

captive listening sessions. When that doesn't work, they fire their employees. Five hundred bucks an hour for an antiunion lawyer to go in and fire a \$13-an-hour worker. Wow. After what they did in the pandemic, this is what we are seeing.

Howard, do the right thing. Respect your workers. Give them a voice in the workplace. Let them vote on the union.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Small Business Development Center Day. SBDC Day unites nearly 1,000 Small Business Development Centers across the country and the hundreds of thousands of clients they serve.

Pennsylvania is lucky to have 16 SBDCs across our Commonwealth, and they are ready to assist entrepreneurs and small business owners with the knowledge and tools needed to make smart decisions and prosper.

The Pennsylvania SBDCs are a public-private partnership with the U.S. Small Business Administration, the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, and 16 universities and colleges.

Small Business Development Centers are there to provide resources for entrepreneurs of all ages and backgrounds, from underserved communities to veterans.

Madam Speaker, I grew up working for my family's small sporting goods business. I know firsthand the drive, dedication, and determination it takes to succeed.

If you are a small business owner, entrepreneur, or are looking to get started, be sure to check out a Small Business Development Center near you.

ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, last week marked the 1-year anniversary of the passage of the American Rescue Plan.

The American Rescue Plan was the bold and necessary action we needed to take to put us on the path of economic recovery. This was the boost our country needed to get shots in arms, Americans back to work, and money back in the pockets of working families.

Despite unprecedented challenges, the Biden administration has led our Nation to record economic growth, including the largest job creation in American history. In President Biden's first year, over 7.4 million jobs were added to the economy. Also, growth is up, wages are up, and unemployment is

down. But we know we still face inflationary times.

President Biden and Democrats are also acting to fix supply chains and taking strong steps to boost competition, strengthen U.S. manufacturing, create good-paying jobs, and lower everyday costs. We are working towards building a better America and delivering for America's working families.

□ 1215

BAN HAIR DISCRIMINATION THROUGH THE CROWN ACT

(Ms. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the CROWN Act. This long-overdue legislation would finally ban hair discrimination in schools, in the workplace, and in other public spaces.

No worker should be denied employment because of their natural hair. No child should be sent home from school because they choose to wear protective hairstyles like Bantu knots or braids.

Discrimination against Black hair has been and always will be a form of racism. Every person deserves to be their true, authentic self, and crowns of all types should be embraced.

I was proud to wear braids on the day of my swearing-in, just as I am proud to wear braids as I speak on the House floor today.

It is time to end hair discrimination in America. It is time to pass the CROWN Act.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 963, FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT OF 2022, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2116, CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR NATURAL HAIR ACT OF 2021

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 979 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 979

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 963) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-34 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided

and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2116) to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-36 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee met on and reported a rule, House Resolution 979, providing for consideration of H.R. 963, the FAIR Act, under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It makes in order one amendment and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2116, the CROWN Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary and provides one motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, the bills we discuss today have to do with fundamental American values.

The first bill under this rule, the FAIR Act, simply restores the right of individuals to have their day in court.

It prevents the use of forced arbitration clauses in consumer and employment contracts.

Most likely, all of us have signed a contract with a forced arbitration clause, and many may not even know it. How many Americans have read their cell phone contract? How many have read their credit card contract?

Too many consumer contracts are written to protect the pockets of corporations, leaving consumers at the mercy of a system created by, paid by, and focused on minimizing liabilities of corporate companies.

These documents are dozens of pages long, and most contain clauses that require arbitration in case of a legal dispute and prevent the consumer from going to court as an alternative. There is no negotiation or choice.

Ask yourselves, if you saw something that you objected to in a contract for your cell phone, what option do you have to change it? The answer is no choice at all.

That is why this is called forced arbitration, and these requirements game the system in favor of one party, large corporations. If there is a dispute, corporations get to pick the location of arbitration, and in many cases, it is out of State; pick the arbitrator; and pay for them. Yes, the impartial arbitrator, who depends on corporate contractors, is paid for by the corporation. And corporations get to shield the results from the public. Imagine that.

The FAIR Act stops this harmful and abusive behavior. It bans forced arbitration clauses in employment, civil rights, and consumer disputes.

Congress just passed legislation that changed this process for disputes involving sexual harassment. However, there are tens of millions of Americans who are still affected by forced arbitration in other contexts, and this legislation provides those same protections to them as well.

Ensuring fairness under the law is at the center of the second bill being considered under this rule, the CROWN Act. This bill would ensure that discrimination based on race is not masked as discrimination about hair-styles.

This is legislation that we passed by a voice vote last Congress with no objection from the other side. But this year, Republicans decided that something had changed—not with the legislation, but with their Conference—since they objected to the consideration of this bill under suspension.

The CROWN Act simply clarifies what studies have shown, that oftentimes women, particularly Black women, are discriminated against based on their natural hair.

Courts have rejected previous guidance finding that discrimination on the basis of hairstyle or hair texture is a violation of the Civil Rights Act. So, this legislation simply makes these protections clear, that you cannot discriminate on the basis of a person's hair texture or hairstyle if that style

or texture is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin.

I believe that both of these bills will help to make our legal system more fair for every single one of us. I urge passage of the rule and these bills.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I thank the Representative from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we are here to discuss H.R. 2116, which would clarify that it is a Federal crime to discriminate based on an individual's hair. But we are also here to discuss H.R. 963, the FAIR Act, which bans arbitration clauses in private contracts.

H.R. 963 makes it clear: The intention is to remove arbitration as a legal tool for the American people while preserving arbitration with an exemption for labor unions. The belief is that the American people need Washington watching over their private contracts. I assure you, those in Minnesota's Seventh District do not need them.

The bill purports to ban forced arbitration. This is misleading rhetoric. Forced or involuntary agreements are already illegal. So, what would this bill really do?

It would insert the Federal Government into the private contracts of citizens and remove their ability to settle disputes outside of the courtroom through predispute arbitration agreements.

This bill pretends to empower plaintiffs, but by voiding arbitration clauses in the context outlined in the bill, it would effectively end most arbitration entirely, even when that arbitration would benefit those most impacted.

Because the bill fundamentally changes an arbitration clause from a mutual commitment to use an alternative dispute resolution method into a one-sided election for an injured party, contracts will be far less likely to include the option to arbitrate.

If parties cannot agree in advance to arbitrate, the plaintiff may never have access to arbitration. These unintended consequences will have real-life implications, especially for those who lack deep pockets and do not have the possibility of a high-dollar settlement that some of the more affluent individuals do.

Democrats are also ignoring how arbitration is generally a good way to resolve disputes. They seem to assume that all arbitration is secret, that arbitration automatically keeps individuals from going to the authorities or publicizing their experiences. But agreeing to resolve a case outside of court is different than agreeing to silence.

That distinction matters here because much of the push for this bill comes from concern about secrecy rather than whether justice can be served in the arbitration context. And despite that emphasis, the bill does not

actually address confidentiality or nondisclosure agreements.

□ 1230

Additionally, arbitration is often less expensive and more efficient than litigation. It tends to be less adversarial, which allows parties to continue doing business together after the dispute is resolved. That is why so many Americans choose to enter into contracts with arbitration clauses in them.

Voting for this rule is a vote for a bill empowering Washington to micromanage the business life of Americans. Voting for this rule is to take away freedoms from Americans. Congress should stand ready to improve the legal system, and we must make sure that whatever we do will actually be an improvement for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bills.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am going to share three stories from hardworking Americans.

Connie Nagrampa, a California resident, started working as a franchisee for a marketing company. The company cheated her out of her investments, her life investments. When she tried to seek accountability, they forced her into arbitration.

The company, conveniently enough for them, chose to move the arbitration process across the country to the city of Boston. A California resident was expected to fly herself and pay for all of her expenses to Boston to seek justice. It was too expensive, obviously, for somebody who has just lost her life savings. She lost the arbitration as a result, and the arbitrator said she had to pay more money to the company. Connie spent years attempting to overturn that unjust cause.

Now let me tell you about a brave American Navy reservist, Lieutenant Commander Kevin Ziober, whose employer fired him the same day he was deployed to Afghanistan. This is blatantly illegal under Federal law. But because the employer had forced all of their employees to sign a forced arbitration clause, he was unable to make his claim in Federal court and get his job back.

That is what they are defending.

Let me tell you about another brave military servicemember, Charles Beard, whose rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, SCRA, were violated by his bank.

SCRA is a bipartisan law which provides financial and legal protections to servicemembers and their families when they are on Active Duty. This is especially important given how vulnerable Active Duty servicemembers can be to predatory lending schemes, identity theft, or other unfair financial practices when they are deployed or on Active Duty.

Mr. Beard is a former sergeant in the Army National Guard, now 100 percent VA disabled. When he was on tour in Iraq, his wife at the time and their five children relied on one vehicle. One day the bank decided to repossess that vehicle. It was no longer convenient to keep that loan open for somebody risking their life for us, our country.

This, too, was a violation of the Federal law SCRA because he was deployed. When he tried to hold the bank publicly accountable in court, he was forced into arbitration because of a forced arbitration clause buried in the fine print.

These are just three stories of hard-working Americans. These are the stories of real people that we need to stand up for and protect.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of Congresswoman McMORRIS RODGERS' and Congressman WESTERMAN's American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, while the majority is continuing their agenda of misguided woke policies, constituents in my district continue to send me photos of their energy bills and prices they are paying at the pump.

Since President Biden took office, gasoline prices are up more than 50 percent, natural gas is up more than 25 percent, and diesel fuel is up more than 47 percent. These price increases are on top of crippling, unprecedented inflation. They are attacks on Americans of every stripe, class, and creed.

When adjusted for these factors, wages and salaries are actually below pre-pandemic levels. My constituents are pleading with the majority to focus on this issue rather than the idealism filled with Green New Deal pipe dreams.

To further explain the amendment, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

We are on the House floor today because House Democrats have decided to bring up yet another bill to benefit their special interests instead of dealing with the number one pocketbook issue facing the American people. That is energy affordability and reliability.

The world is at the brink of war, and Americans are suffering from higher prices not only at the gas pump, but in every part of American life because when energy becomes more expensive, everything else does as well.

Recent news reports show that Democrat Members of this body are asking the President to declare a climate emergency and halt energy production on Federal lands entirely.

The Transportation Secretary—this is hard to believe—tells Americans to stop complaining about high gas prices and buy electric vehicles that cost nearly twice as much as the median wage in this country. He might as well have yelled, "Let them eat cake."

Energy security is national security and increasing our energy security should be the number one priority in Congress today instead of finding new ways to enrich trial lawyers.

Representative CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS' bill, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act, of which I am an original cosponsor, is a critical step we must take to reverse President Biden's anti-American energy policies that have emboldened Vladimir Putin to invade Ukraine. As he fought to keep American energy in the ground, our reliance on foreign oil grew, and here we are, more reliant on foreign sources today.

Last year, I stood on the floor of this House and talked about the flawed decision by President Joe Biden to lift sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, further tying European nations to Russian sources of energy; primarily natural gas, which burns dirtier than American gas.

In addition, given the resources we have here in the United States, we should never buy oil and gas from Russia. That puts American consumer dollars right in the pocket of one of the richest men in the world, Vladimir Putin. He is laughing all the way to the bank and now, sadly, all the way to Ukraine.

Russian oil imports reached an 11-year high last year in the United States, which cost American consumers \$17.5 billion.

The McMorris Rodgers' bill would immediately approve the Keystone XL pipeline, remove all restrictions on LNG exports, restart oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and waters, and require the Biden administration to submit to this Congress an energy security plan to reduce energy and gas prices for all Americans.

Despite President Biden's deflection, this isn't Putin's price hike. Gas prices were already up 55 percent from the day Biden took office, and this was before Russia invaded Ukraine.

If you Democrats are going to keep telling lies about American energy using TikTok actors to push these lies, I am going to keep telling the truth about what policies are failing American families.

This attack on American energy started during President Biden's cam-

paign for President. Putin watched as Biden vowed to eliminate fossil fuel production in the U.S. during the 2019 Presidential debate, canceled the Keystone XL pipeline on his first day in office, and halted all new oil and gas leases on Federal lands.

Biden's war on American energy knows no limits. This does not have to be our reality, folks. The President and the Democrat majority could take immediate steps both to strengthen our energy security and reduce prices at the pump for American families.

And hear this: America, the United States, has led the world in emissions reductions. You all don't want to acknowledge that. The President has completely sold out the environmental left, whose Green New Deal policies have caused consumers to pay an average of nearly \$4.50 per gallon at the pump, the highest cost in United States history, and still these costs are rising.

Further, many of these environmental NGOs pushing the Green New Deal policies are funded by Vladimir Putin himself to ensure our dependence on Russian energy and kill American energy development.

The United States is blessed with abundant natural resources, but we are cursed with liberal politicians who refuse to allow Americans to benefit from them. They also refuse to let our allies benefit. There are currently six, Madam Speaker, six LNG export terminal permit requests at the Department of Energy. Zero have been approved. Even during President Obama's time, more LNG export terminals were approved.

If Democrats really were interested in cutting Putin's leverage, they would be focused on increasing U.S. exports to Europe because European nations have 40 percent of Europe's energy supply coming from Russia. The reality is, they would rather sell their Green New Deal ideology while lining the pockets of tyrants in the Kremlin, Iran, and Venezuela. American consumers are paying these tyrants.

Europe and the rest of the world needs American energy leadership at this time. Drill more. Export now. Cut off that money pipeline to Vladimir Putin.

Let's flip the switch and vote on the American Energy Independence from Russia Act to unleash American energy production and security.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so the House can immediately consider this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we are supposed to be debating two very important bills to help Americans continue to thrive in this great country, but instead my colleagues across the aisle want to debate

about something that they know is incorrect.

There are over 9,000 approved drilling permits the oil industry is not using. And the truth is that changes in domestic energy policy often take years to impact global energy markets. They know that.

But instead, what is happening here is oil companies are using Putin's war as an excuse to jack up prices at the pump even more, and then they argue for looser regulations, cheaper drilling, and more pollution.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a March 4, 2022, opinion article from The Guardian written by House Natural Resources Committee Chairman RAÚL GRIJALVA entitled "Oil and Gas Lobbyists are Using Ukraine to Push for a Drilling Free-for-All in the U.S."

[From the Guardian, Mar. 4, 2022]

OIL AND GAS LOBBYISTS ARE USING UKRAINE TO PUSH FOR A DRILLING FREE-FOR-ALL IN THE US

(By Raúl M. Grijalva)

Last week, we all watched in horror as Vladimir Putin launched a deadly, catastrophic attack on Ukraine, violating international treaties across the board. Most of us swiftly condemned his actions and pledged support for the Ukrainian people whose country, homes and lives are under attack.

But the fossil-fuel industry had a different take. They saw an opportunity—and a shameless one at that—to turn violence and bloodshed into an oil and gas propaganda-generating scheme. Within hours, industry-led talking points were oozing into press releases, social media and opinion pieces, telling us the key to ending this crisis is to immediately hand US public lands and waters over to fossil-fuel companies and quickly loosen the regulatory strings.

Our top priority must be ending Putin's hostilities, but as chair of the US House committee on natural resources, I feel duty-bound to set the record straight. We can't let the fossil-fuel industry scare us into a domestic drilling free-for-all that is neither economically warranted nor environmentally sound.

Despite industry's claims to the contrary, President Biden has not hobbled US oil and gas development. In fact, much to my deep disappointment and protest, this administration actually approved more US drilling permits per month in 2021 than President Trump did during each of the first three years of his presidency. Before the pandemic, oil and gas production from public lands and waters reached an all-time high, and the current administration has done little to change that trajectory over the last 13 months.

Fossil-fuel companies and their backers in Congress also profess that more drilling on public lands and waters would lower gas prices for Americans. But if that's true, why hasn't record oil extraction from both federal and non-federal lands over the last decade done anything to consistently lower, or at least stabilize, prices at the pump?

The fact is that crude oil is a volatile global commodity. Worldwide supply, demand, and unpredictable events—like wars—influence the price of gas, not the current administration's decision to approve a few new leases or permits.

Even if we take industry's claims at face value, nothing is keeping fossil-fuel companies from more drilling on public lands right now. The oil industry already controls at least 26m acres of public land and is sitting

on more than 9,000 approved drilling permits they're not using.

They have a similarly gratuitous surplus offshore, where nearly 75% of their active federal oil and gas leases, covering over 8m acres, have yet to produce a single drop. Any new leases issued today wouldn't produce anything of value for years, or even decades in some cases.

If industry did start to ramp up production from federal leases, the overall increase to the total US supply would likely be marginal. In 2020, public lands and waters only accounted for 22% and 11% of oil and gas production, respectively. The vast majority of oil and gas resources are beneath state and private lands—not public lands or federal waters.

With the facts laid bare, we see the fossil-fuel industry's crocodile tears for what they are—the same old demands for cheaper leases and looser regulations they've been peddling for decades. These pleas have nothing to do with countering Putin's invasion or stabilizing gas prices, and everything to do with making oil and gas development as easy and profitable as possible.

The US is the world's top oil and gas producer. Doubling down on fossil fuels is a false solution that only perpetuates the problems that got us here in the first place.

And quite frankly, we can't afford to maintain the status quo. In its newest report the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued its most dire warning yet on the rapidly accelerating climate crisis. If we fail to enact major mitigation efforts, like curbing fossil-fuel development, both quickly and substantially, we will "miss a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a livable and sustainable future for all".

Fortunately, there is a path forward that simultaneously cuts the lifeline to fossil-fuel despots like Putin, stabilizes energy prices here at home, and creates a safer, more sustainable planet. We must wean ourselves off our oil and gas dependence and make transformational investments in cleaner renewable energy technologies, like those in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the Build Back Better Act and the Competes Act, and we must do it now.

The fossil-fuel industry has had hold of the microphone for far too long. It's time we let the facts speak for themselves.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, if my colleagues were so concerned about oil prices or the welfare and security of humanity in the crisis that is happening in Ukraine, maybe they should have stepped up and inquired about the five meetings that the previous administration held in secret without staff, only a translator, with Vladimir Putin.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, under the Trump administration, the U.S. became a net exporter of petroleum for the first time since 1958.

Under President Biden's leadership, starting with the revocation of the Keystone XL pipeline, the U.S. is back to being a net importer of petroleum and is expected to continue through this year. This is unacceptable, and our constituents are paying dearly for it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I oppose the previous question so that we can, instead, consider the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

In recent weeks, we have all seen Europe struggle to navigate its dependence on Russian energy. It is terrible to be beholden to, to be dependent on an adversary. And so, like so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I pushed to ban Russian energy imports into this country, and I am grateful that we have done that.

But rather than look to other countries to fill that gap, we should be looking here at home. The resources that we need for energy security are already located right here. Now, yes, of course, renewables will play an important role, but so will North American oil and gas.

The President made a terrible decision on day one to cancel the Keystone XL project. But this bill will move us back in the right direction by, once again, allowing the permitting and the leasing of oil, gas, and mineral development on Federal lands and waters.

Developing a plan for that energy security, which this bill would also do, to better utilize North American oil and gas, it would reduce prices; it would increase energy security; and it would increase national security as a result.

Now, of course my colleague on the other side of the aisle is right. Passing this bill would not reduce energy prices overnight. But the reality is, the second best time to plant a tree is today. The second best time to make this kind of an investment in energy security would be right now.

We did miss too much time. We lost too much time during the first year of the Biden administration, but we can get it right now. And doing that doesn't just bear security benefits, it is also cleaner.

Giving the world an opportunity to displace dirty Russian oil with 23 percent cleaner North American oil would save the equivalent of 100 million cars' worth of emissions. We can do that. Our stuff is cleaner.

And so, Madam Speaker, we know that we can build a cleaner, a better, a safer energy future, and we can do it by focusing right here at home, and that is what H.R. 6858 would do.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, every action the Biden administration has taken since Keystone's cancellation has increased our foreign dependency on oil. June 2021, 5 months after canceling Keystone, the Biden administration suspends leasing of ANWR. Three months later, the White House calls on OPEC to boost oil production. Two months after that, the Biden administration stopped efforts to modernize the NEPA permitting process for domestic extraction.

Every action this majority has taken is directly responsible for the prices

consumers are seeing today. Fortunately, the solution to this problem is very simple.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, for my colleagues to continue to advance this narrative that there are some 9,000 permits out there waiting to be drilled demonstrates the naïveté of the oil and gas industry and it is just, frankly, disingenuous.

And to make the statement that Vladimir Putin is responsible for the skyrocketing cost of gasoline, what a joke. Gasoline was going up before Russia ever invaded Ukraine because of President Biden's policies.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act. I was proud to work on this legislation with Ranking Member RODGERS and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Madam Speaker, we all saw it today, President Zelenskyy pleading with the United States and the West to do more to punish Russia for these atrocities and halt Putin's assault on innocent Ukrainians.

It is obvious that the United States and Europe need to do more. But sadly, more, much more, could have been done before this invasion, and I believe it could have all been avoided.

Madam Speaker, you will hear a lot today that energy security is national security. Well, ain't that the truth.

Our European allies, after years of rushing to green, weather-dependent, unreliable energy, and shutting down their own energy resources, have come to learn this the hard way. Their green priorities led them to greater and greater dependence on Russia, to the point that they could do virtually nothing as Russian tanks rolled into Ukraine.

Let's not make the same mistake here in America. We can't make our energy supply and the energy supply of our allies dependent on some of the worst people in the world.

This legislation would put us on a better path. It would restart the Keystone XL pipeline; reopen our Federal lands and waters to access our abundant natural resources; and it also includes a provision, legislation that I authored, to cut the red tape and unleash American liquefied natural gas exports, which our allies in Europe are currently clamoring for; ultimately, to get out from under the boot of Putin's energy dominance.

There is still time to make things right, Madam Speaker, so I am urging this Chamber to consider H.R. 6858 immediately.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, the prices American consumers are paying at the pump is directly affected

by how much oil is produced domestically. Canceling American oil production jobs, while seeking it from dictators, is not only nonsensical, but it also is against our national interest.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN).

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider legislation to force President Biden to restore our energy independence.

The United States was the largest producer of oil and gas in the world under President Trump. In less than a year, President Biden has destroyed our energy sector, created the highest gas prices in American history, and crippled our economy in the process.

There is no logic to this administration's refusal to unleash our full energy potential. It is time to ask if this administration is holding the reins of power, or if radical environmentalist groups are calling the shots at the White House.

For 2 years, I have been demanding an investigation into foreign funding of these environmental organizations. Vladimir Putin has a long history of spreading misinformation and using activist groups to deter domestic energy production. In just 10 years, the European Union went from producing more natural gas than Russia to relying on them for 40 percent of their natural gas consumption. Russian dark money is to blame, and we have to prevent the same thing from happening here at home.

Russia will use every tool at their disposal to undermine our national security. And by listening to these radical groups, the Biden administration has allowed them to succeed.

Madam Speaker, we are relying on foreign adversaries and authoritarian regimes when we have the resources here at home to bring down gas prices and help our allies in Europe. Instead of calling Venezuela and Iran, the President should be calling Texas.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, how long will the House continue to attack the basic freedoms of the American people? It is not for Congress in Washington or some bureaucrat to tell the American people what they can and cannot do when revolving disputes. That is, frankly, none of their business.

If they want to agree to an arbitration clause before a dispute arises, that is for the American people to decide and not Washington, who think they know better than the American people.

It is not our job to micromanage the lives of our constituents. It is our job to safeguard their freedom.

We need to consider the unintended consequences of this legislation. There are many policies in this well-inten-

tioned bill, but if it becomes law, contracts will be far less likely to include the option to arbitrate. This may not be an issue for people with deeper pockets and the ability to hire attorneys, but it will be a concern for those who do not have the option of a high-dollar settlement.

We must also keep in mind that sometimes arbitration is the best way to solve disputes. This is just one of the many aspects of this bill that needs to be reconsidered before we can move forward.

I oppose this bill, and encourage my colleagues to do the same. Everyone has the best intentions.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, the rule allows for consideration of these two bills, which will ensure that we are providing better protections for consumers and employees.

The FAIR Act stops large corporations from gaming the system in their favor, and allows consumers the opportunity to have their day in court.

And the CROWN Act ensures that we do not allow discrimination in any way, shape, or form. These are commonsense bills that help the American people.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 979

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6858) to strengthen United States energy security, encourage domestic production of crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6858.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1515

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANGEVIN) at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 963, FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT OF 2022, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2116, CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR NATURAL HAIR ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 979) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 963) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2116) to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—219

Adams	Chu	Foster
Aguilar	Cicilline	Frankel, Lois
Allred	Clark (MA)	Gaetz
Auchincloss	Clarke (NY)	Gallego
Axne	Cleaver	Garamendi
Barragán	Clyburn	García (IL)
Bass	Cohen	García (TX)
Beatty	Connolly	Golden
Bera	Cooper	Gomez
Beyer	Correa	Gonzalez,
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Vicente
Blumenauer	Craig	Gottheimer
Blunt Rochester	Crist	Green, Al (TX)
Bonamici	Crow	Grijalva
Bourdeaux	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bowman	Davidson (KS)	Hayes
Boyle, Brendan	Davis, Danny K.	Higgins (NY)
F.	Dean	Himes
Brown (MD)	DeFazio	Horsford
Brown (OH)	DeGette	Houlihan
Brownley	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bush	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Bustos	Delgado	Jacobs (CA)
Butterfield	Demings	Jayapal
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Carson	Dingell	Johnson (TX)
Carter (LA)	Doggett	Jones
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Kahele
Case	F.	Kaptur
Casten	Escobar	Keating
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Españillat	Khanna
Cherfilus-	Evans	Kildee
McCormick	Fletcher	Kilmer

Kim (NJ)	Nadler	Scott, David
Kind	Napolitano	Sewell
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Sherman
Krishnamoorthi	Neguse	Sires
Kuster	Newman	Slokin
Lamb	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Langevin	O'Halleran	Soto
Larsen (WA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Larson (CT)	Omar	Speier
Lawrence	Pallone	Stansbury
Lawson (FL)	Panetta	Stanton
Lee (CA)	Pappas	Stevens
Lee (NV)	Pascrell	Strickland
Leger Fernandez	Payne	Suozzi
Levin (CA)	Perlmutter	Swalwell
Levin (MI)	Peters	Takano
Lieu	Phillips	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Lowenthal	Pocan	Titus
Luria	Porter	Tlaib
Lynch	Pressley	Tonko
Malinowski	Price (NC)	Torres (CA)
Maloney,	Quigley	Torres (NY)
Carolyn B.	Raskin	Trahan
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Trone
Manning	Ross	Underwood
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
McBath	Ruiz	Veasey
McColum	Ruppersberger	Vela
McEachin	Rush	Velázquez
McGovern	Ryan	Wasserman
McNerney	Sanchez	Schultz
Meeks	Sarbanes	Waters
Meng	Scanlon	Watson Coleman
Mfume	Schakowsky	Welch
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Wexton
Morelle	Schneider	Wild
Moulton	Schrader	Williams (GA)
Mrvan	Schrier	Wilson (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth

NAYS—204

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Latta
Allen	Fortenberry	LaTurner
Amodei	Fox	Lesko
Armstrong	Franklin, C.	Letlow
Arrington	Scott	Long
Babin	Fulcher	Loudermilk
Bacon	Gallagher	Lucas
Baird	Garbarino	Luetkemeyer
Balderson	García (CA)	Mace
Banks	Gibbs	Malliotakis
Barr	Gimenez	Mann
Bentz	Gohmert	Massie
Bergman	Gonzales, Tony	Mast
Bice (OK)	Gonzalez (OH)	McCarthy
Biggs	Good (VA)	McCaul
Billirakis	Gooden (TX)	McClain
Bishop (NC)	Gosar	McClintock
Boebert	Granger	McHenry
Bost	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Brady	Graves (MO)	Meijer
Brooks	Green (TN)	Meuser
Buchanan	Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)
Buck	Griffith	Miller-Meeks
Bucshon	Grothman	Moelenaar
Burchett	Guest	Mooney
Burgess	Guthrie	Moore (AL)
Calvert	Harris	Moore (UT)
Cammack	Harshbarger	Murphy (NC)
Carey	Hartzler	Nehls
Carl	Hern	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Herrell	Norman
Carter (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Obermole
Cawthorn	Hice (GA)	Owens
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Cheney	Hill	Palmer
Cline	Hinson	Pence
Cloyd	Hollingsworth	Perry
Clyde	Hudson	Pflieder
Cole	Huizenga	Posey
Comer	Issa	Reed
Crawford	Jackson	Reschenthaler
Crenshaw	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
Curtis	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Jordan	Rose
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Rosendale
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer
Dunn	Katko	Roy
Elizy	Keller	Rutherford
Estes	Kelly (MS)	Salazar
Fallon	Kelly (CA)	Scalise
Feenstra	Kim (CA)	Schweikert
Ferguson	Kustoff	Scott, Austin
Fischbach	LaHood	Sessions
Fitzgerald	LaMalfa	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)	Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Smith (NJ)	Tiffany	Webster (FL)
Smucker	Timmons	Wenstrup
Spartz	Turner	Westerman
Stauber	Upton	Williams (TX)
Steel	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Stefanik	Van Drew	Wittman
Steil	Van Duyne	Womack
Steube	Wagner	Young
Stewart	Walberg	Zeldin
Taylor	Walorski	
Tenney	Waltz	

NOT VOTING—9

Budd	Emmer	Miller (IL)
Costa	Huffman	Mullin
Diaz-Balart	Kinzing	Sherrill

□ 1553

Messrs. KUSTOFF, GALLAGHER, CALVERT, and GONZALEZ of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll call No. 73.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Garamendi	Norman (Wilson)
Bourdeaux	(Correa)	(SC)
(Correa)	Gimenez (Waltz)	Pascrell
Bowman (Meng)	Golden	(Pallone)
Brown (OH)	(Courtney)	Payne (Pallone)
(Jeffries)	Harder (CA)	Porter (Wexton)
(Beyer)	(Beyer)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	(Escobar)
(Gomez)	(Jeffries)	Salazar (Fallon)
Carter (GA)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Schrier (Jeffries)
(Cammack)	Kaptur	Scott, David
Carter (TX)	(Lawrence)	(Jeffries)
(Nehls)	Kim (NJ)	Sires (Pallone)
Connolly	(Pallone)	Suozzi (Beyer)
(Wexton)	Kirkpatrick	Taylor (Fallon)
Crist	(Pallone)	Titus (Cicilline)
(Wasserman)	Lawson (FL)	Trone (Beyer)
Schultz)	(Evans)	Upton (Katko)
Dean (Scanlon)	Lesko (Joyce)	Van Drew
DeLauro	(PA))	(Reschenthaler)
(Courtney)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman
DeSaulnier	McHenry	(Pallone)
(Beyer)	(Cammack)	Welch (Pallone)
Fortenberry	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
(Moolenaar)	(Perlmutter)	(Cicilline)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 207, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—219

Adams	Bourdeaux	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bowman	Case
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Casten
Auchincloss	F.	Castor (FL)
Axne	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Brown (OH)	Cherfilus-
Bass	Brownley	McCormick
Beatty	Bush	Chu
Bera	Bustos	Cicilline
Beyer	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cleaver
Blunt Rochester	Carson	Clyburn
Bonamici	Carter (LA)	Cohen