

[Roll No. 91]

## YEAS—414

Adams De La Cruz Jeffries  
 Aderholt Dean (PA) Johnson (GA)  
 Aguilar DeGette Johnson (LA)  
 Alford DeLauro Johnson (SD)  
 Allen DelBene Jordan  
 Allred Deluzio Joyce (OH)  
 Amo DeSaulnier Joyce (PA)  
 Amodei DesJarlais Kamlager-Dove  
 Armstrong Diaz-Balart Kaptur  
 Arrington Dingell Kean (NJ)  
 Auchincloss Doggett Keating  
 Babin Donalds Kelly (IL)  
 Bacon Duarte Kelly (MS)  
 Baird Duncan Kelly (PA)  
 Balderson Dunn (FL) Khanna  
 Balint Edwards Kiggans (VA)  
 Banks Ellzey Killey  
 Barr Emmer Kilmer  
 Barragán Escobar Kim (CA)  
 Bean (FL) Eshoo Kim (NJ)  
 Beatty Espallat Krishnamoorthi  
 Bentz Estes Kustoff  
 Bera Evans LaHood  
 Bergman Ezell LaLota  
 Beyer Fallon LaMalfa  
 Bice Feenstra Lamborn  
 Biggs Ferguson Landsman  
 Bilirakis Finstad Langworthy  
 Bishop (GA) Fischbach Larsen (WA)  
 Bishop (NC) Fitzgerald Larson (CT)  
 Blumenauer Fitzpatrick Latta  
 Blunt Rochester Fleischmann  
 Boebert Fletcher LaTurner  
 Bonamici Flood Lawler  
 Bost Foster Lee (FL)  
 Bowman Foushee Lee (NV)  
 Boyle (PA) Foxx Lee (PA)  
 Brecheen Franklin, Scott Leger Fernandez  
 Brown Frost Letlow  
 Brownley Fry Levin  
 Buchanan Fulcher Lieu  
 Buck Gaetz Lofgren  
 Buchoon Gallagher Loudermilk  
 Budzinski Gallego Lucas  
 Burchett Garamendi Luetkemeyer  
 Burgess Garbarino Luna  
 Burlison Garcia (IL) Luttrell  
 Bush Garcia (TX) Lynch  
 Calvert Garcia, Mike Mace  
 Cammack Garcia, Robert Magaziner  
 Caraveo Gimenez Malliotakis  
 Carbajal Goldman (NY) Maloy  
 Cárdenas Gomez Mann  
 Carey Gonzales, Tony Manning  
 Carl Gonzalez, Massie  
 Carson Vicente Mast  
 Carter (GA) Good (VA) Matsui  
 Carter (LA) Gooden (TX) McBath  
 Carter (TX) Gottheimer McCaul  
 Cartwright Granger McClain  
 Casar Graves (LA) McClellan  
 Case Graves (MO) McClintock  
 Casten Green (TN) McCollum  
 Castor (FL) Green, Al (TX) McCormick  
 Castro (TX) Greene (GA) McGarvey  
 Chavez-DeRemer Griffith McGovern  
 Cherfilus-Grothman McHenry  
 McCormick Guest Meeks  
 Chu Guthrie Menendez  
 Ciscomani Hagaman Meng  
 Clark (MA) Harris Meuser  
 Clarke (NY) Harshbarger Mfume  
 Cleaver Hayes Miller (IL)  
 Cline Hern Miller (OH)  
 Cloud Higgins (LA) Miller (WV)  
 Clyburn Hill Miller-Meeks  
 Clyde Himes Mills  
 Cohen Hinson Molinaro  
 Cole Horsford Moolenaar  
 Collins Houchin Mooney  
 Comer Houlihan Moore (AL)  
 Connolly Hoyer Moore (UT)  
 Correa Hoyle (OR) Moore (WI)  
 Costa Hudson Moran  
 Courtney Huffman Morelle  
 Craig Huizenga Moskowitz  
 Crane Hunt Moulton  
 Crawford Issa Mrvan  
 Crenshaw Ivey Mullin  
 Crockett Jackson (IL) Nadler  
 Crow Jackson (NC) Napolitano  
 Cuellar Jackson (TX) Neal  
 Curtis Jackson Lee Neguse  
 D'Esposito Jacobs Newhouse  
 Davids (KS) James Nickel  
 Davidson Jayapal Norcross

Norman Salinas Thanedar  
 Nunn (IA) Sánchez Thompson (CA)  
 Obernolte Sarbanes Thompson (MS)  
 Ocasio-Cortez Scalise Thompson (PA)  
 Ogles Scanlon Tiffany  
 Omar Schakowsky Timmons  
 Owens Schiff Titus  
 Pallone Schneider Tlaib  
 Palmer Scholten Tokuda  
 Panetta Schrier Tonko  
 Pappas Schweikert Torres (CA)  
 Pascrell Scott (VA) Torres (NY)  
 Payne Scott, Austin Trahan  
 Pelosi Scott, David Turner  
 Peltola Self Underwood  
 Pence Sessions Valadao  
 Perez Sewell Van Drew  
 Perry Sherman Van Dуйne  
 Peters Sherrill Van Orden  
 Pettersen Slotkin Vargas  
 Pfluger Smith (MO) Vasquez  
 Phillips Smith (NE) Veasey  
 Pingree Smith (NJ) Velázquez  
 Pocan Smith (WA) Wagner  
 Porter Smucker Walberg  
 Posey Sorensen Walt  
 Pressley Soto Wasserman  
 Quigley Spanberger Schultz  
 Ramirez Spartz Waters  
 Raskin Stansbury Watson Coleman  
 Reschenthaler Stauber Weber (TX)  
 Rodgers (WA) Steel Webster (FL)  
 Rogers (AL) Stefanik Wenstrup  
 Rogers (KY) Steil Westerman  
 Rose Steube Wexton  
 Rosendale Stevens Wild  
 Ross Strickland Williams (GA)  
 Rouzer Strong Williams (NY)  
 Roy Suozzi Wilson (SC)  
 Ruiz Swalwell Wittman  
 Ruppersberger Sykes Womack  
 Ryan Takano Yakym  
 Salazar Tenney Zinke

## NOT VOTING—18

Davis (IL) Harder (CA) Rutherford  
 Davis (NC) Kildee Simpson  
 Frankel, Lois Lee (CA) Stanton  
 Golden (ME) Lesko Trone  
 Gosar Murphy Williams (TX)  
 Grijalva Nehls Wilson (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1411

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to prohibit data brokers from transferring personally identifiable sensitive data of United States individuals to foreign adversaries, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent and missed three votes on the House Floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 89, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1085. “no” on rollcall No. 90, H. Res. 1085 and “yea” on rollcall No. 91, H.R. 7520.

## PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1085, I call up the bill (H.R. 1121) to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1121

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting American Energy Production Act”.

## SEC. 2. PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that States should maintain primacy for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing for oil and natural gas production on State and private lands.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DECLARATION OF A MORATORIUM ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not declare a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing unless such moratorium is authorized by an Act of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1121.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1121, the Protecting American Energy Production Act.

H.R. 1121, introduced by Congressman DUNCAN, would prevent any President from issuing a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing while also establishing a sense of Congress that States should regulate the practice on State and private land.

Hydraulic fracturing has been around for almost 100 years. The practice, combined with recent technological improvements and the advent of horizontal drilling, has propelled the United States to global energy superpower status.

This surge in supply has contributed to lower energy prices for consumers, stimulating economic growth, and improving the quality of life for all Americans.

In truth, a ban on hydraulic fracturing would cripple the American economy while surrendering world energy leadership to Russia, Iran, and China.

Federal efforts to regulate fracking, which is currently adequately regulated by the States, could have an equally devastating impact.

The 2005 Energy Policy Act clarified that Congress never intended the Federal Government to regulate fracking under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

In the Obama administration, the Bureau of Land Management attempted to regulate the practice for Federal lands and minerals, but the courts threw out that effort.

In the decision, the judge clearly stated, "Congress has not delegated to the Department of the Interior the authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing. The BLM's effort to do so through the fracking rule is in excess of its statutory authority and contrary to law."

Currently, States regulate fracking, and each has comprehensive laws and regulations to provide for safe operations, to protect drinking water sources, and to have trained personnel effectively regulating oil and gas exploration and production.

In addition to preventing the President from implementing a unilateral fracking ban, this bill would also express a sense of Congress that States should maintain regulatory authority over fracking on State and private lands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1121, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome everyone to the long-anticipated, endlessly rescheduled energy week.

Over the next 2 days, with only a matter of days until a partial shutdown, rather than a transparent discussion on how to fund the government, this Chamber will debate and vote on a number of energy-related bills, bills Republicans claim will boost so-called energy dominance.

It is not hard to see through their talking points.

The U.S. is producing more oil and gas than ever before, and what do we have to show for it? Everyday Americans still face volatile energy prices because oil and gas are global commodities and because we are exporting record amounts of fossil fuels.

The communities nearest to this record-breaking production are overburdened with pollution, and their health and well-being are suffering. The climate crisis, because it is real, is getting more dire each year.

The United States should be leading the way to a new, cleaner future, not drilling deeper into this catastrophe.

Rather than addressing these issues head-on and building a just future that generations to come can be proud of, House Republicans are instead choosing to lead us toward more of the same—stuffing the pockets of Big Oil executives who are hoping to make another quick yacht off the backs of hardworking Americans just as they have done for years.

We have seen these washed-up, has-been proposals before.

Last year, Republicans passed H.R. 1, the polluters over people act which contains some of these repeat proposals. It is like a bad boyfriend coming back who just needs to be gone.

This week is no different.

We are going to see the same tired handouts to the richest and most polluting megacorporations, all while leaving our most vulnerable communities in the toxic dust. It is polluters over people 2.0.

The first bill on the agenda is H.R. 1121, which would prevent the President from banning fracking unless authorized by Congress, even if there is a public health emergency, poisoned drinking water, or any other fracking crisis.

For my colleagues across the aisle, maybe this is just a messaging bill, but for folks on the ground, it is extremely dangerous. It ignores the very real consequences of fracking for impacted communities.

Fracking is a method of extracting oil and gas from deep underground. It involves blasting open rock at high pressure with a mixture of water, sand, and chemicals, many of which are undisclosed.

In areas where fracking is concentrated, it has been linked to preterm births, high-risk pregnancies, asthma, migraines, fatigue, respiratory symptoms, skin disorders, and the list goes on.

The fracking chemicals we do know about—things like benzene and ethylene glycol, are known to be hazardous to human health. Children living near fracking sites have lower birth weights and higher rates of cancer.

Fracking chemicals end up in our soil and in our groundwater. Fracking is known to contaminate air and drinking water, but this Republican sweetheart legislation would stop the President from banning or even pausing fracking on public lands and in Federal waters, even if it poses a clear, known, and present danger to drinking water and public health.

Here is something you are going to hear a lot from Democrats this week: Big Oil and Big Gas don't need any more favors right now. They don't need more tax breaks. They don't need more special loopholes. They don't need more handouts.

The President should have the full range of tools to protect the American people, especially when it comes to our public lands and resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have stated is that the Big Oil and Gas companies are making record profits, and these bills are essentially tax cuts for Big Oil. That couldn't be further from the truth.

This President's anti-energy agenda has driven up energy prices for all Americans, which also has created

greater revenues for Big Oil companies. If Democrats are really concerned about energy prices, the best thing they can do is mirror the energy dominance policies of the previous administration.

Doing so would create abundance, driving down energy prices for all Americans. Producers with no more than \$5 million in retail sales of oil and gas in a year account for 83 percent of America's oil production, 90 percent of its natural gas, and natural gas liquids production.

These are small businesses, Mr. Speaker, often locally and independently owned with a handful of employees, but collectively they support 4.5 million American jobs.

Our Republican energy bills help ensure small businesses can continue to operate on Federal lands.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the balance sheets of all of these Big Oil executives. No one is waiting in a food line. No one is trying to cash an unemployment check. They have the money, and they will be getting more because of these loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

□ 1430

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1121.

This extreme legislation would limit the President's ability to respond to public health, environmental, and climate risks. It is nothing more than a made-up solution in search of a problem.

To be clear, the President has made no indication that he will ban fracking, and yet H.R. 1121 would prohibit the President from ever banning fracking for any reason ever, despite the risks that it poses. Many of my colleagues aren't even in favor of sensible oversight or regulation of fracking.

It is my view that public lands managers ought to have access to a full range of tools to reduce harmful emissions, protect our environment, and safeguard public health. I am particularly concerned because we don't have adequate regulations and safeguards in place to ensure that if fracking is done, at the very least it is done in a way that reduces environmental and health risks.

There is a growing body of evidence that illustrates that fracking creates vast amounts of wastewater, emits greenhouse gases such as methane, and releases toxic pollutants such as potent carcinogens into the air.

Studies have also reported associations between residential proximity to fracking operations and increased adverse pregnancy outcomes, cancer incidence, hospitalizations, respiratory diseases, mental health problems, and more. Additionally, throughout the U.S., pregnant women, children, indigenous people, communities of color, and

low-income communities disproportionately bear the negative impacts of fracking.

Our understanding of fracking's risks just continues to grow. We can't let this pollution of our air, water, climate, and health continue unabated, especially if we remove a tool from the President's toolbox, as H.R. 1121 would do.

We need some regulations in place to protect the health of our environment and our communities, otherwise we risk unleashing the fossil fuel industry's unfettered pollution and damage to our environment and our health.

For these reasons, at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would require the Bureau of Land Management to issue regulations around fracking that include baseline water testing and public disclosure of the chemicals that companies use in their fracking operations before the ban on fracking bans can go into place.

At the end of the debate, I will insert into the RECORD the text of this amendment. I hope my colleagues will join me for the motion to recommit.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that this bill, H.R. 1121, is unnecessary, as the President has not proposed a hydraulic fracturing moratorium. They say it sets a dangerous precedent for limiting the authority of the President and the Secretary of the Interior to manage energy resources on Federal lands.

The fact is, this President, on the campaign trail, said: "No more, no new fracking." This was candidate Biden. We know from what he has done in his first 3-plus years in office, don't necessarily listen to his words, watch his actions. He has done it on mining. He said we were going to mine domestically for our critical minerals. Once he became President, he changed his tune. Now he wants memorandums of understanding with other countries that are adversarial to the United States.

After years of disastrous energy policies by this President, we know we cannot take him for just his word, which is exactly why this bill is necessary. This is especially true, Mr. Speaker, given that the Obama administration's Bureau of Land Management tried to regulate fracking.

The courts ultimately stopped this effort. In the decision, U.S. District Court Judge Skavdahl clearly stated: "Congress has not delegated to the Department of the Interior the authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing. The BLM's effort to do so through the Fracking Rule is in excess of its statutory authority and contrary to law."

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, in 2015 the Obama administration

published a rule regulating fracking on public lands, and I should mention that the rule was not a ban on fracking, but a commonsense requirement that companies disclose what chemicals they are using.

It would also have required storage protocols for wastewater, barriers between wells and water zones, and the disclosure of the location of existing wells—additional commonsense protections for the public.

The rule was challenged, and the District Court of Wyoming struck down an appeal. The District Court of Wyoming read the Safe Drinking Water Act's exclusion of fracking from that law's underground injection program to mean that no Federal agency can regulate fracking.

This was a flimsy court case that has not been reviewed on appeal, and the Trump BLM rescinded the rule before the appeals court could rule on it. The case does not mean that the Federal Government should have no role in regulating fracking for oil and gas. This issue is too important for us to leave 100 percent to a patchwork of State laws. The President must have the full range of tools to protect our health, safety, and climate from the dangers of fracking.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as one of the only few who doesn't take corporate PAC money in this institution, I am here to tell you the truth, per usual.

H.R. 1121 is a danger to all of our communities. The President must have a full range of tools to protect our health, safety, and climate from dangers of fracking.

We know this bill is nothing more than a waste of time. I would like to take a step back for a minute and remind people of the truth, why we are here in this situation right now, with fracking being practically unregulated at the Federal level.

Nearly 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker, then-Vice President Dick Cheney, the former CEO of Halliburton, managed to insert a loophole into the Energy Act of 2005 specifically exempting fracking chemicals from EPA regulation under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Halliburton, of course, is one of the largest oil and gas companies in the world and also just happens to be behind most of the major fracking worldwide.

For the last 20 years, we have been dealing with the Halliburton loophole, a terrible reminder of the revolving door of oil, money, and politics, and how Big Oil buys its way into the Halls of Congress.

This bill is another step to enshrine fracking protections and polluter loopholes into law, and it is wrong. It says to people in our communities all across the country, the people who elected

us—urban, rural communities—that corporate polluters' profits are more important than their health.

The mere fact that fracking is linked to childhood cancer should be enough for us to act. I merely ask for us, please, don't frack with our health.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this legislation.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle make statements that fracking is mostly unregulated and the practice can consume millions of gallons of water. They say this is industry first and that the Republicans look to take away and protect public health and combat the climate crisis. That couldn't be further from the truth. Absolutely couldn't be further from the truth.

According to the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, member States each have comprehensive laws and regulations to ensure safe operations and protect drinking water sources. They have trained personnel to effectively regulate oil and gas exploration and production.

Mr. Speaker, even President Obama's own EPA found that fracking has no widespread systemic impacts on drinking water resources in the United States of America. No evidence has arisen that this practice is dangerous, and to say anything else is simply fear-mongering to the American people and pandering to the radical left that would rather have us rely on Iran, Russia, and Venezuela for our energy needs.

Mr. Speaker, one last thing. This President took the sanctions off Iran. Iran is now making \$90 billion because those sanctions were taken off. Who do you think is funding the war against Israel? Iran, the top sponsor of terrorism. He took the sanctions off.

When we produce here in the United States of America, it is a win-win, Mr. Speaker. It is the safest, and the cleanest. It employs American technology, American resources, provides American jobs. It helps American families, American communities. We do it better than anybody else.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD Mr. LEVIN's amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the Yale School of Public Health, published in ScienceDirect in response to the statements of my colleague on the other side of the aisle that fracking is safe and that it is safe for nearby communities.

[From Science of the Total Environment, Aug. 16, 2016]

# UNCONVENTIONAL OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT AND RISK OF CHILDHOOD LEUKEMIA: ASSESSING THE EVIDENCE

(By Elise G. Elliott, Pauline Trinh, Xiaomei Ma, Brian P. Leaderer, Mary H. Ward, Nicole C. Deziel)

## ABSTRACT

The widespread distribution of unconventional oil and gas (UO&G) wells and other facilities in the United States potentially exposes millions of people to air and water pollutants, including known or suspected carcinogens. Childhood leukemia is a particular concern because of the disease severity, vulnerable population, and short disease latency. A comprehensive review of carcinogens and leukemogens associated with UO&G development is not available and could inform future exposure monitoring studies and human health assessments. The objective of this analysis was to assess the evidence of carcinogenicity of water contaminants and air pollutants related to UO&G development. We obtained a list of 1177 chemicals in hydraulic fracturing fluids and wastewater from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and constructed a list of 143 UO&G-related air pollutants through a review of scientific papers published through 2015 using PubMed and ProQuest databases. We assessed carcinogenicity and evidence of increased risk for leukemia/lymphoma of these chemicals using International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) monographs. The majority of compounds (>80%) were not evaluated by IARC and therefore could not be reviewed. Of the 111 potential water contaminants and 29 potential air pollutants evaluated by IARC (119 unique compounds), 49 water and 20 air pollutants were known, probable, or possible human carcinogens (55 unique compounds). A total of 17 water and 11 air pollutants (20 unique compounds) had evidence of increased risk for leukemia/lymphoma, including benzene, 1,3-butadiene, cadmium, diesel exhaust, and several polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Though information on the carcinogenicity of compounds associated with UO&G development was limited, our assessment identified 20 known or suspected carcinogens that could be measured in future studies to advance exposure and risk assessments of cancer-causing agents. Our findings support the need for investigation into the relationship between UO&G development and risk of cancer in general and childhood leukemia in particular.

## INTRODUCTION

Unconventional oil and gas (UO&G) development is a complex, multi-phase process of extracting oil and natural gas from low-permeable rock formations that were inaccessible prior to recent technological advances in hydraulic fracturing and directional drilling. It has expanded rapidly in the past decade and now occurs in as many as 30 states within the United States, with millions of people living within 1 mile of a hydraulically fractured well (US EPA, 2015). Concerns have been raised about the potential exposures to water and air pollutants and related health impacts (Adgate et al., 2014). Chemicals involved in or produced by UO&G development may include reproductive/developmental toxicants (Elliott et al., 2016; Kahrilas et al., 2015; Wattenberg et al., 2015), endocrine disruptors (Kassotis et al., 2014), or known or suspected carcinogenic agents (McKenzie et al., 2012). The limited epidemiologic studies of UO&G development have observed an increase in adverse perinatal outcomes (Casey et al., 2016; McKenzie et al., 2014; Stacy et al., 2015), asthma exacerbations (Rasmussen et

al., 2016), dermal irritation (Rabinowitz et al., 2015), hospitalization rates (Jemelita et al., 2015), and nasal, headache, and fatigue symptoms (Tustin et al., 2016).

Childhood leukemia in particular is a public health concern related to UO&G development, and it may be an early indicator of exposure to environmental carcinogens due to the relatively short disease latency and vulnerability of the exposed population (Rothwell et al., 1991; Shy et al., 1994). The age-adjusted incidence rate of leukemia in the United States for children under the age of 15 was 5.3 per 100,000 persons in 2011, the highest among all types of childhood cancer, and the peak age of incidence is 2–5 years (CDC, 2015). The U.S. incidence rates for acute lymphocytic leukemia, the most common subtype of childhood leukemia, increased annually by 1.4% from 2000 to 2010 (Gittleman et al., 2015). Environmental exposures, such as ionizing radiation, benzene, traffic exhaust, tobacco smoke, and pesticides, have been linked to childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia, though evidence is generally limited or inconsistent (Bailey et al., 2015a; Bailey et al., 2015b; Tong et al., 2012; Ward et al., 2014; Wiemels, 2012; Zachek et al., 2015). A comprehensive review of the carcinogens and leukemogens associated with UO&G development is not available and could inform future environmental and biological monitoring and human health studies. In this analysis, we aimed to systematically assess the evidence for a possible carcinogenic/leukemogenic role of (1) water and (2) air pollutants associated with UO&G development.

### 1.1. Unconventional oil and gas development description of the process

In oil and gas extraction, a well pad must first be constructed. This involves the use of construction vehicles, heavy equipment, and diesel generators in continuous operation to create roads, clear and set up a well site, and transport materials to the site (Moore et al., 2014). After well pad construction is complete, drilling rigs drill vertically past the deepest freshwater aquifer down to the level of the source formation, such as shale rock, turn and drill horizontally for distances up to 3000 m (Laurenzi and Jersey, 2013). After drilling, the well is hydraulically fractured. In this step, large volumes of fracturing fluids consisting of water, chemicals, and proppants (sand or ceramic beads) are forced into wells under high pressure, creating fissures or fractures in the rock along the horizontal section of the wellbore to release oil or gas. Typically, about 15–100 million l of fluid are used for each well, of which approximately 1–2% are chemical additives, representing a substantial volume of chemicals used per well (estimated as upwards of 114,000 l) (US DOE, 2013; US EPA, 2012). Chemical additives in fracturing fluids include biocides, surfactants, and anti-corrosive agents (US EPA, 2015). After fracturing, wastewater flows up the wells. Within 1–4 weeks about 30% of injected fracturing fluids rapidly return to the surface through the well as “flowback” water; subsequently, “produced” water returns up the well more slowly. The produced water includes the injected fluids along with mobilized, naturally-occurring compounds (e.g., heavy metals, bromides, radionuclides) (Ferrari et al., 2013; Vidic et al., 2013). Flowback and produced wastewater are stored in large open pits or storage tanks until they can be treated, re-used, or disposed of offsite, such as in injection wells. Oil, gas, and produced water flow up the well for years or decades during the production phase of the well (Barbot et al., 2013; Nicol et al., 2014). During production, diesel-power trucks may be used to maintain the wells or transport oil or gas off the well

pad. This stage also includes the processing and distribution of the produced oil and gas at other facilities (NYS DEC, 2011).

### 1.2. Possible pathways of environmental exposure to carcinogenic agents

Possible pathways of water contamination during fracturing and production include faulty or deteriorating well casings, equipment failure, surface spills of fracturing fluids or wastewater on-site or from tanker trucks transporting these liquids, migration of chemicals from fractures to shallow aquifers, leakage from wastewater pits, and unauthorized discharge and release of inadequately treated wastewater into the environment (Adgate et al., 2014; Brantley et al., 2014; Ferrar et al., 2013; Gross et al., 2013; Jackson et al., 2013b; Osborn et al., 2011; Rozell and Reaven, 2012; Shonkoff et al., 2014; US EPA, 2015; Vengosh et al., 2014; Vengosh et al., 2013; Warner et al., 2012). Surface activities may pose the greater potential threat in the near-term (Drollette et al., 2015), with sub-surface activities potentially presenting a hazard over a longer period of time. Several water quality studies have measured total dissolved solids, isotopes, and other chemicals to characterize a geochemical fingerprint of UO&G development (Jackson et al., 2013a; Vengosh et al., 2013; Warner et al., 2013; Warner et al., 2012); these studies are not necessarily focused on compounds with evidence of toxicity to humans. Studies measuring concentrations of health-relevant chemicals in drinking water sources are emerging (Harkness et al., 2015; Hildenbrand et al., 2015; Llewellyn et al., 2015), but data are limited.

UO&G development activities that could generate air pollution include operation of diesel-powered equipment, use of vehicles to transport materials and waste to and from the site, addition of sand (silica) to the fracturing fluid mixture, volatilization of compounds from wastewater, and processing and distribution of the oil and gas (Moore et al., 2014). Air pollutants, such as diesel exhaust, fine and coarse air particulates, crystalline silica, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), are a few examples commonly cited as being generated as part of the various phases of UO&G development (Burnham et al., 2012; McCawley, 2015; Moore et al., 2014). To our knowledge, no comprehensive list of air pollutants potentially related to UO&G development is available in the published literature or government reports.

### 1.3. Epidemiologic studies of unconventional oil and gas development

Knowledge of the the health risks of UO&G development is sparse though epidemiologic studies on this topic are emerging. Studies using proximity-based metrics observed associations between UO&G development and congenital heart defects in children (McKenzie et al., 2014), self-reported dermal irritation (Rabinowitz et al., 2015), decreased birth weight and increased incidence of small for gestational age (Stacy et al., 2015), increased preterm birth (Casey et al., 2016), increased in mild, moderate, and severe asthma exacerbations (Rasmussen et al., 2016), and increased chronic rhinosinusitis, migraine headache, and fatigue symptoms (Tustin et al., 2016). The number of wells per ZIP code was associated with increased hospitalization rates, particularly in the areas of dermatology, neurology, oncology, and urology (Jemelita et al., 2015).

The only epidemiologic analysis of the association between UO&G development and risk of cancer published in the scientific literature reported similar county-level standardized incidence ratios for childhood leukemia before and after drilling of any oil and gas wells in any Pennsylvania counties during 1990–2009 (Fryzek et al., 2013). Also in this

analysis, standardized incidence ratios were similar before and after drilling started in counties with unconventional wells, specifically. However, several important shortcomings of this study have been noted. For example, this ecologic study did not account for a latency period between exposure and cancer incidence. In addition, though the study objective was to examine risk associated with hydraulic fracturing, 98% of the wells included in the study were “non-horizontal” wells that likely did not involve the practice of hydraulic fracturing (Goldstein and Malone, 2013). Case-control studies of proximity to other petroleum-based sources provide some evidence of an association with childhood leukemia risk. Two case-control studies in France reported increased odds of childhood leukemia among those living in proximity to the petroleum-based sources of petrol stations and automotive repair garages (Brosselin et al., 2009; Steffen et al., 2004). Another case-control study reported elevated odds of childhood leukemia with proximity to petrol stations, but the relationship was not statistically significant, possibly due to small sample size (Harrison et al., 1999). Another study observed an association with proximity to petro-chemical plants and increased odds of leukemia in young adults (20–29 years), but not children ages 0–15 (Yu et al., 2006). Additionally, a human health risk assessment found an increased risk of cancer for residents living  $\leq 0.5$  versus  $> 0.5$  mile from a well, attributable primarily to benzene, a known human carcinogen associated with leukemia risk (McKenzie et al., 2012). Taken together, these findings support the plausibility of an increased risk of childhood leukemia related to oil and gas development. The current analysis investigates whether there is additional evidence for the plausibility of a carcinogenic risk from air or water contaminants and provides information to improve the specificity of exposure assessments and human health research of the potential adverse effects of UO&G development.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1 Identification of potential water contaminants

We compiled a list of all chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing fluids, detected in hydraulic fracturing wastewater, or both from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) Appendices A of the progress report “Study of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources” and draft report “Assessment of the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing for Oil and Gas on Drinking Water Resources” (US EPA, 2012; US EPA, 2015). We eliminated duplicate entries and combined the entries for xylene isomers. This yielded a total of 1177 distinct compounds or groups of compounds (1043 in fracturing fluids only, 98 in wastewater only, 36 in both). The U.S. EPA developed these chemical lists from federal and state databases of well permits and construction records, industry disclosures and monitoring reports, trade journals, the scientific literature, and governmental and non-governmental reports. The fracturing fluid list contains a greater number of substances because it reflects reported usage and includes disclosed substances used across varying companies, locations, and geological formations. The list of wastewater constituents is shorter because it is based on the limited wastewater measurement data available from industry, government reports, or the published literature.

### 2.2 Classification of carcinogenicity of potential water contaminants

We searched the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) monographs for

evidence of carcinogenicity of the potential water contaminants. IARC is an internationally recognized authority on carcinogenicity of chemicals and other agents (Pearce et al., 2015). The monographs are written by working groups of international experts convened by IARC, and they provide detailed evaluations of the quality and strength of evidence of carcinogenicity of agents. The agents are selected for evaluation based on exposure prevalence and suggestive evidence of likelihood to pose a cancer hazard to humans (Tomatis, 1976). Other organizations evaluate environmental agents for carcinogenicity, such as the U.S. EPA through their Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) or the National Institutes of Health through their National Toxicology Program (NTP). Their lists of agents evaluated for their carcinogenicity contain much overlap with IARC and are less comprehensive; IARC, IRIS, and NTP have evaluated 1050, 264, and 243 compounds, respectively (IARC, 2016; IRIS, 2016; NTP, 2014).

Chemicals were designated as “no information available” if they were not evaluated in an IARC monograph. For chemicals that were evaluated, we indicated their IARC carcinogenicity classification: carcinogenic to humans (Group 1), probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A), possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B), not classifiable as to their carcinogenicity to humans (Group 3), and probably not carcinogenic to humans (Group 4). We calculated frequencies and percentages of the potential water contaminants in each carcinogenicity classification. For chemicals in Groups 1, 2A, or 2B, we assessed whether these chemicals had evidence linked to leukemia and/or lymphoma specifically, based on the available information on human and animal study data provided in the monograph summary or synthesis.

### 2.3. Identification of potential air pollutants

We constructed a list of potential air pollutants associated with UO&G development by conducting a comprehensive review of the scientific literature. First, we systematically searched the biomedical and health-oriented PubMed database for papers published through December 31, 2015 using the terms “fracking air”, “hydraulic fracturing air”, “unconventional gas air”, “shale gas air”, “unconventional oil air”, and “shale oil air,” which yielded 136 unique publications. Next, we searched the ProQuest Environmental Science Collection database for papers published in environmental science-oriented journals through December 31, 2015 using the terms “fracking”, “hydraulic fracturing”, “unconventional gas”, “shale gas”, “unconventional oil”, and “shale oil” with the term “air pollution.” This search yielded 42 publications (31 additional, unique publications and 11 previously identified through PubMed). We included three types of studies in this analysis: (1) studies that collected primary air pollutant measurements or presented air pollutant measurements from secondary data sources, such as a state or county dataset (“measurement” studies), (2) studies that modeled air pollutant concentrations using inputs from primary or secondary measurements, emission rates from equipment or UO&G activities, and/or meteorological data (“modeling” studies), and (3) studies with qualitative assessments of potential or expected air pollutants based on review of the scientific literature, government or non-governmental reports, and/or expert judgement about the types of pollutants likely to be generated from UO&G activities (“descriptive” studies). We excluded papers not directly related to environmental air pollution associated with UO&G development ( $n = 86$ ), papers describing generic chemical classes (e.g., volatile organic com-

pounds (VOCs)) but not specific chemical names (e.g., benzene) ( $n = 25$ ), publications that were not peer-reviewed original research or review papers or were corrected and updated after 2015 ( $n = 4$ ), and papers written in foreign languages ( $n = 3$ ). From the 49 publications meeting our criteria, we abstracted chemical names of air pollutants from tables, text, and figures, if explicitly reported as present or predicted to be present at UO&G sites. For example, we abstracted names of target analytes from tables and figures presenting measured or estimated concentrations of pollutants near UO&G sites. This approach is consistent with the U.S. EPA water list construction, which included any compounds reportedly used in hydraulic fracturing fluids or detected in wastewater. We combined individual chemicals into one category if these agents were evaluated as a group by IARC (e.g. xylenes, particulate matter).

### 2.4. Classification of carcinogenicity of potential air contaminants

We searched the IARC monographs for evidence of carcinogenicity using chemical names of the potential air pollutants. Following the same procedure as for potential water contaminants (Section 2.2), chemicals were designated as “no information available” if they were not present in the IARC monographs; or else were reported as Groups 1, 2A, 2B, 3, or 4. For the compounds in Groups 1, 2A, and 2B, we determined whether the monograph summary or synthesis indicated that there was sufficient evidence of increased risk of leukemia and/or lymphoma specifically, based on human or animal data.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Carcinogenicity of potential water contaminants

Of the 1177 potential water contaminants assessed, 1066 compounds (91%) had not been evaluated for carcinogenicity by IARC. The 111 potential water contaminants evaluated included 14 (13%) known human carcinogens (Group 1), 6 (5%) probable human carcinogens (Group 2A), and 29 (26%) possible human carcinogens (Group 2B), and 62 (56%) compounds were not classified with respect to their carcinogenicity (Group 3) (Fig. 1). None were designated as probably not carcinogenic to humans, though only one compound has ever been assigned this classification. The distribution of compounds among the carcinogenicity classifications was similar between the fracturing fluid compounds and wastewater compounds (Fig. 1). Of the 49 potential water contaminants classified as known, probable, or possible human carcinogens (Groups 1, 2A, 2B), 17 had evidence of an increased risk of leukemia and/or lymphoma (Table 1). This included 7 known human carcinogens (1,3-butadiene, benzene, cadmium, ethanol, ethylene oxide, formaldehyde, and quartz), 3 probable carcinogens (dibenz[*a,h*]anthracene, dichloromethane, tetrachloroethylene), and 7 possible carcinogens (1,2-propylene oxide, benzo[*b*]fluoranthene, benzo[*k*]fluoranthene, heptachlor, hydrazine, indeno[1,2,3-*cd*]pyrene, styrene). This list reflects petroleum-related volatile organic compounds (e.g., benzene), metals (e.g., cadmium), solvents (e.g., dichloromethane, tetrachloroethylene), and PAHs (benzo[*b*]fluoranthene, benzo[*k*]fluoranthene, dibenz[*a,h*]anthracene).

### 3.2 Identification of potential air pollutants

Our literature review yielded 143 distinct potential air pollutants or groups of pollutants related to UO&G development from 49 studies (Supplemental Table S1, Table 1). Of the 143 compounds, 97 had also been identified in water and 46 were unique to air. A

total of 27 studies included measurements, 19 used modeling, and 15 were descriptive in nature; some studies incorporated a combination of these approaches (Table 2). There were 31 studies of gas development, 1 of oil development, and 17 of both. Studies reporting primary measurements or modeled estimates of air pollutants were conducted mainly in Colorado, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wyoming. Frequently reported air pollutants (reported in ≥5 studies) included benzene, ethylbenzene, hydrogen sulfide, methane, nitrogen oxides, ozone, particulate matter, toluene, and styrene (Supplemental Table S1). Sampling locations included perimeters of UO&G well sites, mobile monitoring stations, and fixed community sites. Sampling durations varied, such as one-time grab samples of 2 to 3 min (Macey et al., 2014) and weekly 24-hour integrated samples collected over a period of two years (McKenzie et al., 2012).

### 3.3. Carcinogenicity of potential air pollutants

Of the 143 potential air pollutants, 114 compounds (80%) had not been evaluated for carcinogenicity by IARC. Of the 29 potential air pollutants evaluated, 7 (24%) were considered carcinogenic to humans (Group 1), 2 (7%) were considered probably carcinogenic to humans varied, such as one-time grab samples of 2 to 3 min (Macey et al., 2014) and weekly 24-hour integrated samples collected over a period of two years (McKenzie et al., 2012). (Group 2A), and 11 (38%) were considered possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B) (Fig. 1). A total of 9 (31%) compounds were not classifiable with respect to their carcinogenicity (Group 3) (Fig. 1). None were designated as probably not carcinogenic to humans (Group 4).

Of the 20 known, probable, or possible carcinogens (Groups 1, 2A, 2B), 11 had evidence of an increased risk of leukemia and/or lymphoma (Table 3). This included 5 known human carcinogens (1,3-butadiene, benzene, ethanol, formaldehyde, diesel engine exhaust), 2 probable human carcinogens (dibenz[*a,h*]anthracene, tetrachloroethylene), and 4 possible human carcinogens (carbon tetrachloroethylene, chrysene, indeno[1,2,3-*cd*]pyrene, styrene). This list includes constituents of oil and gas resources (e.g., benzene) and diesel exhaust (e.g., formaldehyde, PAHs, 1,3-butadiene).

### 4. DISCUSSION

We evaluated the evidence that potential exposures from UO&G development are risk factors for cancer in general and leukemia in particular. Our analysis of 1177 chemicals in hydraulic fracturing fluids or wastewater and 143 potential air pollutants identified 55 possible, probable, and known carcinogens related to UO&G development activities. However, the vast majority of chemicals (91% of potential water contaminants, 80% of potential air pollutants) were not evaluated for their carcinogenicity by IARC. Of the 55 known, probable, or possible human carcinogens, 20 had some evidence for increased risk of leukemia and/or lymphoma: 1,2-propylene oxide, 1,3-butadiene, benzene, benzo[*b*]fluoranthene, benzo[*k*]fluoranthene, cadmium, carbon tetrachloroethylene, chrysene, dibenz[*a,h*]anthracene, dichloromethane, engine exhaust (diesel), ethanol, ethylene oxide, formaldehyde, heptachlor, hydrazine, indeno[1,2,3-*cd*]pyrene, quartz, styrene, and tetrachloroethylene. These findings support the hypothesis that exposure to UO&G development could increase the risk of leukemia.

Our findings demonstrate the presence of known and suspected carcinogens surrounding UO&G facilities, but drawing conclusions about cancer or leukemia risk is challenging, due to the varied and limited water and air measurement data. With respect to water, for example, Fontenot et al.

(2013) measured metals in private drinking water wells in a community proximate to UO&G activity and observed concentrations of the known carcinogen arsenic in exceedance of U.S. EPA Maximum Contaminant Levels, although possible sources included mobilization of natural constituents and hydrogeochemical changes in addition to UO&G activities. Drollette et al. (2015) detected trace levels of organic compounds, such as the known leukomogen benzene and possible carcinogen ethylbenzene, in private drinking water wells in areas with UO&G development in Pennsylvania, with highest observed concentrations within 1 km of active UO&G operations. Although the observed concentrations were below U.S. EPA Maximum Contaminant Levels, cancer risk is generally assumed not to have a threshold below which there is a safe level of exposure.

With respect to air, our literature review identified six studies measuring hazardous air pollutants associated with childhood leukemia (e.g., benzene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) near UO&G facilities (Bunch et al., 2014; Macey et al., 2014; McKenzie et al., 2012; Pekney et al., 2014; Rich and Crosby, 2013; Rutter et al., 2015). Differences in location, sampling duration, target agents, and sampling methodology in the air pollution literature hindered our ability to synthesize the air data and place it into context of human health risk. However, some individual studies used the air monitoring data to estimate cancer or health risk. Macey et al. (2014) identified concentrations of benzene, 1,3-butadiene, and formaldehyde in exceedance of EPA IRIS cancer risk levels; however, these were based on grab samples that represented high-exposure scenarios (e.g., ≤20 m of UO&G separator, compressor station, discharge canal, and well pad). McKenzie et al. (2012) estimated risk to communities based on Colorado measurement data collected over nearly three years from a fixed monitoring station in a rural community. They observed an excess risk of cancer for residents living <0.5 mile from the nearest well, mainly attributable to benzene and 1,3-butadiene. Bunch et al. (2014) used VOC measurements collected over ten years by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality from seven fixed-site monitors in the Dallas/Fort Worth area to conduct deterministic and probabilistic risk assessments and found that all but one of the cancer risk estimates were within the acceptable cancer risk range. Pekney et al. (2014) collected mobile measurements of ambient concentrations of pollutants in Pennsylvania and found no exceedances of National Ambient Air Quality Standards for criteria pollutants. These studies indicate that water and air pollution related to UO&G activities may pose a public health and potential cancer risk. More environmental measurements of health-relevant chemicals associated with UO&G development, particularly at residences in close proximity to these facilities, are needed to better characterize human exposures and determine whether confirmed or suspected carcinogens and toxicants are present and at what levels. In particular, studies with longer sampling durations or integrated over longer periods of time would be more relevant to chronic outcomes like cancer.

To our knowledge, our analysis represents the most expansive review of carcinogenicity of hydraulic fracturing-related chemicals in the published literature. Previous studies have examined the carcinogenicity of more selective lists of chemicals. For example, Kahrilas et al. (2015) reviewed the toxicological properties of biocide constituents of fracturing fluids and their degradation and reaction products and found that few had been evaluated by IARC. Compounds identified by Kahrilas et al. included formaldehyde (a known carcinogen associated

with an increased risk of leukemia and lymphoma, identified in our analysis), dibromoacetonitrile (a possible carcinogen, identified in our analysis), nitrosamines (includes probable carcinogens, not identified in our analysis), and trihalomethanes (includes possible and probable carcinogens, four identified in our analysis: bromodichloromethane, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane, and bromoform). Stringfellow et al. (2014) assessed 81 common hydraulic fracturing fluid additives and identified five confirmed or suspected carcinogens using the U.S. NTP carcinogenicity evaluations (Stringfellow et al., 2014). Our analysis also identified four of these five chemicals: ethanol (known carcinogen associated with an increased risk of leukemia and lymphoma), acetaldehyde (possible carcinogen), diethanolamine (possible carcinogen), and naphthalene (possible carcinogen). The fifth compound, thiourea, was included in our analysis, but was considered not classifiable with respect to human carcinogenicity by IARC. Colborn et al. (2011) abstracted a list of chemical additives of hydraulic fracturing fluids using information on Material Safety Data Sheets provided by government and natural gas industry sources (Colborn et al., 2011). They found that 25% of the 353 chemicals evaluated could cause cancer and mutations. However, the inclusion criteria for this carcinogenicity evaluation were not provided to make a direct comparison with our findings.

An experimental study on the carcinogenicity of hydraulic fracturing wastewater observed that immortalized human bronchial epithelial cells exposed to flowback water collected from unconventional natural gas drilling of the Marcellus Shale underwent malignant transformation and exhibited altered morphology compared to parental cells (Yao et al., 2015). The flowback water sample contained relatively high concentrations of barium and strontium. However, these metals were not evaluated for carcinogenicity to humans by IARC and therefore were not included in our evaluation. Strontium was not evaluated by the NTP or U.S. EPA IRIS programs; barium was not evaluated by NTP, and it was deemed not classifiable with respect to carcinogenicity by the U.S. EPA.

Looking broadly at UO&G development and cancer risk, other risk factors should also be considered. For example, UO&G development could pose a risk for childhood leukemia through a phenomenon known as population mixing (Belson et al., 2007; Kinlen, 2012). This refers to the migration of new populations into previously contained rural areas, introducing new infectious agents. This could give rise to increasing underlying infections, for which childhood leukemia is a possible complication (Kinlen, 1988; Kinlen, 2012). An alternative hypothesis is that a delayed exposure to infectious agents among individuals who experienced an absence of exposure in very early life could increase the risk of an inappropriate immune response and lead to leukemia (Greaves, 2006; Greaves, 1997). UO&G development is a rapidly expanding industry that creates an influx of specialized, external workers into less populated areas to fill industry jobs (Brasier et al., 2011; Filteau, 2015b; Jacquet, 2014). Additionally, previous examples of resource extraction or energy development have reported population increases of up to 80% and worker influx-related impacts on public health and local communities (Ennis and Finlayson, 2015; Filteau, 2015a; Keough, 2015). More research would be needed to demonstrate risk to newly introduced infectious agents. Another possible risk factor for childhood leukemia is parental occupational exposures to agents such as benzene or PAHs from work in the



oil and gas industry during the pregnancy period, a critical window of vulnerability for childhood leukemia (Fusion et al., 2001). In addition, parents employed by oil and gas companies could introduce contaminants into the home environment through clothing, shoes, and skin (Newman et al., 2015; Sahmel et al., 2014). Also, the introduction of bromide constituents from hydraulic fracturing wastewater into drinking water sources could increase the subsequent, downstream formation of carcinogenic disinfection byproducts and increase the risk of cancer, such as bladder cancer (Regli et al., 2015). Further, agents released from other components of oil and gas infrastructure, such as petroleum storage tanks (Zusman et al., 2012), petrochemical plants (Yu et al., 2006), and petrol stations (Brosselin et al., 2009; Harrison et al., 1999; Steffen et al., 2004) could pose a leukemia risk.

This analysis has several limitations. The list of potential water contaminants from fracturing fluids is limited to non-proprietary chemicals that were reported to the U.S. EPA by oil and gas companies and included in the U.S. EPA reports on hydraulic fracturing (US EPA, 2012; US EPA, 2015). Our identification of potential air pollutants was based on information available in the PubMed and ProQuest Environmental Science databases and may not include all potential air pollutants associated with UO&G development. The published literature may be more likely to report air pollutants for which health data are available, which could explain why a greater percentage of chemicals in air were evaluated by IARC compared to chemicals that were potential water pollutants. Additionally, IARC only evaluates chemicals with suspected carcinogenicity. Therefore, the proportion of known, probable, and possible carcinogens among those compounds evaluated may not be representative of the proportion of carcinogens among those not evaluated. Although the IARC monographs are the most comprehensive, systematic carcinogenicity evaluations, a comprehensive literature review of all 1177 water contaminants and 143 air pollutants could identify additional compounds that pose an increased risk of cancer.

Conducting a well-designed sampling campaign for UO&G development is challenging, given the wide variety of potential target pollutants and the limited information available to identify which pollutants have the highest probability of exposure or health impact. Our list of 143 air pollutants associated with UO&G development (Supplemental Table S1) may serve as a useful resource for researchers designing future studies. Furthermore, our list of known, probable, and possible carcinogens linked to UO&G development can be used as a target analyte list for environmental or biological measurements in future exposure and health studies. Measurements of these compounds in air or water in residences proximate to this activity would provide insights into whether exposures are occurring and at what levels. Additionally, air pollution measurements corresponding to the different phases of UO&G development would provide critical information about the relative contribution of exposures from various aspects of the development activities and priorities for exposure mitigation. Furthermore, geographical and seasonal variations could influence release, concentration, and dispersion of potential air pollutants. Therefore, additional water and air measurement studies are urgently needed to investigate the potential for spatial and temporal variations in exposures.

This analysis could also inform design of exposure metrics for epidemiologic studies. Epidemiologic studies have generally used individual-level, geographic information sys-

tems-based inverse-distance weighted metrics to estimate exposure to UO&G development, which characterize UO&G development as a collective process. More specific metrics or measurements could offer improvements to the exposure assessment and potential insights into etiologic agents. Future studies could incorporate environmental and/or biological monitoring of health-relevant chemicals, such as the 55 known, probable, and possible carcinogens in water or air, and examine the relationship between chemical concentrations and proximity and density-based metrics, to determine the extent to which proximity is associated with exposure. Though more measurement data is needed to better understand whether exposures are occurring and at what concentrations, release of any carcinogens from UO&G development should be minimized.

#### 5. CONCLUSIONS

There is a need to better understand the potential risks of UO&G development with carefully designed exposure and epidemiologic studies. We identified 55 known, probable, and possible carcinogens (20 compounds associated with leukemia and/or lymphoma specifically) that are potential water contaminants and/or air pollutants related to UO&G development. Our study provides some support for the hypothesis that exposure to UO&G development could increase the risk of leukemia. Because children are a vulnerable population, research efforts should first be directed toward investigating whether exposure to UO&G development is associated with an increased risk in childhood leukemia. Environmental and biological measurements of the compounds identified in this analysis in communities proximate to UO&G development would be critical for future research on the potential public health impact.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.072>.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, this article shows that living within a mile of a fracked well directly increases the risks of children developing leukemia. They are not children from across the country. The study warns that millions of people living within a mile of fracked wells may have been exposed to these cancer-causing chemicals.

In response to this study, several physicians are quoted as saying: "This is like smoking in the 1950s. There was a lot of suggestive evidence, but the conclusive stuff came later. I think we're going to get it, maybe in 5 or 10 years, but it is a question of how much damage is going to be done in the meantime."

"Too often, we look at the political environment before we look at the evidence, and I don't think that's serving our future."

This is just one study looking at a couple dozen pollutants. There is ample evidence out there to be concerned with fracking's impact on public health, but there is still too much to learn. Yet, H.R. 1121 would ban restrictions on fracking before we know the full realm of impacts on public health. This is unacceptable. The bill is rooted in many falsehoods as it relates to public health.

I am so excited to hear my colleague talk about the fact that we should be

hiring American workers, that we should be ensuring that we have great union jobs, that we should be invested in green energy infrastructure. I hope that is why my colleagues across the aisle woulda, shoulda, coulda supported the bipartisan infrastructure law—I know a couple of them did—as well as the Chips and Science Act, and also the Inflation Reduction Act. All of those bills are actually really focused on making sure that we are investing in our country, working on creating more clean, green energy that does not include fracking.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, \$9,600, that is how much the average American household is paying today in the higher cost of living in the United States as a direct result of policies of the Biden administration, \$9,600.

Now, Mr. Speaker, compare that to what President Biden said on the campaign trail. He said, I will not raise costs, raise taxes on any American who earns less than \$400,000. That is the average, \$9,600. In fact, for some people it is more. Mr. Speaker, the cause of these higher costs is the regulatory agenda of this administration.

That is exactly what we are debating today. We are talking about energy prices. We are talking about energy policies of this administration that are having an adverse effect on Americans. We are watching right now as this administration, as this bill tries to fix, bans fracking.

You can go back, and you can look historically at the United States. We have led the world in reducing emissions. How have we done it? Do you know what the secret is? One of the most important tools that we have used to reduce emissions is actually natural gas. Natural gas, one of the biggest targets, the biggest victims of this fracking ban.

Let's take a look. Is this fracking ban legal? Well, there was a judge in Wyoming who actually looked at this under the Obama administration and said: "Congress has not delegated to the Department of the Interior the authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing. The BLM's effort to do so through the Fracking Rule is in excess of its statutory authority and contrary to law."

What does this administration do? The same exact thing.

□ 1445

It is not just a fracking ban, though. It is also banning the export of liquefied natural gas.

As my friend from Minnesota just said, what happens is that you don't have a decrease in demand for energy. It is simply that other countries provide it.

Countries like Iran that are profiting tens of billions of dollars love these policies. Russia loves these policies. This administration actually increased the importation of energy from Russia when they came in.

This is baffling energy policy. You are failing to address America's energy security. You are failing the affordability test.

Mr. Speaker, let's think about emissions. On the emissions side, are these policies resulting in lower emissions? Let's look at facts. The facts show that between 2005 and 2021, the United States has actually reduced emissions more than any other country in the world—not just more than any other country, more than the six next emissions-reducing countries combined.

How have we done it? It is by using natural gas. What happens? Other countries fill the void, countries like Russia.

Let's do a comparison there. When you take 1 year of liquefied natural gas supplied to the European Union from Russia, and if you were to supplant it with liquefied natural gas coming from the United States, it would reduce emissions by 218 million tons, but my friends across the aisle and at the White House have taken that off the table.

Let's go back and review. We have higher prices that Americans are paying—higher prices for utilities and higher prices for gasoline. We have more dependence upon countries like Iran, China, Venezuela, and Russia for energy. We are more dependent upon them, the globe is, and emissions are going up.

Which one of these is important? I mean, this is baffling to me. Higher prices, less energy security, and higher emissions are what this administration's energy policies have achieved. It makes no sense.

Let's talk about where these dollars are going. My friend talked about the tens of billions going to Iran. These dollars are being directly provided to Iranian terrorist proxies that have attacked and killed American troops in Syria and Iraq. These policies are funding this.

Coming back to us, we are now funding Ukraine, which is battling Russia, paid for with U.S. bad energy policy. We are funding Israel. That is paid for by bad energy policy that Iran is profiting from. This makes no sense. It makes absolutely no sense.

This bill, however, does make sense because it reverses the policies of this administration. It brings back common sense. It follows evidence, science, and math that show that we can actually reduce emissions, increase energy security, and have affordable energy in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from across the aisle is right: This makes no sense.

If my colleagues across the aisle actually want to push back against Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, then pass the supplemental because that funding will do more to help support democracies around the world and help countries most in need than whatever is in H.R. 1121.

Listening to some of the arguments we have heard from Republicans over the last week and even now today, I have to say, I am confused.

Is oil and gas production higher than ever, or is there a war on energy? Are gas prices high because of Bidenomics, or are prices so low that we should continue exporting LNG? Should the government stop picking winners and losers through energy subsidies, or should we continue giving handouts to oil and gas and even expand those giveaways with the bills up today?

I suspect Republican messaging is so confusing because continuing to rig the system for Big Oil just doesn't make sense.

The U.S. is producing record amounts of oil and gas and is exporting more than ever before. I will say it again: The U.S. is producing record amounts of oil and gas and is exporting more than ever before.

Yet, the American people aren't seeing the benefits. Prices for consumers are still high while Big Oil and other big corporations rake in massive profits.

Reporting from the Groundwork Collaborative found that over half of recent U.S. inflation was caused by corporate price gouging, even as input costs decreased.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Groundwork Collaborative report.

[From Groundwork Collaborative, Jan. 18, 2024]

INFLATION REVELATION: HOW OUTSIZED CORPORATE PROFITS DRIVE RISING COSTS  
(By Liz Pancotti, Strategic Advisor, and Lindsay Owens, Executive Director)

As their cost of doing business comes down, corporations pad their bottom lines on the back of consumers.

Inflation has come down significantly from its peak over the past year, yet prices remain high for American consumers. From housing and groceries to car insurance and electric bills, families are still feeling the squeeze. In the wake of the pandemic, virtually every company in every industry faced rising costs to make products and stock shelves. Labor costs rose sharply, the cost of transporting goods across the country hit record highs, and raw materials became costly or impossible to get. Corporations were quick to pass rising costs—and a little extra—on to consumers, fueling rapid inflation. As supply chain snarls have receded and the economy has stabilized, businesses continue to pad their bottom lines, rather than passing these savings on to consumers.

CORPORATE PROFITS ARE DRIVING MORE THAN HALF OF INFLATION

Some economists and pundits have sought to discredit the link between inflation and corporate profiteering. A Washington Post columnist recently claimed that blaming inflation on corporate profiteering is like saying "it's raining because water is falling from the sky." But this isn't true. Prices are

simply the sum of costs and corporate profits. While rising costs or inputs can drive up Americans pay at the gas pump or the grocery store, corporate profits can just as easily.

As corporations have lamented supply chain woes and high labor costs over the past two years, their profits have skyrocketed, fueling inflation and exacerbating a long-standing affordability crisis.

Some economists suggested that markup growth in 2021 was primarily driven by corporations raising prices in anticipation of future costs increases. However, corporate profit margins have remained high—and even grown—as labor costs have stabilized, nonlabor input costs have come down, and supply chains snarls have eased.

While labor and nonlabor input costs have played a role in price increases, corporate profits drove 53 percent of inflation during the second and third quarters of 2023 and more than one-third since the start of the pandemic. Comparatively, over the 40 years prior to the pandemic, they drove just 11 percent of growth.

Corporate profits as a share of national income has skyrocketed by 29 percent since the start of the pandemic. While our economy has returned to or surpassed its pre-pandemic levels on many indicators, workers' share of corporate income has still not recovered.

As White House National Economic Council Director Lael Brainard has noted, "Overall, the labor share of income has declined over the past two years and appears to be at or below pre-pandemic levels. While corporate profits as a share of GDP remain near postwar highs."

Economist Isabella Weber has pointed out that corporations are keeping prices high even as post-pandemic and Ukraine War supply chain pressures ease and wage growth slows. Why? Because they can.

Weber argues that supply shocks allowed corporations to tacitly collude, hike prices, and rake in record profits. This type of inflation, where corporations raise prices to protect—and even increase—their profit margins, allows prices to rise faster than the costs to make goods or provide services. When corporations pursued this opportunistic pricing strategy, they found a lot of space to increase prices, drive up profits, and see very little dropoff in demand.

Though inflation has eased, prices remain tremendously elevated from their pre-pandemic levels. Housing costs, for example, are up 21 percent, grocery costs have risen by 25 percent.

CONSUMER PRICES ARE RISING MUCH FASTER THAN CORPORATIONS' INPUT COSTS

While prices for consumers have risen by 3.4 percent over the past year, input costs for producers have risen by just 1 percent. For many commodities and services, producers' prices have actually decreased.

Input costs for key goods and services have sharply decreased over the past year. For example, nearly 60 percent of the drop in input goods prices was driven by large declines in energy costs, such as jet fuel and diesel fuel. Transportation and warehousing costs, which many corporations have cited as a main driver of price increases, have come down by nearly 4 percent since peaking in June 2022.

These input costs are critically important for corporations' balance sheets. As costs go down but revenue stays high because of higher sticker prices, corporate profit margins expand on the backs of American consumers.

One prime example of this is the diaper industry, which is highly concentrated—Procter & Gamble Co. (P&G) and Kimberly-Clark Corp. control 70 percent of the domestic market. Diaper prices have increased by more



than 30 percent since 2019 from, on average, \$16.50 to nearly \$22. Wood pulp is a major input in diapers and other paper products, like toilet paper and paper towels. Wholesale wood pulp prices soared by 87 percent between January 2021 and January 2023. Yet between January and December 2023, prices declined by 25 percent.

Using their pricing power, P&G and Kimberly-Clark have kept diaper prices high for American families, allowing their profit margins to expand considerably. In P&G's October 2023 earnings call, its CFO, Andre Schulten, said that high prices were a big driver of profit margin expansion and 33 percent of their profits in the previous quarter were driven by lower input costs. During P&G's July 2023 earnings call, the company predicted \$800 million in windfall profits because of declining input costs. In Kimberly-Clark's October 2023 earnings call, CEO Mike Hsu said the company "finally saw inflation in the cost environment" and admitted that he believes the company has "a lot of opportunity to [expand margins over time] between what [they're] doing on the revenue side and also on the cost side." Despite these large input cost declines, Hsu said he thinks the company has "priced appropriately" and did not anticipate any price deflation.

The diaper industry is just one example of corporations exploiting their pricing power to expand margins as input costs normalize. The same is true for many consumer goods, including new and used cars, groceries, and housing.

#### CORPORATIONS HAVE BRAGGED ABOUT THEIR ABILITY TO RAISE PRICES

Over the past two years, corporations have been explicit about how they've exploited their pricing power, and how they have and will continue to do so even as inflation comes down.

General Mills attributed their 16.5 percent increase in profits in FY 2022 to "getting smart about how [they] look at pricing."

PepsiCo raised its prices across snacks and beverages by roughly 15 percent during each of 2022Q4 and 2023Q1 as it increased its margin. CFO Hugh Johnson said they "may, in fact, increase margins during the course of the year" as costs decrease and prices remain elevated.

The CEO of Holcim, a construction materials manufacturer, said on recent earnings call, "We are in that inflationary environment already for almost two years now...We have done the pricing in a very proactive way so that our results aren't suffering. On the contrary, they are improving the margins."

Profit margins for AutoNation's finance and insurance segment have increased by 7 percent as they continue to hike margins with new fees and increased prices for consumers, even while products don't improve.

Carvana notes that it decreased its non-vehicle retail costs by nearly \$1,000 per car, driving huge margin increases (30 percent) even as used car costs remain elevated. Used car prices remain elevated and are up nearly 40 percent.

#### CONCLUSION

In the wake of the pandemic, consumer demand rebounded and supply chains struggled to keep up as a result of decades of disinvestment and offshoring. Goods became more expensive to make and transport, and tighter labor markets delivered long-overdue wage increases for workers. As businesses' costs went up, they jumped on the opportunity to pass on rising costs to consumers and have continued squeezing American's pocketbooks for more. Now that their costs have stailized—or, in many cases, come down significantly—it's time for companies to stop gouging consumers.

The Biden administration is taking steps to strengthen global supply chains and on-shore manufacturing, crack down on corporate concentration that has enabled corporations to put consumers through the wringer, and eliminate junk fees. President Biden said last month, "To any corporation that has not brought their prices back down—even as inflation has come down, even [as] supply chains have been rebuilt—it's time to stop the price gouging." The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Justice continue to dust off authorities not touched in decades to rein in corporate profiteering and concentration.

As Congress turns to expiring provisions from the 2017 Trump tax cuts over the next year, they must take a hard look at the corporate tax rate. Our tax code should support a robust and equitable economy, not incentivize profiteering.

The fundamental question we need to ask ourselves is whether we want an economy where corporations can exploit pandemics, supply chain crises, and wars at the expense of American workers and families, or an economy where corporations are put in check, allowing everyone to thrive?

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, communities living closest to oil and gas production, mostly low-income and people of color, are left paying the costs of constant pollution and public health crises. We are all paying for the record number of billion-dollar climate disasters in 2023, driven by the fossil fuel climate crisis.

These bills we are debating today would walk back important protections for taxpayers and local communities to keep funneling money into the pockets of Big Oil.

It does not make sense to keep doubling down on a bad deal. Big Oil does not need more favors right now. They don't need more tax breaks. They don't need more handouts—I am going to keep saying it—and they don't need more special loopholes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have continuously said that oil production on Federal lands is at an all-time high. The fact of the matter is that the production is occurring on lands leased by the Trump administration and previous administrations.

I guess my colleagues now support the policies of the Trump administration as best they are trying to take credit for them.

My good friend, Ranking Member MCGOVERN, made this point in the Rules Committee just yesterday. After mentioning that America is a top energy producer, he said: "Let me be very clear. I am not highlighting these facts because I like them. I find it very troubling that we are producing so much oil. . . ."

How very sad it is to hear that from my colleagues. Why are they so ashamed that we produce energy here in America? Would they rather us be dependent on Russia, Iran, or Venezuela for oil and natural gas in the

same way Democratic policies have made us dependent on China for critical minerals?

We should celebrate American energy independence where, again, we do it cleaner and safer than anybody else in the world with the best labor standards.

Mr. Speaker, let's celebrate the opportunity. Let's be happy the good Lord blessed the United States with these rich minerals and this opportunity to become energy independent and critical mineral dominant.

My friends and neighbors, I want the technology here in the United States. I do not want this country to depend on foreign adversarial nations for our livelihood.

We have learned so much during COVID, Mr. Speaker. We cannot rely on adversarial nations for our energy any longer, nor should our allies.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I often hear my Republican colleagues say that more oil and gas production in the U.S. benefits consumers and that fracking has helped that production along. We should celebrate.

Then I did have to think about seeing this recent movie, "Killers of the Flower Moon," and how that is probably not a really good thing to celebrate, but I digress. I don't want to do that.

The U.S. is already the number one producer of oil and gas in the world. We are exporting record amounts of fossil fuel across the globe. Yet, our communities are still not seeing the benefits.

That is because the benefits are going straight to Big Oil, which is seeing profits soar yet again. We cannot rely on the decades-old Republican agenda of "drill, baby, drill," to lower prices for Americans.

This bill proposes to give yet another handout to oil and gas, supposedly in the hope that these corporations will be so thankful that they will lower their prices just to be nice. I mean, does anyone still believe this trickle-down nonsense?

Look, if we want better energy prices, then we need energy independence, which means a transition to clean energy, which is cheaper, safer, and generated entirely here at home instead of being at the mercy of global price shocks like oil and gas.

I am also so grateful to hear my colleagues talk about the things that we should have learned from COVID. I hope that means that at some point they will be willing to discuss universal healthcare and making sure we all have access to affordable, high-quality healthcare. I hope that means that they are going to admit that COVID is a real thing and that vaccinations and access to that kind of healthcare and information is important.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I reiterate my good friend and colleague did reserve.

Listen, one of the things that we hear from my colleagues is that Big Oil is price gouging, which is why energy prices are higher. The fact is, this President's anti-energy agenda has created uncertainty for domestic energy producers and has driven up energy prices for all Americans.

Repeated in-depth investigations by the FTC have shown that changes in gasoline prices are based on market factors and are not due to any illegal behavior.

The price gouging argument is simply a red herring meant to distract the American public from the Biden administration's disastrous energy policies.

The fact of the matter is, when my friends and colleagues talk about transition, wind and solar, they don't want to produce those minerals for those solar panels or windmills here in the United States, Mr. Speaker.

Minnesota has the most mineral wealth of any State in the Nation with the exception of Alaska. Minnesota has the biggest untapped copper and nickel mine in the world, and this administration pulled the leases.

This administration, with support from the Secretary of the Interior, banned 225,000 acres of mining in northeastern Minnesota. Can you believe that? Yet, they will get the minerals from Congo, which uses child slave labor for their energy addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have the opportunity today and now. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us to let the American worker succeed and energy dominance, critical mineral dominance in this country, be made here in America. We need it, this country needs it, and our allies are asking for it.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another shameless giveaway to Big Oil, even though Big Oil is still making earth-shattering, mineral-shattering profits by taking billions in taxpayer-funded subsidies, price gouging families, and leaving Americans with climate, health, safety, and financial consequences. This bill would enshrine Big Oil's exploitation of American taxpayers for the foreseeable future.

Big Oil does not need any favors right now. I know I sound like a broken record, but sometimes you have to say it more than once so people can hear it. They don't need more special loopholes. They don't need more handouts. They don't need more tax breaks.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 1121, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite a 2019 study by the U.S. Chamber of Com-

merce's Global Energy Institute. Their research shows a ban on fracking would eliminate 19 million jobs between 2021 and 2025 while simultaneously reducing the U.S. gross domestic product by \$7.1 trillion over that same period.

The Global Energy Institute's research also shows that over the same 2021 through 2025 timeframe, energy prices would skyrocket, with natural gas prices rising by 324 percent, causing household energy bills for the average American to quadruple and the cost of living to increase by \$5,600. Additionally, the price of gasoline would double, and government revenues would plummet by almost \$2 trillion.

With these sobering facts in mind, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1121 to prevent the worst case scenario from becoming our reality.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1121 is postponed.

□ 1500

#### RESTORING AMERICAN ENERGY DOMINANCE ACT

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1085, I call up the bill (H.R. 6009) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw the proposed rule relating to fluid mineral leases and leasing process, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6009

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Restoring American Energy Dominance Act".*

#### SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF BLM PROPOSED RULE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall withdraw the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled "Fluid Mineral Leases and Leasing Process" (88 Fed. Reg. 47562 (July 24, 2023)).

(b) *NO FURTHER ACTION.*—The Director of the Bureau of Land Management may not take any

*action to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule described in subsection (a) or any substantially similar rule.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6009.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 6009, the Restoring American Energy Dominance Act.

H.R. 6009, introduced by Congresswoman BOEBERT, would nullify the Bureau of Land Management's proposed onshore oil and gas leasing regulations.

While on the campaign trail, then-candidate Joe Biden said during a primary debate: "No more drilling on Federal lands." That was candidate Biden.

The BLM's proposed regulations attempt to accomplish President Biden's campaign promise by limiting onshore leasing, reducing flexibility, and increasing fees.

The regulations propose eliminating nationwide bonds while increasing individual bonding requirements 15-fold and statewide bonding requirements 20-fold. The BLM's stated rationale for doing this is to protect taxpayers from having to clean up orphaned wells.

One would think that there is an orphaned well crisis on BLM lands, given the significant cost increases the rule proposes. However, the opposite is true, Mr. Speaker. According to the Department of the Interior, there are only 37 orphaned wells on BLM lands, and the Department has used bonds to plug wells on Federal lands just 40 times over this last decade.

The proposed regulations would also be extremely harmful to small businesses. Tom Kropatsch, the Wyoming State oil and gas supervisor, said: "The bonding provisions will impact hundreds of small businesses in Wyoming, resulting in lost royalties, taxes, and other revenues to local and State government, and likely will create orphaned wells, not protect against them."

While he is speaking of his home State of Wyoming, the impacts would be the same in energy-producing regions nationwide.

The regulations also introduce new and vague preference criteria for evaluating onshore oil and gas leasing. The