

others. On the day of remembrance, the most important thing to remember is the humanity that exists in all of us.

May we always remember and always pledge "Never Again."

#### WE ARE TEXAS STRONG

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the resilience of residents of Houston, Pasadena, and our neighbors in Deer Park and Baytown that were hit by the tornado earlier this week.

We were hit hard, and it devastated our area, but the people are resilient. The tornado left dozens of families displaced in my district with homes without roofs and surrounded by debris. Thankfully, there were no deaths or serious injuries, and our spirit is not broken.

In this time of recovery, it is important to remember that our communities always come together in time of need.

I thank all the first responders, the workers who helped restore our electricity, the people who picked up the debris, and those who were there immediately to help our neighbors. That is what we are all about, helping each other. We continue to rebuild our communities because we are strong together.

As long as I continue to represent Texas-29, I will ensure that our district is well prepared and has the best available resources and information for recovery.

We are Houston strong. We are Pasadena strong. We are Texas strong.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF LOU MOORE

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

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow but also with great pride that I rise today to honor the life of one of my constituents, a hero of America's Greatest Generation.

On December 6, 2022, Mr. Lou Moore, a veteran of World War II and a truly valiant warrior who took the fight to the Nazis in Europe, passed just shortly after turning 100 years old.

Today, he is with the Lord. I had the pleasure of presenting Lou with the Congressional Gold Medal last year. While he was a man of small physical stature, his heart, his love of country, and his passion for this beautiful Nation's youth and its veterans were of mammoth proportions.

My friend Lou cherished the marriage he had with his true love, his wife, Nellie. While she passed away slightly before Lou, he always had family in our district in the form of thou-

sands of veterans throughout our area. They loved him dearly.

Lou blessed us with his special gifts of patriotism and honor, and God blessed us with Lou's presence and, now, has brought him home.

We are all grateful for the life of a truly great American, Mr. Lou Moore.

□ 0915

#### REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC SCHEME HURTS WORKING FAMILIES

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

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the extremists in this Chamber to stop playing political chess with the lives of working people and families.

In 2021, 85 percent of Americans over the age of 50 opposed cuts to Social Security and Medicare to reduce the national debt.

Clearly, the economic scheme proposed by the GOP is in direct opposition to the people's will: slashing Social Security and Medicare for the working class while giving tax breaks to the wealthy.

The GOP scheme also proposes a ridiculous 30 percent—yes, 30 percent—national sales tax, a huge setback for working families, increasing the cost of everyday essentials and raising gas prices.

As if that wasn't enough, this scheme is holding the reputation of our Nation hostage to extremist demands for cuts to Social Security and Medicare.

Democrats stand with the people. Dismantling Medicare and Social Security will never be up for debate.

#### STRATEGIC PRODUCTION RESPONSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). Pursuant to House Resolution 5 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 21.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) kindly take the chair.

□ 0917

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 21) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, with Mr. MCCLINTOCK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, January 26, 2023, amendment No. 14 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAI) had been disposed of.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 21.

Once again, Republicans are selling out the American people to their Big Oil friends. Oil companies are not even using the thousands of permits to drill on public lands that they currently hold, and Republicans want to add another 300 million acres to this oil carnage.

Big Oil rakes in record profits while poisoning the Earth and anyone who lives and works near their oil fields.

The Inglewood Oil Field is in my district and has been toxifying the predominantly Black and Brown communities near it for decades. There is literally oil bubbling up through the sidewalks.

Back in April, more than 1,600 gallons of oil spilled from the field, spewing toxins into the air, and Republicans want more of that everywhere. Not caring if people literally have clean air to breathe doesn't sound very pro-life to me.

This "drill, baby, drill" attitude isn't making the United States any safer or more economically competitive. It is killing Mother Earth and us.

H.R. 21 is derelict to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to protect what is left of our public lands and vote against H.R. 21.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

(4) PROTECTED PUBLIC LANDS.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall not include oil and gas leasing on any protected public lands, including any—

- (A) unit of the National Park System;
- (B) unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System;
- (C) component of the national wild and scenic river system;
- (D) component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;
- (E) designated wilderness study area or other area managed for wilderness characteristics;
- (F) component of the national trails system;
- (G) national conservation area;
- (H) national monument;
- (I) national recreation area;
- (J) inventoried roadless area within the National Forest System;

(K) area of critical environmental concern;  
(L) Backcountry Conservation Area; or  
(M) National Conservation Lands.

Mr. GRIJALVA (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer what I hope will be an amendment that every Member of this body can support.

This amendment would simply prevent new planned oil and gas drilling in our national parks or on protected public lands, including national monuments, national recreation areas, or areas of critical environmental concern.

The debate yesterday and today has shown the American people that there are deep divisions between our two parties when it comes to America's energy future. We have starkly different priorities for protecting communities and the climate, securing environmental justice, and safeguarding public health.

I hope the concerns that we have raised might change some minds across the aisle, though I worry it will not. However, one area in which I believe we can all agree is that we should not allow oil and gas extraction in our national parks, our national wildlife refuges, our national recreation areas, or our conservation lands.

Mr. Chair, for those of us who have had the privilege to serve on the House Natural Resources Committee, we hear nearly every day about what parks and public lands mean to the communities in every congressional district across the country. Put simply, Americans love their parks. From the Everglades to the Grand Canyon, Shenandoah to Mesa Verde, these iconic landscapes are some of the most visited and the most loved in the United States.

It is our responsibility as elected officials to ensure future generations, our children and our grandchildren, will have the same opportunities we have enjoyed and experienced in these incredible places.

My amendment would protect these opportunities, ensuring that any new planned oil and gas extraction would not occur in our parks or our protected public lands.

Despite what some may suggest, this amendment is essential, given the repeated extremist efforts we saw under the previous administration to open protected public lands to extraction.

This amendment is necessary. I hope that all of my colleagues can join me in protecting our parks and protected public lands from unnecessary oil and gas extraction.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, this amendment will prohibit the leasing plan from including a whole new swath of Federal lands.

This is a solution in search of a problem because many of these areas are already protected. I went through the list. I don't see any that aren't.

Under existing law, many of these places aren't open for oil and gas leasing. Nothing in H.R. 21 would change that fact.

President Biden campaigned on a platform to end fossil fuels, and on day one of his administration, he imposed a moratorium on energy production on Federal lands. The Biden administration has leased fewer acres than any other administration dating all the way back to World War II. H.R. 21 will reverse the dangerous precedent set by President Biden and his administration and unlock the natural resources owned by the American people for the benefit of all.

The SPR shouldn't be used for political purposes. Drawing down to influence gas prices is wrong when the SPR is set aside for national emergencies, a time of war. It is a strategic asset for the American people, not to be used to influence elections.

This amendment will increase gas prices and weaken our energy security by reimposing the Biden administration's leasing moratorium.

It is wrong. It is messaging. I get it. You are okay with releasing gas and oil out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to influence gas prices, weakening our Nation if a natural disaster should strike.

We need to replenish the SPR. We need to do it with the American resources that we are blessed with in this country. That is what H.R. 21 does.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after "(d)" insert "or if the Secretary determines that a situation exists in which a delay in executing a drawdown of petroleum products in the Reserve in order

to comply with this paragraph will harm national security".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, we just heard from the gentleman from South Carolina that the purpose of this bill was to make sure that the use of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve was confined to instances in which there was a national emergency.

The purpose of this amendment is very simple. It is to make sure that if we are going to restrict releases from our strategic reserve, it have an exception for national security. That is it. Very simple.

If you are going to tie the President's hands to respond to an energy crisis, at least include language that allows for a swift response in the event of a threat to our national security. At least do that.

I understand the concern about the use of our reserve. I do not understand the lack of concern for a future situation that could call for its use when our national security is at stake.

This is a simple amendment. It only adds language with respect to national security. This should be a bipartisan concern, and I welcome bipartisan support.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, once again, this amendment would further allow the President to abuse the SPR by draining it without declaring a national emergency under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, giving him the ability to once again use the SPR for political purposes, and that is wrong.

It is set aside for national emergencies, true national emergencies. Hurricanes hit the coast. We just saw one in Florida this year. We all remember Hurricane Katrina. We have adversaries threatening us around the world.

We need the SPR full. We don't need it to be released to influence an election. We need it there for national emergencies. This amendment would further allow the President to abuse it.

The statute is clear, and emergency triggers to use the SPR are very well defined. The law requires the President to declare that a "severe energy supply interruption" exists.

The only reason a severe supply interruption exists is because of their policies, the policies of the Biden administration that took oil and gas production in this Nation off the table.

We have American resources here. We are blessed in this Nation with abundant natural resources, but we are cursed by liberal politicians who don't want America to be energy independent. They don't want us to be energy dominant.

□ 0930

They want to take those resources off the table for production to increase supply to meet demand to lower prices for consumers, manufacturers, and people across America.

The statute defines a supply interruption as follows: "An emergency situation exists and there is a significant reduction in supply which is of significant scope and duration."

There was no emergency situation existing when the President withdrew oil from the SPR.

"A severe increase in the price of petroleum products has resulted from such emergency situation."

Where was the emergency?

Yes, we had higher prices because supply was low due to the policies of the administration that took oil and gas production off the table. He created the emergency if you want to call it an emergency.

Number three: "Such price increase is likely to or may cause a major adverse impact on the national economy."

There is a solution. Drill here. Drill now. Produce American energy.

The SPR is a critical national security asset. We have said that over and over and over and over on this side. It is a national asset paid for by the taxpayers, set aside for the use of this Nation in time of a real emergency. A real emergency.

The SPR is a critical national security asset. It should have only been utilized in accordance with the law. This amendment would affect that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from South Carolina concluded his remarks by saying this amendment "would affect that" and provided no specification for "that."

Look, this was just about national security. We didn't get two words in response to the substance of this amendment. We got a bunch of platitudes that were completely unrelated.

I was under the assumption, given everything we had heard about national emergencies and national security, that making sure that the Strategic Petroleum Reserve could be used for national security used to be bipartisan.

If not, there would be a good reason as to why that exception should not exist. We didn't get a one. We got a speech about hurricanes. We got a speech about other uses for oil. I hear you. I am on board. This is national security.

The fact that you had no response whatsoever tells me your bill isn't seri-

ous. This bill is about messaging. You are looking to tie any future President's hands in a way that is fundamentally reckless. If this bill were serious, you would take national security more seriously.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JACKSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO ABUSE OF EMERGENCY DECLARATIONS.**

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to authorize the President to make a determination under section 161(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(d)) that an emergency situation exists in order for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell petroleum products under such subsection for political, non-emergency purposes.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, yesterday I introduced an amendment that would take away the President's emergency power to sell our oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and give that authority back to Congress.

Since Joe Biden has become President, he has abused his emergency power and sold American oil to our enemies. China was the number one buyer.

President Biden abused his power to sell our oil and reduce gas prices so that the midterm elections would swing Democrats' way. It is a shame to trick the American people just to win an election.

No President should be able to use their emergency powers for politics.

While my amendment failed yesterday, it opened up discussions on how to solve this problem.

While our leadership was working with me to protect America's Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Democrats and the mocking Hill media were making fun of me for having a failed amendment. I want to say this: True success comes through failure.

There is one thing that needs to be pointed out about our new Republican majority: We are much different than Republican majorities of the past. We aren't afraid of conflict, of disagreements in the public's eye. We have already proven that.

What all of us are afraid of is not being a successful Republican majority for the American people and stopping the Democrats' America last policies.

What our Republican majority will continue to show the country and the mocking media, in the words of our new, great Republican Speaker: "It's not how you start, it's how you finish."

Today, I am introducing a new amendment that would prevent President Biden, or any President, from selling our strategic oil reserves for political reasons.

The American people don't believe President Biden should have the sole authority to sell our oil for whatever reason he comes up with. President Biden's war on American energy has crippled our country and left us vulnerable to an economic crisis and a national security crisis.

There is no reason the President should be able to sell one of our most strategic resources for political gain. Instead, the President should unleash American energy at home.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, which would simply clarify that the President is not authorized to make emergency drawdowns of the SPR for political purposes. It is pretty simple.

Imagine if a Republican administration would have done what this administration did. You all would be hollering from the tops of buildings in the streets.

It is clear. President Biden has abused his emergency powers to raid our SPR for political gain. The SPR was meant for true emergency energy supply interruptions. President Biden has mismanaged the SPR.

Mr. Chair, 250 million barrels, over 40 percent of the SPR, has been drained in less than 2 years; it happened in 15 months.

We need to unleash American energy by expanding energy production on Federal lands across the country. We are going to work on that in the House majority, to expand American energy. We are fighting—like MARJORIE is—to deliver affordable and reliable energy for all Americans.

We are also fighting to maintain and bolster our energy security. That is

what this is about: energy security, national security.

H.R. 21 furthers these goals, and I support this amendment and the passage of H.R. 21.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I listened to the gentlewoman from Georgia, and to me, this amendment is unbelievable. I mean, she says that you can't draw down or sell petroleum products under this amendment for political and non-emergency purposes.

Well, I mean, everything around here is political, so I don't know how you would define that.

What the President has been doing is using this Strategic Petroleum Reserve to help bring down the price of gasoline at the pump, or in other cases, to increase supply because of the supply shortage due to Russia's action in the invasion of Ukraine.

These are, in my opinion, totally legitimate emergency purposes to help the American people and help the supply chain.

What the bill does is to say: Well, if you want to do that—if you want to use the reserve—then you have to drill for more oil on public lands.

Well, isn't that political?

A decision is made to say that you can't use the reserve unless you help the oil companies and let the oil companies take more of our public lands. That is about the most political thing that I can think of.

In addition to that, was it not political when the Republican administrations in the past released and sold oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve?

What did they do it for?

Well, they did it for deficit reduction. They did it to pay for different items, like the 21st Century Cures bill that came out of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Were those emergencies?

Were those not political?

I would argue that using the reserve for those purposes was not an emergency at all and certainly was incredibly political.

This is just another example of what the Republicans are doing. They are politicizing the Strategic Petroleum Reserve because they want to make message points.

They know that this bill isn't going anywhere. The President already said that he will veto it, and the Senate won't take it up. They are being so political. They are talking about situations that have nothing to do with an emergency.

I really don't know what to say. The whole process here is very political, oriented toward messaging, oriented

toward going on TV, I guess, to appeal to base voters. It is just incredible to me that this amendment is being offered.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, the Democrats try to paint this picture that rising energy costs was Putin's war, Putin's gas hikes.

I had to do some research. The gentleman from North Carolina tried to make this all about the war in Ukraine, the reason the President did this. Just a little factoid: The first drawdown of SPR was 2 months before Russia invaded Ukraine. So this isn't about a national emergency related to Ukraine or related to Vladimir Putin. This isn't Putin's price hike on gasoline for American consumers.

This is the Biden administration's war on American energy. He said it on the campaign trail, and he is implementing it today. He implemented it from day one, and it continues.

The SPR is a strategic asset for the American people to meet their needs in a time of crisis, such as a national emergency or time of war.

Let's just be clear. It should not be used for political gain or political influence. The American people see right through this. They appreciated a little bump—and that is all it was, a speed bump—at the pump for them. The prices went right back up.

It didn't have much influence on the price of energy in this country. What can have an influence on the price of energy in this country is producing American energy resources.

My goodness. We are blessed in this Nation with natural gas and oil to meet the demands of a growing economy.

Your constituents and mine are paying the price at the pump. It is time to unleash American energy dominance, which we can.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my Democrat colleague across the aisle pointed out exactly what I was saying, that the entire reason why President Biden released our very precious oil—that the American people paid for with their hard-earned tax dollars for our emergency reserves—the reason why it was released was to reduce gas prices before an election. Our Democrat colleague completely admits that.

He then goes on to blame the war in Ukraine for the reason that we have a low supply. Talk about serious.

Let's talk about the most unserious decisions: that the Senate would not take up this bill to protect the American Strategic Petroleum Reserves; that the Senate would not take up this

bill and pass my amendment to stop any President, Democrat or Republican, from selling oil out of our SPR for political reasons; and to imagine that President Biden would say that he would not consider this bill.

President Biden is telling America that he doesn't care about our emergency supply or our national security. President Biden gives a serious, clear message to the American people that he will destroy the fossil fuel energy industry and that that will hurt every single American. There are no politics that can play with that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to pass my amendment and H.R. 21.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0945

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, strike the closed quotation mark and the final period.

Page 3, after line 9, insert the following:

“(4) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the President produces a plan to limit the amount of oil and gas exported from the United States by the same percentage as the percentage of petroleum in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve that is drawn down in each drawdown that occurs after the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, American gas prices are too high. The pressure is on this Congress to do something about it. President Biden has done something about it by releasing oil at a strategic time from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and gas prices are down from their peak.

But Americans want more. They want real action, and instead, they get what is nothing more than a 2-day fraud on this House floor: a bill that would do absolutely nothing to reduce oil prices or gas prices.

Yet, by spending 2 days on the floor and by making this the bill of the week, we fool the American people into thinking that Congress is doing something.

Now, how utterly meaningless is this bill?

It would do nothing to increase oil production in the United States for it calls only for a plan to be created but not necessarily implemented. It implies that it would do something to increase oil production but not for well more than a year after the crisis began any spike in oil prices. Finally, even if more oil is produced in the United States, it will be exported and will lower the world price perhaps by a penny.

This is a messaging bill. Its message is to attack President Biden, who is the only one who has actually done something to reduce oil prices.

So let's look at what this bill does. It calls for a plan. If the administration wants to give us a plan, then give us a plan. Washington is filled with plans. The American Petroleum Institute has a plan. Everybody has a plan. So we draft another plan.

What does that do?

Now, it forces the administration to write a plan about leasing more land for oil drilling. They are free to list parcels where everybody knows there is no oil and nobody wants to bid. If they don't want to do a plan, then that is the plan they will give us.

But let's say they give us the plan that the majority seems to want. They can write the plan, accompany it with a letter explaining that they think it won't reduce oil prices and that it is bad for the environment, and therefore they are not going to implement it. So now we have a plan that is similar to what they want and a letter saying why it won't be implemented.

This is what we offer the American people?

If we are going to have a bill that requires a plan, then we ought to adopt this amendment that offers the administration a chance to create a different kind of plan, a plan to prohibit or limit exports.

The illustration of how important this is can be seen just north of our border. Canada produces twice as much oil as they consume, and their consumers are paying \$2 a gallon more than we are paying. So producing more oil inside your country doesn't seem to lower oil prices for those living to the north of the United States.

Why?

Because the oil is simply exported at the world price. Now, that guarantees—if we actually produced more oil in the United States and exported it—more profits for oil companies but not a penny of reduction at the pump.

If instead we had a plan to limit or prohibit exports, then we would lower certainly the price of natural gas, and I believe that under many circumstances we would reduce the price of oil and gasoline paid for by the American people.

So the majority comes to this floor with a bill requiring a plan to be added to the hundreds of existing plans that already exist that requires the administration to create a plan that the majority tells us the administration doesn't want to create, allows the administration to create a plan that they wouldn't like, allows the administration to create a plan that they would like and then refuse to implement it, and then tells the American people that they are doing something to lower the price of gasoline now.

Let's point out that we are going to produce more oil in this country in 2023 than any other year in our history. So this is a message bill that is sending a

false message. We are going to produce more oil in 2023 than any other year. But even if we did lease more land, and even if they did drill on it, that is a response that might affect us in 2025.

Why don't we have something that will lower gas prices now?

So if we want to engage in this process of telling the American people that we are doing something or that we would do something but it is the other party's fault, then for God's sakes, bring forward a bill that if enacted—which, of course, won't happen—but if enacted, that would actually do something. This bill will not increase oil production in the United States, and oil production in the United States, if exported, will do nothing to help the American consumer.

Mr. Chairman, vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, the education of my colleagues continues.

A plan?

The administration in violation of the law that requires a 5-year drilling plan on OCS. I was on the MMS 5-year OCS drilling study committee. I know what the law is. The administration needs to create a 5-year plan for drilling offshore on Federal lands. That is a plan.

We talked about oil and how we shouldn't import oil. There are all kinds of different oil: heavy and light. Our refineries are set up to take a certain kind of oil. We were called a net exporter when we exceeded the demand in this country. We had a surplus and were able to export it. Net exporter because we are still going to import oil because our refineries are set up to take that kind of oil and not necessarily the oil that is produced here.

My friend mentioned our neighbors to the north in Canada producing a lot more oil.

They don't have refineries up there to meet their demand. They need to send that oil somewhere to be refined and made into all of the miraculous products that come out of a barrel of hydrocarbon. It doesn't just produce diesel fuel and gasoline. So they have to send that oil somewhere.

But the stoppage of the Keystone XL pipeline kept that oil from coming to the United States of America.

Guess what, Mr. Chairman?

They have got to send it somewhere else. They have got to send it overseas to be refined somewhere. That is the reason that Canada may pay higher prices for gasoline.

We have the solution. Bring that oil here. Let us refine it. Let's put American workers to work at refineries. We haven't built a refinery in this country since I don't know when.

We can meet a lot of different goals in this country and globally by refining

more of that product here. That is a plan for you.

The Keystone pipeline is important for our refineries and the energy sector and for our allies both north and south in Mexico and Canada. We can be North American energy secure. We can actually be hemispherically energy secure by working with our colleagues.

H.R. 21 is about the SPR, about requiring nonemergency use to be accompanied by a plan to produce American oil resources. There is the gentleman's plan.

By requiring a plan to limit oil imports, this amendment aims to harm American families by imposing costly trade restrictions into the global market for oil, which would drive up fuel prices.

OPEC doesn't play by these rules. America is the top producer in the world; increasing energy production leads to more security and price stability especially when prices are set by OPEC and the global market.

This amendment undermines the purpose of the bill and undermines American energy affordability and security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote for my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike "that is" and insert "that has been drawn down during the period beginning January 21, 2021, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, and that is".

Ms. GREENE of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, plans are extremely important, but, unfortunately, our President has given us no plan on how he will replace all of the oil—very important oil—that has been sold out of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The American people are trapped on a journey in this country. The American people work hard every single day and pay their taxes, and their taxes have been abused. Their tax dollars were used to fill up the supply in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and in 2 years' time, this President has sold out America by selling our Strategic Petroleum Reserves and creating a national security crisis for all of America.

I am introducing an amendment today that will require a leasing plan from day one of President Biden's Presidency, Inauguration Day, when this bill is enacted into law. President Biden will have to come up with a plan to tell the American people how he will clean up his mess and refill America's SPR.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PALLONE. The pending amendment violates the germaneness requirement of rule XVI, clause 7. That rule precludes amendments "on a subject different from that under consideration."

The subject matter of the underlying bill is a requirement that the Department of Energy issue a plan related to the leasing of Federal lands for oil and gas drilling before certain first drawdowns from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

However, the subject matter of the pending amendment is different. The pending amendment introduces a new subject matter to the bill by requiring a plan for drawdowns that have already occurred. Because the pending amendment is on a different subject than that of the underlying bill, I urge the Chair to hold this amendment as not germane.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I wish to speak on the point of order. This is absolutely germane. It is the same subject, and it meets all the rules.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia is not germane.

Clause 7 of rule XVI, the germaneness rule, provides that no proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

The bill prohibits the drawdown of petroleum products in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until the Secretary of Energy has developed a plan to increase the percentage of certain Federal lands leased for oil and gas production. The amendment changes the calculation of how much land would need to be leased to offset the drawdown.

The Chair finds that the amendment is within the subject matter of the underlying bill. It is, therefore, germane. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think the gentlewoman's previous amendment was about the policies of the President being political. And I think this amendment is more political than anything.

First of all, as we know, what the underlying bill does is it says that if the President wants to release crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, then he has to put together a plan that would require more leases on public lands.

What the gentlewoman's amendment says now is that she makes this retroactive and goes back to the day of the President's inauguration—again, a very political decision to use that date—and says that any releases from the reserve beginning on the day of the President's inauguration, we would also then have to go back and make sure that we sell or lease additional leases on public lands to cover those releases from the reserve back to the inauguration.

So, the bureaucracy of all this in itself I think is absurd.

But the point is that she is essentially saying that now we have to lease more public lands when, in fact, there are about 9,000 leases already on public lands, half of which are not being used. The oil companies do not want to pump more oil because that brings down the price. They don't want any releases from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve because that brings down the price.

So all that the Republican majority is doing here is trying to help the oil companies, trying to make sure that there are no tools on the part of the administration to increase the supply, to bring down the cost of gasoline at the pump. Whatever the oil companies, which are making huge profits, want to do, that is what they want to do, as well.

So I would just again say that this amendment may be germane but it is certainly detrimental to what the President and the Democrats are trying to do to help people deal with affordability.

□ 1000

We understand that the price at the pump is prohibitive, and we have to continue to choose whatever tools we have to try to bring it down.

The Republicans, on the other hand, don't want to do any of that. They want to make political points, and they want to do the bidding of the oil companies.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. LIEU

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 11, insert "and any drawdown that the Secretary determines will result in a net profit for the Federal Government" after "(d)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Chair, this amendment would create an exception allowing for a drawdown of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve if the Secretary determines that the drawdown would result in a net profit for the United States.

Let me tell you what this is all about. I can summarize this debate of the last 2 days into one sentence: Joe Biden lowered your gas prices, and Republicans are upset about it.

That is what this is about. Joe Biden lowered your gas prices last year, and that makes Republicans mad.

How do we know? They said it out loud. The gentlewoman from Georgia earlier this morning just said that Joe Biden lowered your gas prices for political reasons.

I don't care why the President lowers your gas prices. If any President can lower your gas prices, we should support that President's action.

If prices surge later this year, if gas prices surge again, Joe Biden should be able to use the tools at his disposal and lower your gas prices again. We should be giving the President even more flexibility to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower gas prices.

Joe Biden lowered your gas prices, and Republicans want to keep him from doing that again.

We don't want to stop the President from lowering your gas prices. We want Joe Biden to lower your gas prices again if he can do that.

There is another reason this Republican bill is so stupid. Not only did Joe Biden lower your gas prices, but the United States of America made a profit on it. Buy low, sell high. It was brilliant what Joe Biden did.

He released the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at a time when gas was high, and that helped lower gas prices, and then he refilled it at the lower amount. The U.S. made \$4 billion on Joe Biden's action.

Republicans always want to say: Let's run government like a business. Joe Biden did exactly that when he lowered your gas prices and then made a \$4 billion profit for the United States of America.

Adopt my amendment, which would make this stupid bill better, and then vote against this bill.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, recollection serves me that you guys on that side of