H.Amdt. 416 to H.R. 2643 –Reducing Global Warming in the Interior-Environment Appropriations Bill**

H.R. 2643, the Interior-Environment appropriations bill, included a nonbinding Sense of the Congress resolution, sponsored by Representative Norm Dicks (D-WA) that endorses mandatory limits on global warming pollution. Representative Joe Barton (R-TX) offered a motion to strike the resolution from the bill. The House rejected the motion by a 153-274 vote (House roll call vote 555). A vote **for** this amendment was deemed an “**anti-climate science**” position. *Access full vote results here: <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2007/roll555.xml>*



## **Senate**

### **2011 – S. Amdt. 183 to S. 493 – Senate vote to prevent EPA action**

The McConnell Amendment (S Amdt 183) to the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011 (S 493) would “prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.” The amendment failed 50-50. A vote **for** this amendment was deemed an “**anti-climate science**” position. *Access full vote results here: <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2007/roll555.xml>*

### **2010 – S.J. Res. 26 – Dirty Air Act**

Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) introduced a Congressional Review Act disapproval resolution (S.J. Res. 26) that would overturn EPA’s Endangerment Finding. The resolution would prevent the EPA from taking the necessary steps under the Clean Air Act to address global warming pollution. In particular, the resolution would dismantle the clean vehicles standards negotiated by the Obama administration and supported by the auto industry, labor, states, and environmentalists. In addition to blocking the clean cars standards, the resolution would have blocked new safeguards to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink from global warming pollution. The Senate defeated S.J. Res. 26 by a vote of 47–53. A vote **for** this resolution was deemed an “**anti-climate science**” position. *Access full vote results here: [http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=111&session=2&vote=00184](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=111&session=2&vote=00184)*

### **2008 – S. 2191 – Climate Security Act**

S. 2191, the Climate Security Act was comprehensive legislation to cut global warming pollution and drive rapid investment in the clean energy economy. The Climate Security Act would have reduced global warming pollution 17-19% below 2005 levels by 2020 and 57-63% below 2005 levels by 2050. Through a flexible market mechanism, the bill allowed major polluters to choose the most cost-efficient way to reduce pollution and buy pollution allowances to cover each ton of pollution that they continue to emit. Opponents of the Climate Security Act mounted a filibuster against it. The cloture vote failed 48-36. A vote **for** cloture was deemed a “**pro-climate science**” position. (Senate roll call vote 145). *Access full vote results here: [http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00145](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=110&session=2&vote=00145)*

### **2005 – S. Amdt. 866 to H.R. 6 – “Sense of the Senate” Resolution**

With S. Amdt. 866 to the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Senate endorsed global warming pollution limits by adopting a “Sense of the Senate” resolution offered by Senators Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) and Arlen Specter (R-PA). This watershed vote put the Senate on record that global warming is real and that mandatory limits are necessary to slow, stop, and reverse the growth of global warming pollution. Before the resolution passed by voice vote, Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) offered a motion to table (kill) the amendment. By a 44-53 vote, the Senate rejected the motion (Senate roll call vote 149). A vote **for** tabling the motion was deemed an “**anti-climate science**” position. *Access full vote results here: [http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=1&vote=00149](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=1&vote=00149)*

### **2003 – S. 139 – Climate Stewardship Act**

Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Joe Lieberman (D-CT) forced an up or down vote on their “Climate Stewardship Act” (S. 139), which would have required major industries, including power plants and oil companies, to collectively reduce U.S. emissions of greenhouse gases to 2000 emission levels by the year 2010. The legislation represented an important first step towards emissions reduction and would have sent an important message to the global community that the U.S. was willing to take action on this global issue. The Senate defeated the McCain-Lieberman legislation by a 43-55 vote (Senate roll call vote 420). A vote **for** this bill was deemed a “**pro-climate science**” position. *Access full vote results here: [http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=108&session=1&vote=00420](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=108&session=1&vote=00420)*