

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

criteria seemingly intended to avoid conflict in areas with “sensitive cultural, wildlife, and recreation resources.”

Don't be fooled. The criteria, which could be applied to any parcel of land, are meant to lock up lands from resource development and shut down future oil and gas production. President Biden is once again proactively taking steps to increase energy prices, reduce American energy production, and ultimately diminish our national security.

To continue using Wyoming as a case study, in 2022 and 2023, the Wyoming BLM had initially offered to sell 830 parcels covering 954,281 acres. However, through successive rounds of an environmental review that incorporated considerations of these preference criteria, the Wyoming BLM deferred 462 parcels encompassing 586,000 acres. That is 61 percent of the acreage that should have otherwise been available that was ultimately deferred due to these new criteria—and the regulations aren't even final yet.

BLM's proposed onshore oil and gas leasing regulations are an attack on domestic energy production that will further lock up our Federal lands and eliminate access to our natural resources. We will not stand idly by as the Biden administration increases our reliance on foreign adversarial nations. It diminishes our national security and inflates already unaffordable energy prices.

H.R. 6009 acknowledges the BLM statutory mission of managing our Federal lands for multiple use, including energy and mineral development. It will keep our country safe by ensuring continued domestic energy production. It will benefit American families, American communities, American jobs, and our small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, Representative BOEBERT's so-called Restoring American Energy Dominance Act would have only one effect: furthering Big Oil's dominance over our public lands.

This bill, H.R. 6009, would force the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw its proposed oil and gas rule. This rule will implement reforms that Democrats enacted in our historic climate law, the Inflation Reduction Act, along with other long-overdue reforms to the onshore oil and gas program. The rule will help hold Big Oil accountable for cleaning up after itself, provide a fair return for the use of taxpayer-owned resources, and end speculative leasing of our public lands.

This is important but also very basic stuff. If you make a mess, you should be responsible for cleaning it up. If a public company extracts a publicly owned resource for profit, taxpayers should get a fair return.

It makes sense to me. Those are not difficult concepts to understand.

It is for these reasons that BLM's rule has broad support across Western voters. Mr. Speaker, 92 percent of comments provided from all 50 States in response to BLM's proposed rulemaking were in favor of the rule. That is listening to the people.

What we are seeing here is out-of-touch House Republicans attempting to block this rule as a giveaway to the fossil fuel industry. It is a blatant effort by Big Oil and corporate lobbyists to game the system in their favor.

The proposed rule is common sense. The reforms have long been recommended by the Government Accountability Office and nonpartisan entities like Taxpayers for Common Sense.

Republicans call it Biden's war on American energy, but with domestic oil and gas production and profits soaring, it is hard to see how Big Oil is suffering. As I said, their pockets are not on life support at all, but our public health is.

It is past time to commit to reforms to protect taxpayers and the environment. We are talking about modest increases in royalty rates, going from 12½ percent to 16⅓ percent. Texas royalty rates are up to 25 percent. In the bill sponsor's home State of Colorado, they are at 20 percent.

To repeat, these rates have not impeded domestic production. Domestic oil and gas production and profits are at record highs. No one is disputing that.

As if that were not enough, these companies continue price gouging the consumer. It is obscene that these polluters, these extremely profitable corporations, are now pushing for more tax handouts. They are the last industry that needs it.

We must vote down this out-of-touch giveaway.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 6009, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague talked about making a mess. Joe Biden and his administration have made a mess for American energy—higher energy prices throughout our country. The middle class is getting squeezed because of his energy policies and, dare I say, his anti-mining agenda. We will clean up this mess.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. Boebert), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, on day one of his administration, Joe Biden declared an all-out war on American energy production and exploration. He has made it clear that he cares more about appeasing the radical climate change activists than protecting the millions of oil and gas workers and producers in America.

I was disappointed but not surprised when the Biden administration filed this proposed rule titled “Fluid Mineral Leases and Leasing Process,” which mandates provisions from the partisan so-called Inflation Reduction

Act—we know that it didn't reduce inflation; it expanded it—which increased the royalty rate for production on Federal lands while also increasing and creating new fees for domestic energy producers.

This fluid mineral leasing rule is further proof that Joe Biden is using every tool in his administration to dismantle American energy production. It codifies pieces of the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, which is really the Green New Deal, and makes major non-statutory changes to the BLM's onshore leasing program.

It increases bonding levels for production on Federal lands and proposes ending nationwide bonding and increasing the minimum bond amounts for individual lease bonds and Statewide lease bonds from \$10,000 to \$150,000 and from \$25,000 to \$500,000, respectively. This significant increase will tie up capital that would otherwise be put back into production and is unjustifiable as there are only 37 orphaned oil and gas wells on BLM-managed land.

These increases will impact smaller producers that can't afford to operate in the market. These additional fees will ultimately harm returns and reduce revenues to State and local governments by disincentivizing development on Federal lands.

When environmental extremists create rules like this that are grossly restrictive, they can hinder the development and availability of energy resources that are fundamental to human progress and prosperity. It is important to remember that energy is not just another commodity; it is the lifeblood of modern civilization.

Any regulation in this domain must be evaluated through the lens of its impact on human life and prosperity. This means considering not just the environmental aspects but also how these rules affect energy affordability, reliability, and scalability.

Not-in-my-backyard extremists have regulated States like Colorado into poverty with their reckless and extremely flawed policies.

The proposed rule also introduces the idea of using preference criteria to inform the BLM's selection of lands for lease sales. BLM's rationale for this change is to avoid conflict in areas with “sensitive cultural, wildlife, and recreation resources.”

I think the people who occupy these lands most—our farmers, our ranchers, and our energy producers—understand the land better than BLM agents in Washington, D.C., in some concrete building or maybe even still working remotely from their homes. These are stewards of our lands, and they do a darn good job at it.

This means that the BLM field office could avoid leasing in all areas with endangered or threatened species, critical habitat, or nearby recreation areas, a move that would greatly limit leasing on Federal lands.

□ 1515

With the wars happening in the Middle East and in Europe and with OPEC

significantly lowering oil production, we cannot rely on foreign nations, especially our adversaries, to control our energy supply. That is why I introduced the Restoring American Dominance Act, to terminate this proposed rule and protect American energy producers.

America makes the cleanest energy in the world. American innovation, in particular, fracking, has allowed America to be the global leader in reducing emissions since the year 2000.

We need to stop buying oil and gas from Russia and stop begging Venezuela and Iran, our adversaries, to produce energy for us. We need to start producing more energy responsibly right here in the United States of America. Rather than begging OPEC, let's bring back the American roughneck.

American energy security is paramount for our Nation's economic stability and national security. When we produce our own energy, we control our destiny. We are not at the mercy of international politics, conflicts, or the whims of foreign governments that may not always have our best interests at heart.

Remember, energy is the industry that powers every other industry. The more control we have over our energy sources, the more competitive and secure our economy is. The concept of American energy dominance is not only desirable, it is essential for both national security and global human flourishing. We can literally be exporting freedom around the globe.

Relying on countries like Russia and others for energy is problematic not just from a security standpoint but also from a moral one. Many of these countries have questionable human rights records, to put it mildly. By producing our own energy, we are not just securing our future, we are also not indirectly supporting or enabling regimes that do not align with our values of freedom and human rights.

In essence, producing energy in America is about taking control of our future, ensuring our economic stability, and standing by our principles. It is about ensuring that we can continue to innovate, grow, and flourish, without being beholden to anyone. Frankly, given our vast resources and technological capabilities, there is no good reason not to.

I thank Chairman WESTERMAN and the committee for working with me on this bill to rein in Joe Biden's out-of-control, rogue bureaucrats. I urge my colleagues to support my bill to stop BLM's proposed regulations before they increase energy costs and threaten American energy production even further. American jobs and our national security depend on us taking a stand against this regime.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am so relieved to hear my colleagues from across the aisle continue to talk about national security concerns. It makes me question why they want to support isolationist values.

If we are so concerned about Russia and our adversaries, then why are we not voting on a supplemental to help Ukraine?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our country needs energy to flourish, and Democrats know that this means authorizing energy projects. If we are going to authorize energy projects, then we need to require any energy developer, including Big Oil, to fully cover the cost of cleanup and reclamation of their extraction.

H.R. 6009 negates that principle, which I feel strongly about as a single mom, of cleaning up your messes, and instead gives Big Oil carte blanche to drill with little or no regulation. With this bill, Republicans are endeavoring to undo all of my work and the work of my colleagues to hold Big Oil accountable and to protect taxpayers.

Last Congress, my bill to protect public lands and recover taxpayer dollars by raising the Federal royalty rate for oil and gas extraction was passed into law.

Since 1920, Big Oil had paid the same 12.5 percent royalty rate for the extraction of minerals on public lands, which was considerably lower than rates charged by States. This allowed Big Oil to exploit our public resources and pay the American taxpayers pennies. My bill ended this corporate giveaway to Big Oil and made sure the American people would get fair benefits for our public lands.

I also had a bill that would increase, for the first time in 60 years, the amount of money Big Oil would put down to promise to clean up its oil wells. Last year, that reform was included in the Bureau of Land Management's onshore oil and gas proposed rule.

Previously, the bond amount that Big Oil paid covered just a fraction of their cleanup costs, leaving taxpayers to foot the bill. Oil and gas companies have abandoned thousands of wells nationwide without undertaking reclamation efforts to make those polluted areas environmentally safe, actions that could now cost all of us, as taxpayers, up to \$333 million. My bill, for the first time in decades, put Big Oil on notice: You pollute, you pay.

My proposal had popular support, including across the West, which is home to much extraction. Ninety-one percent of western voters want oil and gas companies, not taxpayers, to pay for cleaning up and reclaiming public lands after drilling.

However, Republicans don't care about protecting the American people from environmental and economic harm. They would rather prop up Big Oil's profits and exploit the American taxpayer, upending real progress to finally hold Big Oil accountable.

H.R. 6009 would prevent the Biden administration from implementing the Bureau of Land Management's oil and

gas rule. It would bar current and future administrations from increasing bonding requirements or implementing other fiscal reforms to protect taxpayers. It also prevents any administration from future updates to the Federal royalty rate.

It is hypocritical that Republicans, who drape themselves in the mantle of lowering taxes during campaign time, stand here today advocating for a bill that would force taxpayers to pay for sweetheart deals to Big Oil that boost their profits even further.

My Republican colleagues have the opportunity to prove me wrong. At the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to the Committee on Natural Resources. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill, and that amendment would prevent H.R. 6009 from going into effect until the Comptroller General of the United States certified that this bill would, in fact, result in reduced energy costs for American consumers and would not result in increased, record profits for the oil and gas industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the amendment in the RECORD 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. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues across the aisle if they have the bravery to show that they are not beholden to Big Oil's bidding and will stand up for consumers and taxpayers to lower costs? This vote will show where your allegiance is.

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

The Biden administration told Congress just last summer that there are only 37 orphaned wells on BLM lands, and they have called in bonds only four times per year over the last decade. This number is low because the BLM has a process for dealing with at-risk wells.

There are very few, if any, Federal leases that don't have multiple companies with multiple record title interests and working interests. Multiple companies may have equities in the leases and will sell those equities to other companies that want to develop at different depths, for example.

BLM maintains the full chain of ownership. If BLM identifies a well on a lease at risk for abandonment, the agency will go to the companies in that chain of ownership and require them to take care of the well.

Increasing bonds at these levels will also have a disproportionate impact on the small producers and the small businesses and therefore could actually result in more bankruptcies and thus more orphaned wells. Crushing small businesses and limiting production on Federal lands, which is what this regulation would do, would simply reduce

production, driving up prices for American families and driving down revenues paid to the States and the Federal Government.

Federal onshore oil and gas production brought in roughly \$7.7 billion in revenue in fiscal year 2023 alone. That is almost six times more than the BLM's entire fiscal year budget.

We have the opportunity to help the American people who are struggling under this administration's policies and procedures. The time is now. The American people are hurting with energy prices. Inflation is still on the rise. The CPI is almost 20 percent. This is real for blue-collar, working Americans.

The energy policies, Mr. Speaker, of this President have been devastating to the middle and lower class. I have the privilege of representing Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District. It is the oldest and poorest congressional district in our great State. I hear it every single day about the cost of energy. We can change it, and this is our opportunity.

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

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

There is so much to fact check and so little time. My colleagues have mentioned bonding proposals, but the BLM's bonding proposal would help ensure that oil and gas foot the bill for cleaning up their messes, not the American people. By requiring them to post adequate bond money before they drill, we can help avoid them shirking that duty later on by selling off their exhausted wells to shell companies and similar tactics.

My colleagues across the aisle have said this proposal is unnecessary; no need to post bond ahead of time. Trust Big Oil. They are good for it.

Pardon me if I am skeptical. We have been hearing so much about posting bonds over the last week or so. It is often the same story: A company or an individual will brag and brag about supposed wealth, but when it comes time to put that money up, suddenly they come up short. Sometimes they even have to file for bankruptcy.

Many oil and gas companies operate in the same way. They benefit from resources but are afraid of regulations that would set bond amounts that ensure that they actually clean up after themselves instead of skipping town. The proposed BLM rule would require fossil fuel companies to provide reasonable collateral to ensure they pay to clean up after themselves.

I have another fact check for you before I yield. We have heard Republicans say that bonding reform isn't needed to make sure the oil and gas companies clean up after their messes, supposedly because BLM has identified only 37 orphaned wells on Federal land.

Well, let's widen the land to show the truth. An unplugged well can sit idle or even abandoned for many, many years

before a Federal agency seeks to enforce reclamation requirements and finally have it declared officially orphaned. That process eats up valuable staff time and resources. In that time, these unplugged wells can leak oil and gas, creating environmental and public health hazards, regardless of whether or not they have been officially deemed orphaned yet.

□ 1530

We are talking huge numbers here. In 2019, a nonpartisan GAO identified 2,294 unplugged wells that had not been produced in over 10 years. That is 2,294 wells specifically on BLM Federal land. The oil and gas industry should pay to plug and remediate those wells, not the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), who is the most illustrious Congressman.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman who is bringing the receipts today, and I appreciate this conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6009, the Republicans' polluters over people act 2.0.

For anyone following the work of team extreme, the Republican majority, in the 118th Congress, Mr. Speaker, you have probably figured out the pattern by now. Things like governing are really hard for team extreme: funding the government, avoiding a catastrophic debt default, and having an orderly legislative process so you are not continuously improvising and keeping the whole world in limbo while Congress sputters.

Team extreme has failed miserably at the basics of governing because they are too busy sowing chaos, fighting with each other, and competing for who gets the most bookings on FOX News and Newsmax.

Passing serious legislation that tackles pressing issues and solves problems is definitely out of favor in this Congress. I suppose to look busy for the C-SPAN audience, they give us warmed over versions of their polluters over people act every few weeks.

When you can't govern and you can't legislate, Mr. Speaker, this performative stuff is what you do over and over. It is rinse, lather, and repeat with team extreme in this Congress.

It is reminiscent, really, of how they operated when Donald Trump was President and they had a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress. We kept hearing about infrastructure week every few months without any serious proposals and certainly without any serious legislation. However, when Democrats took back Congress and the White House, we showed them how to do it. We delivered results: an historic bipartisan infrastructure law that is making transformative differences in communities all over America.

Nonetheless, we have swung back now with team extreme back in charge here in the House, and it is the old

performative playbook again. In this Congress, it is usually involving cheerleading for Big Oil and Gas. That was H.R. 1. That is clearly what this spin-off bill before us today is all about. It is political performance art for the fossil fuel industry.

Since we have seen all of this several times before and since these bills, thankfully, will go nowhere, let's just take a moment to remind those who get all their news from rightwing media that team extreme's entire energy narrative, that this poor fossil fuel industry is struggling under the oppressive burden of environmental regulations, and that unless we provide even more financial and regulatory giveaways to this industry, America will fall behind in the competition for global energy dominance. All of this is a complete fiction.

America is already the world's dominant producer of oil and gas. We are the top exporter of oil and gas. We are awash in oil and gas, and those poor fossil fuel companies are awash in record profits thanks to price gouging the American consumers. They are rolling in so much money that they are giving massive executive bonuses and dividends, and they are doing stock buybacks. In addition, of course, they continue to lobby to protect their Federal subsidies and to oppose climate action.

This is not an industry that needs more of our help. Nonetheless, American consumers who are paying at the pump for all of these profits and stock buybacks do need our help. They need an alternative to the fossil fuel roller coaster and to the tyranny of the pump. They also need a planet that their children and grandchildren can live on, and so they need Congress to get serious about tackling the climate crisis and accelerating the clean energy transition.

With these bills today, and, frankly, with all of the stunts and antics that we have seen from team extreme in its dysfunctional Congress, Republicans are saying that they don't care about any of that.

With H.R. 6009, they are trying, once again, to repeal parts of the historic climate actions we took in the last Congress and take us back. They want to repeal the modest fossil fuel royalty reforms we enacted in the Inflation Reduction Act to protect taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 45 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. They are trying to repeal a very modest royalty reform and claw that back, and all that this reform would do is give taxpayers a fair return on the public resources on public land that this industry has been extracting on royalty rates that hadn't been touched for a century.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we increased those royalties was to finally

confront the problem of fossil fuel companies with their subsidies extracting these public resources and sticking taxpayers with the bill to clean up their messes.

This is not controversial. It is popular. Ninety-one percent of Western voters want to see oil and gas companies, not taxpayers, paying the bill for this cleanup.

With these performative bills we are back at it again: a fake narrative that exalts the fossil fuel industry above everything and everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle brought up the Inflation Reduction Act. The fact is, that is law, and 90 percent of that money goes to billion-dollar companies in subsidies.

This bill we are talking about today is about small businesses. Under this administration, the average American household is paying \$11,400 per year under these policies and these regulations. That is a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, that may not be a lot of money for a President who has spent 53 years of his life in Washington, D.C. Just maybe he has forgotten what it is like to struggle in our Midwestern States. Mr. Speaker, \$11,400 is the average, and I just stated that I represent the oldest and the poorest Congressional District in the State of Minnesota. That is a lot of money for my constituents and almost every American.

Fifty-three years President Biden has been bloviating on Capitol Hill trying to change things and make it better.

On his energy policies and his mining policies, he has failed the American people, and we all know it. We all know it. We feel it. We see it. Our pocketbooks are shrinking, and our paychecks aren't rising as fast as we want them to, and they are not keeping up with inflation.

This is about small businesses. This is about not letting the unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., dictate production of our natural resources. We, in Congress, have a responsibility to write legislation that will benefit all Americans. Today we are talking about legislation, Mr. Speaker, about energy prices. There is nobody in this country who feels as if this administration has reduced the cost of energy for them.

Mr. Speaker, \$11,400, that is a lot of money for this retired police officer. That is a lot of money for my wife who served 24 years in the military and is an Iraq war veteran. That is a lot of money for her, for me, and for many other Americans who are trying to just feed their families, keep up, and try and live the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, this President has failed the American people on his energy policies.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have sat in this Chamber,

and I have listened to folks debate and raise concerns and problems about the legislation that is before us right now. I have heard people talking about how this is extreme, about how it is a gift to oil and gas production, and how it is going to trash the environment. There has been a poster that is up over there—and I am sad I don't have it right now—that said: polluters over people.

Mr. Speaker, we take an oath of office to stand up for this country and to defend the Constitution. We make a commitment to represent about 700,000 people each, 700,000 people, to represent their best interest.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the things that my friend from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) was saying were accurate, then I would be outraged too, but the facts show a very different story.

I am from south Louisiana.

When President Biden took office, Mr. Speaker, do you know what gasoline prices were?

The lowest prices in our State were \$1.74 per gallon on the day he took office.

Mr. Speaker, where do you find \$1.74 per gallon anywhere?

If I can find it at \$2.74, then I am going to fill up extra gas cans. Prices are outrageous.

Does somebody want to call AAA a partisan organization?

AAA says that the average gasoline prices in America today are \$3.52 a gallon. This is outrageous. It is absolutely outrageous.

This has the biggest impact on those who can least afford it. People can't afford to fill up their vehicles. With higher energy prices, they can't afford to pay their utility bills. We have watched as food prices have skyrocketed and as housing prices have skyrocketed. Much of this is attributable to energy policy because everybody has got to drive, and everybody has got to air-condition their homes and heat their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, so what is the cause of all this?

The cause of this is exactly what this administration's policies are doing. We just heard my friend from Minnesota say that the average American family is spending about \$1,000 a month more now than they were when Biden took office.

Everything we are hearing this administration say and my friends across the aisle talk about is that this is trashing the environment.

Let's look at the facts. The facts show that the United States, even under the Trump administration, actually led the world in reducing emissions, in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Under the Biden administration, they have gone up, not down. They are going up.

What problem is the administration solving?

They are charging people higher prices. They are more dependent on foreign countries, and emissions are

going up. They are having more of an adverse impact on the environment. I don't understand.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. I noted that the folks who have been speaking on this bill are from California. Let's take a look at the performance of California. Let's take a look at the performance.

Electricity rates in California are almost triple those in my home State. They are almost triple. Gasoline prices are approaching double. Emissions, they have the eighth worst emissions growth in America. California is the most dependent State upon oil from the Amazon rainforest. It is the most dependent State on imported energy, and it has the least reliable grid in America.

Mr. Speaker, who in the hell would want to thrust that upon their citizens?

This is a complete record of failure. Yet, it is the exact blueprint that this administration is following. It doesn't make sense.

This isn't about Republican, Democrat, Conservative, or Liberal. This is about math. It doesn't make sense.

All we are doing is we are creating a void that Iran is filling, that Russia is filling, and that Venezuela is filling.

Are they taking those dollars and doing things that are in America's interests?

No.

We have got to look at this globally. We have got to follow the math and the science as America has led the world in reducing emissions. We have led the world more than the next six emission-reducing countries combined, and we have ceded all of this energy void to China.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what has happened?

China has increased emissions five tons for every one ton we have reduced. It doesn't make sense.

I am not asking for Republican or Democrat policies. I am not asking for Conservative or Liberal policies. I am simply saying: Let's follow the math and follow the science and do what makes sense.

Folks are wondering: Why are my prices higher?

For one reason, this bill right here actually repeals higher royalty rates. Royalties are a percentage. They are not a hard dollar figure per barrel of oil or cubic foot of gas. It is a percentage. So as prices go up, so do the royalties. They have raised the percentage.

People are wondering why they are paying more money?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. It is a percentage, yet this bill tries to come in and create a level playing field, create certainty, and create economic conditions that make sense.

My friends are sitting here saying: Oh, Big Oil is profiting.

They are profiting because the policies that the Biden administration is putting forth is resulting in conditions that cause prices to skyrocket. The thing that is so frustrating is that we had evidence that this is exactly what was going to happen. During the Obama administration the exact same thing happened, and I noted in the State of California the exact same thing happened.

I am just asking that we follow the math and the science. Let's support this legislation. Let's stop doing things that charge people unaffordable energy prices and trash the environment at the same time.

□ 1545

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues always want to bash California, and then they find ways to sneak into the State to visit. California is bringing it today as it relates to H.R. 6009.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6009.

This bill is yet another shameless Republican handout to Big Oil companies. Two years ago, House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act, a landmark climate bill that includes reforms for taxpayers to get a fair financial return for oil and gas produced on public lands. H.R. 6009 would block hardworking American taxpayers from receiving the financial benefits in the Inflation Reduction Act.

If energy dominance and independence are the true goals of this bill, let's talk about how we transition to clean energy, which is cheaper, safer, and can be produced right here in the U.S.

My aforementioned home State of California consistently experiences the impacts of climate change. We know that wildfires, sea level rise, flooding, and extreme weather are dangerous and costly. In 2022 alone, extreme weather events cost the United States \$165 billion in damages.

Rather than jamming shameless giveaways to Big Oil through Congress, I invite my Republican colleagues to work with House Democrats as a unified Chamber investing in a shared vision of American prosperity and building the next generation of renewable energy.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an easy concept for us all to understand. This really isn't about the left or the right, Democrat or Republican. We move either forward or backward.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle just talked about the Inflation Reduction Act. It was voted and put into law almost 2 years ago, so I ask the American people: Has it increased your energy prices, or has it lowered your energy prices? The Amer-

ican people know that their energy prices have skyrocketed.

We have many great energy producing States, including the great State of Alaska. This administration has put 54 sanctions on energy production in Alaska. That is more sanctions than this administration has put on Iran. That is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, earlier, at a Federal Lands Subcommittee hearing, there was a witness exchange. Representative TIFFANY chairs it. They talked about where they are going to source their electric vehicles, their critical minerals for the vehicles, and they were talking about child slave labor. The Democrat witness said that it is unfortunate that people are exploited around the world, but it is a reality. He said that is a controversial issue.

Child slave labor should never be controversial. We should never allow that, and this administration has gone with memorandums of understanding with Congo, where 15 of the 19 industrial mines use child slave labor.

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact, and this administration doesn't want to admit it. They want to ignore the human rights atrocities to get to their so-called green agenda. That is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, when we have the mineral resources here in the United States of America.

As I said earlier, we are blessed with an abundance of natural resources that we can extract using the best environmental labor standards. Again, we can move either backward or forward. I submit to you that the Republicans want to move forward on energy production.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close, 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 hope that we can stay focused on the issue. We keep talking about foreign policy issues, and I think we should just, then, pass the supplementals to support Ukraine and our other allies rather than supporting isolationist foreign policies that actually encourage the kinds of human rights violations that my colleague keeps talking about.

I am also very grateful that my colleague mentioned helping the military. I have to say that Republicans voting for H.R. 6009 doesn't, in fact, do that. It doesn't do that at all. Republicans could actually help our military personnel if they voted to support them with housing supports and making sure that our military personnel have access to quality healthcare, especially our female military personnel. Instead, they want to vote for tax breaks for oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6009, the so-called Restoring America's Energy Dominance Act.

This legislation would gut critical provisions that I secured in the Inflation Reduction Act to ensure a fair return for American taxpayers as fossil fuel companies that extract on our public lands make record profits.

This bill undermines the Bureau of Land Management's current proposed rule that follows commonsense recommendations by the Government Accountability Office to protect taxpayers, including a change in royalty rates for the first time since they were established over a century ago.

For my colleagues who care so much about fiscal responsibility, the majority should be aware that, if this bill becomes law, Federal and State governments will lose out on billions of dollars of revenue.

This bill would also allow fossil fuel companies to completely disregard their responsibility to clean up after they cease drilling operations, potentially leaving the American people on the hook for over \$6 billion in cleanup costs.

When oil and gas producers ignore their reclamation responsibilities, they leave their abandoned wells to contaminate our water supplies, degrade our ecosystems, and leave climate-warming methane emissions.

This is personal to me. My wife and I have two young kids at home. As many parents know, one of the first lessons we teach our kids is to clean up after themselves when they make a mess. Why on Earth would we give fossil fuel companies a free pass on this core responsibility?

Additionally, this bill would prevent BLM from directing oil and gas drilling away from areas that don't have a high potential for extraction to begin with. When fossil fuel companies stockpile cheap, unproductive leases, they unnecessarily put these lands and the important wildlife habitats they support at risk of development. It can also complicate any other use for these lands when appropriate, such as renewable energy projects.

H.R. 6009 would block BLM from balancing the extraction of oil and gas with the multitude of uses for our public lands, including the conservation of wildlife habitat, the preservation of landscapes sacred to indigenous peoples, outdoor recreation opportunities, and the list goes on.

My friends across the aisle will say this bill is necessary to increase American energy independence. I have heard that, in fact, several times this afternoon, but if we really want to talk about energy independence, we must focus on the transition to cleaner, cheaper, and safer domestic renewable energy, including modernizing our electric grid and making it easier to build transmission lines.

H.R. 6009 does absolutely none of that. This bill is a shameless giveaway of our public lands to Big Oil companies, which are raking in record profits and enjoying billions in taxpayer-funded subsidies while still charging working families high prices. It is long past

time that fossil fuel companies pay their fair share and do their part to clean up after their actions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Republicans have claimed that H.R. 1, their polluters over people bill, would solve all of our Nation's energy problems and that it is their number one priority for this Congress.

Lately, some of them have even started saying that Senate Democrats and Leader SCHUMER are letting this legislation gather dust on the other side of the Capitol. Let's just fact-check. I love doing it. It is false.

The truth is that the do-nothing Republican House hasn't even sent H.R. 1 to the Senate. Despite passing in the House a year ago, this bill has never been transmitted to the Senate and has languished in limbo with Republican leadership, gathering dust first on Speaker McCarthy's desk, then on nobody's desk, and now on Speaker JOHN-SON'S desk.

If Republicans are so proud of their energy policies for the American people, why are they burying their landmark legislation and trying to blame Democrats? Why are we here passing sections of H.R. 1 for the second time? It is because it is all show.

The do-nothing Republican House has no real solution. Instead of taking real action to invest in a cleaner and safer energy future for every American, House Republicans are just repeating the same stale, tired arguments and passing the same washed-up bills over and over again, fully knowing that these messaging bills aren't going anywhere.

The American people deserve better.

I reiterate that this Republican legislation is a messaging bill that, fortunately, is going nowhere. House Republicans should be doing the bare minimum work this week of funding the government and keeping the lights on. Instead, they are trying to win political points with people's lives and livelihoods on the line.

This legislation creates unacceptable risk, and the President should have every single tool to protect public health and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the American people just have to ask themselves whether they are paying more or less for energy and groceries under this administration. It is clear the American people are suffering under the Biden policies.

The Biden administration's proposed rule would eliminate the opportunity for exploration of newly discovered energy producing areas and shrink future oil and gas production, even on sites

where it already exists, all while drastically driving up costs for Americans.

We will not stand by idly as this administration locks up our Federal lands and prohibits Americans from accessing their abundant natural resources. We will support American families, jobs, communities, our economy, and our national security through safe, clean, and efficient domestic energy production.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 6009, and 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, as amended.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Porter of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6009 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Ms. PORTER is as follows:

Ms. Porter of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6009 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

On page 3, line 8, strike "date of enactment" and insert "effective date".

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the Comptroller General of the United States certifies that this Act would result in reduced energy costs for American consumers and would not result in increased record profits for the oil and gas industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1600

PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further

consideration of the bill (H.R. 1121) to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Levin of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1121 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LEVIN is as follows:

Mr. Levin of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1121 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. REGULATION OF FRACKING ON FEDERAL LANDS.

Section 2(b) shall not take effect until the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, finalizes regulations governing the use of hydraulic fracturing under oil and gas leases for Federal lands, which shall require—

(1) baseline water testing, the results of which shall be posted on an appropriate internet website; and

(2) public disclosure of each chemical used for hydraulic fracturing on an appropriate internet website.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 1121 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 1121, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 6009;

Passage of H.R. 6009, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 213, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—202

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Adams | Blunt Rochester | Carter (LA) |
| Aguilar | Bonamici | Cartwright |
| Allred | Bowman | Casar |
| Amo | Boyle (PA) | Case |
| Auchincloss | Brown | Casten |
| Balint | Brownley | Castor (FL) |
| Barragán | Budzinski | Castro (TX) |
| Beatty | Bush | Cherfilus- |
| Bera | Caraveo | McCormick |
| Beyer | Carbajal | Chu |
| Bishop (GA) | Cárdenas | Clark (MA) |
| Blumenauer | Carson | Clarke (NY) |