

does because it takes away guardrails to protect our communities.

Let's clarify. In 2022, a panel of the Ninth Circuit Court ruled that the proposed Rosemont mine in southern Arizona could not use invalid mining claims to permanently bury Colorado's thousands of acres of national forests in mining waste, including sites that were sacred to multiple Tribes. The court ruled that it was not a valid mining claim to do this.

The requirement that mining claims must contain valuable minerals for the claim to be valid is a core tenet of the mining law. It is the one, as we have said, fragile guardrail that we have in this antiquated law.

For over 150 years, the mining law of 1872 has given mining precedence over all other uses and values of our public lands. This imbalance of power has left a toxic trail of pollution, destruction, and desecration of sacred sites, and it continues to impact our communities today.

We urgently need to reform the mining law. Instead, the bill that is being put forward here today would make things worse and take us back. It is such a breathtaking giveaway of our public lands that former Department of the Interior Solicitor John Leshy said that it should be called the mining charity act because of the giveaways for these mining companies rather than the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act.

This bill allows anyone to put a stake in the ground in any open public land and pay less than \$10 a year to make a claim to those rights forever. Our public land managers have long said that once there is a mining claim in place, they cannot say no to anything mining related on that land.

If this bill becomes law, then the mining industry would be free to pick and choose which of our public lands to lock away and then permanently bury, destroy watersheds, or pollute our communities, to do whatever it wants on those lands that it has tied up. The unintended consequences of this bill go far beyond mining and could hurt our communities irrevocably.

I want to reiterate that this bill empowers anyone with a few dollars, including foreign companies in adversarial nations, to blanket our public lands in untouchable mining claims and block other uses of this land. This bill will create chaos, not clarity, on our public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2925. Contrary to the misconceptions that I have heard regarding the bill, this legislation does not grant mining companies free license to do whatever they want on Federal lands. It does not exempt mining activity from NEPA or any

other environmental review. It does not allow companies to subvert governmental authority or oversight. It simply restates over a century of mining law and decades of regulatory practice.

In passing this bill, we will reaffirm American miners' rights to operate under the law, just as they have done for decades, to provide the essential materials we depend on every day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman AMODEI for his work to bring H.R. 2925 to the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, 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. LEGER FERNANDEZ. 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. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Leger Fernandez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. BARRING ADVERSARIAL NATIONS FROM OPERATING ON PUBLIC LAND.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) BARRING ADVERSARIAL NATIONS FROM OPERATING ON PUBLIC LAND.—A mining claimant shall be barred from the right to use, occupy, and conduct operations on public land if the Secretary of the Interior finds the claimant has a parent company that is incorporated in, located in, or controlled by an adversarial nation.”.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. 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.

□ 1500

**ALASKA'S RIGHT TO PRODUCE
ACT OF 2023**

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call

up the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, 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 (Mr. SELF). Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 118-477 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6285

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 “Alaska’s Right to Produce Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) *Congress provided clear authorization and direction that the Secretary of the Interior “shall establish and administer a competitive oil and gas program for the leasing, development, production, and transportation of oil and gas in and from the Coastal Plain” in section 20001 of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act);*

(2) *the timely administration of the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program is required and in the national and public interest;*

(3) *the Department of the Interior’s cancelling of the leases for the covered Coastal Plain lease tracts represents a major decision of economic and political significance that Congress did not delegate to the Secretary;*

(4) *the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) requires that the Bureau of Land Management—*

(A) *allow for the exploration, development, and production of petroleum products in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and*

(B) *balance, to the extent consistent with that Act, the protection of ecological and cultural values in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and*

(5) *the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska” (88 Fed. Reg. 62025 (September 8, 2023)) fails to reflect the intent of Congress for the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.).*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COASTAL PLAIN.**—The term “Coastal Plain” has the meaning given the term in section 20001(a) of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note).

(2) **COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.**—The term “Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program” means the program established under section 20001(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note).

(3) **COVERED COASTAL PLAIN LEASE TRACT.**—The term “covered Coastal Plain lease tract” means any of tracts 16, 17, 24, 26, 27, and 30 as listed in exhibit B of the document published by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Amendment to the Detailed Statement of Sale” and dated December 18, 2020 (relating to oil and gas leasing within the Coastal Plain Alaska).

(4) **RECORD OF DECISION.**—The term “Record of Decision” means the record of decision described in the notice of availability of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program, Alaska” (85 Fed. Reg. 51754 (August 21, 2020)).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF ORDERS.

(a) **MORATORIUM ON OIL AND GAS LEASING.**—Any order or action by the President or the Secretary that has the effect of placing a moratorium on or otherwise suspending or pausing oil and gas leasing in the Coastal Plain shall have no force or effect.

(b) **APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION OF EXISTING DOCUMENTATION AND AUTHORIZATIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Congress—

(1) ratifies and approves all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law, as described in the Record of Decision, necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program; and

(2) directs the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the heads of other as applicable Federal departments and agencies to process, reinstate, or continue to maintain such authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders described in paragraph (1).

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders described in subsection (b)(1) shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of—

(1) section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142);

(2) section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c));

(3) section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note);

(4) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(5) subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) **REISSUANCE OF CANCELED LEASES.**—

(1) **ACCEPTANCE OF BIDS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, without modification or delay—

(A) accept the highest valid bid for each covered Coastal Plain lease tract for which a valid bid was received on January 6, 2021, pursuant to the requirement to hold the first lease sale in the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program; and

(B) provide the appropriate lease form to each winning bidder under subparagraph (A) to execute and return to the Secretary.

(2) **LEASE ISSUANCE.**—On receipt of an executed lease form under paragraph (1)(B) and payment in accordance with that lease of the rental for the first year, the balance of the bonus bid (unless deferred), and any required bond or security from the high bidder, the Secretary shall promptly issue to the high bidder a fully executed lease, in accordance with—

(A) the applicable regulations, as in effect on January 6, 2021; and

(B) the terms and conditions of the Record of Decision.

(b) **REQUIREMENT FOR FUTURE LEASES.**—

(1) **SECOND LEASE SALE.**—Not later than December 22, 2024, the Secretary shall conduct the second lease sale required by section 20001(c)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) in accordance with the Record of Decision.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS FOR CANCELING A LEASE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President and the Secretary may not cancel a lease issued under the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program if the Secretary has previously opened bids for such a lease or disclosed the high bidder for any tract that was included in a lease sale under the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program unless the lessee is in violation of the terms of the lease and fails to cure the violation after a reasonable period of time.

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF PRIOR RECORD OF DECISION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and with respect to reissuing leases under subsection (a), the Record of Decision shall be considered to satisfy the requirements of—

(1) section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142);

(2) section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c));

(3) section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note);

(4) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–205; 16 U.S.C. 1533); and

(5) subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) **WITHDRAWAL OF SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The Director of the Bureau of Land Management—

(1) shall withdraw the notice of availability entitled “Notice of Availability of the Draft Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement” (88 Fed. Reg. 62104 (September 8, 2023)); and

(2) may not take any action to finalize, implement, or enforce the supplemental environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1).

(e) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **JUDICIAL PRECLUSION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in paragraph (2), no court shall have jurisdiction to review any action taken by the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, a State administrative agency, an Indian Tribe, or any other Federal agency acting pursuant to Federal law that grants an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval described in section 4(b) for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program, whether issued prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, and including any lawsuit or any other action pending in a court as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **FORUM EXCLUSIVITY.**—The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any claim regarding—

(A) the validity of this section; or

(B) the scope of authority conferred by this section.

(3) **RIGHT TO PETITION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a lease holder may obtain a review of an alleged failure by an agency to act in accordance with section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) or with any law pertaining to the grant of an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval related to the lease holder’s lease by filing a written petition with a court of competent jurisdiction seeking an order under subparagraph (B).

(B) **DEADLINES.**—If a court of competent jurisdiction finds that an agency has failed to act in accordance with section 20001 of Public Law 115–97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) or with any law pertaining to the grant of an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval related to the lease holder’s lease, the court shall set a schedule and deadline for the agency to act as soon as practicable, which shall not exceed 90 days from the date on which the order of the court is issued, unless the court determines a longer time period is necessary to comply with applicable law.

SEC. 6. NULLIFICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCY ACTIONS.

(a) **NPRA RULE.**—The final rule based on the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska” (88 Fed. Reg. 62025 (September 8, 2023)) shall have no force or effect.

(b) **EXECUTIVE ORDER 13990.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4 of Executive Order 13990 (86 Fed. Reg. 7037; relating to protecting public health and the environment and restoring science to tackle the climate crisis) shall have no force or effect.

(2) **FUNDING.**—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to carry out section 4 of the Executive Order described in paragraph (1).

(c) **SECRETARIAL ORDER 3401.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Secretarial Order 3401 (relating to the Comprehensive Analysis and Temporary Halt on all Activities in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Relating to the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program), issued by the Secretary on June 1, 2021, shall have no force or effect.

(2) **FUNDING.**—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to carry out the Secretarial Order described in paragraph (1).

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.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 118–477, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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. 6285.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6285, Alaska’s Right to Produce Act.

H.R. 6285, introduced by Congressman STAUBER, would block the Biden administration’s attacks on Alaska, its North Slope communities, and their elected indigenous leaders.

Last September, the Biden administration announced two decisions that would disenfranchise Alaskan and North Slope communities.

First, the administration announced it was rescinding energy leases in the 1002 Area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR.

When it passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Congress approved and mandated the Department of the Interior for commercial leasing, exploration, development, and production in the 1002 Area. Production in the 1002 Area would be limited to roughly 2,000 acres out of the 19-million-acre refuge. This is just a tiny postage stamp when looking at the big picture.

Specifically, the law required the Department to conduct two lease sales in ANWR, the first by December 2021 and the second by December 2024. The Trump administration held the first lease sale, but the Biden administration immediately halted it and canceled the leases without warning last September.

Again, this was a law passed by Congress. Congress mandated lease sales in the 1002 Area with the goal of improving energy security and generating revenue for our country, the State of Alaska, and local communities on the North Slope. The funds these energy projects generate are necessary to support public projects and basic amenities, like roads and modern water and sewer systems, which have only recently arrived on the North Slope within the last 40 years. These amenities are ubiquitous to the lower 48, but the infrastructure is still being developed up in the North Slope.

In a hearing on these issues in September, Nagruk Harcharek, president of The Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, testified on the importance of energy production to quality of life for Alaskans living on the North Slope: “We can quantify the powerful impact of these projects by observing the increase of life expectancy on the North Slope. In 1969, before our people had any land rights and no economic prospects as a result, life expectancy was just 34 years. By 1980, our average life expectancy was 65, roughly equivalent with Libya and lower than North Korea. Today, our people can expect to live to an average of 77 years. This increase, the most dramatic in the United States, can be directly connected to the proliferation of a basic economy, modern infrastructure, and services supported by resource development projects.”

While the administration canceled the ANWR leases, it also issued a proposed rulemaking for the management of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, or NPR-A. This rulemaking, the final version of which was announced 2 weeks ago, would lock up 13 million acres out of the 23 million acres that comprise the petroleum reserve and make it more challenging to conduct exploration and production activities in the rest of the petroleum reserve.

To make matters worse, meaningful engagement with local governments, Alaska Native corporations, federally recognized Tribes, and Tribal nonprofits across the North Slope of Alaska was severely lacking throughout the rulemaking process. It was utterly

nonexistent before the rule was proposed. Additionally, an affront to the communities on the North Slope, the rule was proposed during the whaling season and overlapped with the ANWR comment period.

When pressed to provide more time to comment during a virtual meeting, Department officials explained that they couldn't extend the comment period further because of the Congressional Review Act.

These actions and the utter lack of meaningful engagement and input were panned by the entire Alaska delegation, along with every elected official, local governments, Alaska Native corporations, federally recognized Tribes, and Tribal nonprofits across the North Slope of Alaska.

Again, I thank Congressman STAUBER for his work on this bill to repeal these disastrous actions by the Biden administration and for listening to the voices of Alaskans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 6285, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, instead of dealing with the real problems facing Americans every day, we are back on the House floor talking about the GOP agenda—guns, oil, and polluters. It is a relentless mission to wreak havoc on our planet and communities, but before we go into the merits of this bill, here is a dose of reality.

Last year, as our Republican friends turned a blind eye, the global climate surpassed 2 degrees Celsius, a threshold that ought to be taken quite seriously. For the first time in recorded history, we passed this threshold, and that made it the hottest year on record.

Experts have determined that a 2-degree rise in global temperatures will inarguably cause dangerous and cascading effects on humans and our planet. That hasn't stopped my colleagues across the aisle. It is as if the majority is playing a dangerous game of chicken with our environment, betting against Mother Nature.

In the disaster department, 2023 was a showcase of calamity. We tallied up a staggering \$63 billion in weather-related catastrophes. This includes 19 severe storms, 2 tropical cyclones, 4 floods, a winter weather event, a drought, and a wildfire event. It is as if Republicans were sitting on the front row with the popcorn in their hands, leaning over to ask their oil and gas buddies what they needed in addition to all the other giveaways they have received from the Republican majority.

There is actually even more. In a display of unparalleled negligence, 2023 also came with 10 oil tanker spills because apparently the GOP agenda is also: Spill, baby, spill, and let the taxpayer foot the bill.

We are not even talking yet about pipeline leaks. Every day in America, some aspect of this spiderweb of fossil

fuel infrastructure is exploding, bursting, leaking, spilling. Last fall, there were almost 1.1 million gallons of crude oil released into the Gulf of Mexico, yet my friends across the aisle don't ever legislate about that or do oversight about that. Republican Members don't talk about it or acknowledge it. One has to wonder if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle even care about it.

Here we are again with an effort to expand our Nation's carbon footprint and expose our coastal communities to future disasters and oil spills. Not only does this bill grant access to one of our most ecologically sensitive and difficult regions to productively drill, but it reverses significant strides by the Biden administration to protect lands that Tribal nations have occupied and held sacred since time immemorial.

The Arctic refuge is one of the last truly wild places left in America, and the urgency to preserve the Arctic refuge transcends environmental concerns. It is a rallying cry against irreversible devastation and destruction, things that would fundamentally change and ruin this unique, fragile, and wild place.

The coastal plain, which is the heart of the Porcupine caribou herd's calving grounds, hosts nearly 200 migratory bird species annually. Equally vital, the 9,000-strong Gwich'in Nation, whose subsistence and culture depend on the caribou herd, resides along the migratory route. This means that development in this area would disrupt not only biodiversity, but it would be an assault on their indigenous livelihoods and traditions.

We have already seen how that plays out. In Nuiqsut, the Alaska Native village nearest to the Willow oil and gas project, 70 percent of households rely on subsistence resources for more than half of their diet. With the new Willow development, hunters are being forced to travel farther and farther to find resources and avoid hunting grounds that are now dominated by the fossil fuel industry. Rolling back NPR-A protections would make matters even worse.

In the Bering Sea, which is home to many unique marine ecosystems and rich in indigenous cultures, sea ice is melting earlier and freezing later. This threatens access to subsistence hunting and fishing grounds. Any increased vessel traffic related to oil and gas development would further stress and create risk for an already vulnerable ecosystem.

Exploiting these sensitive areas is equivalent to sacrificing those on the front lines of the climate crisis as martyrs in order to temporarily quench the insatiable thirst of Big Oil for money.

Let's get one more thing clear. The drilling that would be green-lighted in this bill would not make us energy independent. The United States is already the number one producer of oil and gas in the world. We are exporting record amounts of fossil fuel, but consumers still get hit with price shocks

anytime OPEC decides to raise prices or Russia starts a war in Europe because oil and gas are global commodities.

Fossil fuel dependence is not true energy independence because you are always on the roller coaster. You are always subject to the whims of some cartel, somebody gaming the global commodity market, some explosion, some international event.

If we want energy independence, we need 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.

The Republican agenda is predictable, repetitive, and dangerous. They need to stop putting polluters over people.

Enough is enough. We can no longer exploit our frontline communities and delicate ecosystems to pad the pockets of the fossil fuel industries and its GOP cronies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the lead sponsor of this bill.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6285, Alaska's Right to Produce Act.

From Minnesota to Alaska, President Biden has repeatedly prevented the responsible production of America's abundant natural resources.

In Minnesota's Eighth District, which I am proud to represent, the Biden administration banned mining, locking up the world's largest untapped copper-nickel mine in the world.

Now he has turned his focus to the great State of Alaska, where he has made multiple moves to block energy development on Alaska's North Slope.

Last fall, the Biden administration first announced their plans to cancel the remaining oil and gas lease sales in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and limit energy development within the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. I will repeat that, National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. And within the last 2 weeks, the Biden administration finalized this devastating blow to the Alaska communities.

To quote from the testimony of Charles Lampe, the president of Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation in response to these actions, "We are a small community that suffers as the Federal winds blow and feel the Biden administration is working to effectively erase us from the land that we have inhabited for hundreds of years."

These actions have only further reinforced my view that Biden's energy and mining policy can be summed up as "anywhere but America, any worker but American."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration has levied more sanctions

against the great State of Alaska than they have Iran. The Biden administration has put 63 sanctions against energy production in Alaska, more than Iran. In fact, they are taking off sanctions from Iran. This administration has taken off sanctions from Iran.

They are punishing the great State of Alaska. It is uncalled for. Not only does this decision run counter to the wishes of Alaska's Tribes and other hardworking Alaskans who stood to benefit from the jobs, opportunities, and revenue that the responsible production of these resources would create, but it will further cement our reliance on Iran, Russia, China, and Venezuela for the energy and natural resources on which we all rely.

Mr. Speaker, how does that make any sense?

As our adversaries become more and more hostile, shouldn't the President be doing everything in his power to make American energy independent once again?

Energy security is national security.

At a time when American families are struggling under the weight of record-high inflation and energy prices due to Biden policies, shouldn't the President be doing everything he can to support domestic energy projects that will create jobs and lower costs?

As the chairman of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee, I am proud to introduce the Alaska's Right to Produce Act to allow Alaskans to develop their God-given natural resources. I introduced this common-sense legislation with Alaska's Representative MARY PELTOLA, a Democrat, and Alaska's two Senators, and I thank them for their leadership on this critical issue.

The Alaskans on the North Slope support this legislation, Mr. Speaker. They support it because the oil and gas revenues allow them to build schools and hospitals, pay for their police, pay for their fire service, have libraries, have the fundamental parts of our communities that we all have and all deserve.

The only way they can sustain that, Mr. Speaker, is allowing things like this to go forward. Alaskans should be proud to ethically and responsibly resource this. Again, there were 63 sanctions against the great State. You have got to be kidding me. As my co-chair of the Tennis Caucus would agree, John McEnroe, "You have got to be kidding me." It is unbelievable. The great people of Alaska deserve better than what this administration is forcing upon them.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleague's love of tennis, our mutual love of tennis and his sense of humor. I have less appreciation when he draws tortured analogies to international sanctions and national security issues. It is just hard to take that kind of sanctimony seriously from somebody who just last week voted, along with the majority of the House Republican Conference, to hand Ukraine over to Vladimir Putin.

As I often say in these debates, you have to take a lot of this political theater with a grain of salt, in this case, with a glass of vodka.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alaska (Mrs. PELTOLA).

Mrs. PELTOLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the honorable Mr. STAUBER, for his work on this measure.

I rise today to speak about Alaska's Right to Produce Act and how I will be voting.

This bill unintentionally pits two of Alaska's most important industries, energy and fisheries, against one another. Alaska faces an energy crisis, which is more than slightly ironic since our State has vast energy resources. Alaska pays some of the highest prices in the country for the petroleum we need to heat our homes through winter and the fuel that we need to transport ourselves and our goods.

Everyone knows Alaska is rich in oil and gas, but we also have great wind energy potential in the Cook Inlet, geothermal exploration in the Aleutians, and expanding hydropower in the southeast.

However, many Alaskans live in extremely rural areas that rely on diesel and biomass to heat our homes through harsh winters. Those fuels are more expensive and contribute to air pollution in regions like Fairbanks, which has some of the worst air quality in the Nation.

While some would love to jump straight from diesel to wind, that is unrealistic in Alaska. What we can do is use natural gas as a bridge fuel to move more people to cleaner-burning energy and reduced air pollution.

That is why I believe Alaskans should be able to develop and transport the natural gas we have available on our North Slope for our use throughout the State. I genuinely support an all-of-the-above approach on energy.

Alaskans can't afford to be picky about where energy comes from. My personal energy bills are over \$1,000 a month, a reality that many of my lower 48 colleagues do not fully understand.

I was the only Democrat to support this legislation at markup, and I still support the bill's intent. Alaska needs to develop energy for our use and economic well-being.

However, this bill would nullify the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area. This resilience area was created at the request of Alaska Native Tribes in the region. It empowers the people who have lived there for thousands of years to exercise their self-determination and be equal voices on policy decisions facing the Northern Bering Sea.

Let me be clear: This bill never intended to target the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area. That is why I proposed an amendment that would have removed this resilience area from the final bill text. That is

also why today I introduced a clean version of the Alaska's Right to Produce Act that doesn't impact the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area.

Alaska's Right to Produce aims to ensure my State can continue to develop its onshore oil and gas resources in areas like the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska.

It is a reserve, not a refuge. It was set aside for oil and gas development, not permanent preservation. Even as recently as the Obama administration, companies were encouraged to develop in the National Petroleum Reserve as opposed to other parts of Alaska.

On the other hand, the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area is necessary to help manage the impacts of climate change on our Arctic environments, including increased vessel traffic, moving fish stocks, marine debris, and increased military activity.

We saw recently why the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area needs to remain in place. NOAA developed the Northern Bering Sea Effects of Trawling Survey, an experiment to see the impacts of commercial bottom trawling in an area of the Bering Sea where it is currently banned.

In their opposition to this project, the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience intertribal advisory council said that NOAA's plan perfectly illustrated the two reasons why the area was established in the first place: the history of the Bering Sea Tribes not being involved in policy discussions and decisions, and the threat of bottom trawling moving into the Northern Bering Sea ecosystem.

By nullifying this area, we are breaking our promise to the Tribes and directly harming fishing communities. Alaskans face many challenges and threats to our unique ways of life. We are on the brink of being forced to import natural gas from a foreign country, and our fishermen are in the midst of an economic free fall, coupled with depleted fish stocks.

Unfortunately, the way this bill was written puts energy development against fisheries, and for that reason I will be voting "present" today.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and my good friend, Mr. STAUBER, for this bill.

Let's just call it what it is. It is not a big secret that the Biden administration hates American energy. Since day one, they have waged a complete and all-out war on domestic production.

If you take yourself back to 2019, then-candidate Biden said he would kill fossil fuels. I think they made good on that promise, and this is another example of that.

In September 2023, the administration canceled existing oil and gas leases in the Coastal Plain of Alaska, violating statutorily mandated lease sales and suspending operations crucial

to Alaska's economy. These actions were taken despite bipartisan opposition in Alaska as we just heard from our colleague across the aisle.

H.R. 6285, a House Energy Action Team initiative, would reverse Biden's harmful anti-Alaska policies by reinstating mandated ANWR oil and gas leases and prohibiting a leasing moratorium in the Coastal Plain, and nullifying executive orders by the President.

Just last week, the administration denied permission for the development of the Ambler Road, once again, superseding ongoing conversations at the State level.

Alaskans should be able to decide what they want to develop, not the administration, but Alaskans who know Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the RSC HEAT staff for their work on this legislation and Representative STAUBER.

Let me just respond to something that we have heard about Ukraine, about Russia, about the administration. Let me remind all Americans, Mr. Speaker, that it was this President in 2021 who refused to continue and to enhance the sanctions on the Nord Stream pipeline that would have helped all of Europe. It would have helped the Ukrainians more than anything.

If you want to talk about being strong and standing up to Russia, let's take ourselves back to that point where this administration failed to do that, and instead handed Putin a huge gift and decided to declare an all-out war on American energy. This is just yet another example of that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the HEAT team.

I will also point out to the American people that the Biden administration is the gift that keeps on giving to Putin. Not only would they not put sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, now they have put sanctions on U.S. pipelines.

They have put a pause on LNG gas exports. Our friends in Europe, Germany, and Poland would love to have our LNG. They would love to have U.S. LNG, but guess what? We have got a lot of it, but we can't send it there because this President not only won't restrict Russia, he restricts American producers and allows Putin to continue to fund his war machine by selling gas to Europe.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a master class in deflection. I think perhaps the fact that a majority of the Republican Conference voted to hand Ukraine to Russia last week has touched a nerve as people have begun to consider the reality of that.

Going back and trying to deflect to a pipeline from many years ago that no longer even functions, because it was

blown up, certainly doesn't change the fact that last week when we had a chance to vote for critical lifeline military support for Ukraine as it fights for its survival against Russia, a significant majority of my colleagues across the aisle voted "no."

They voted with Vladimir Putin and so congratulations on the deflection. Moscow Marge couldn't have done it any better. It might even make the highlight reel on RT tonight.

I don't watch that network, but I just have to wonder if maybe there wouldn't be coverage of some of these things that we are hearing from across the aisle.

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

□ 1530

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

I love the way my colleague across the aisle operates. He talks about deflecting when what he is doing is deflecting. He is trying to deflect from the issue in Alaska—where, once again, the Biden administration has failed miserably—by talking about Ukraine.

I don't know if the gentleman has checked the voting record, but I voted to support Ukraine. It is regrettable that we have to send more foreign aid, more military equipment to support countries that are fighting against evil regimes like Putin, like Iran because of bad foreign policy, and a lot of it has to do with energy policy.

I would prefer not to have to vote to send more military aid to our allies and our friends who are fighting for freedom and democracy, but this President and his administration has put us in a weakened place on the world stage, and, unfortunately, we have to take votes like that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Alaska Right to Produce Act, and I thank my colleagues PETE STAUBER and AUGUST PFLUGER for the work with RSC's House Energy Action Team to put the legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, it has been noted here that we talk certain ways but vote others. I think nothing is more evident than what we just saw just a few minutes ago where the gentlewoman from Alaska supported the bill but is going to vote "present."

You are either with Alaska or you are not. The Republicans are with Alaska. I just want to note for the record that we are going to vote to support Alaska.

This legislation is only necessary because of the disastrous policymaking coming out of the Biden administration. It is hard to believe today that the national average for a gallon of gas in 2020 was just over \$2. Under President Trump, the United States was well on our way not only to being energy independent, but energy dominant.

Where do we and our allies get our oil from when we are not producing it ourselves? We get it from Russia, Venezuela, and other bad actors around the globe.

Let's be clear: Halting domestic production of oil and gas does absolutely nothing to lower our dependence on oil and gas, as the climate lobby wants you to believe. It just increases our dependence on people like Vladimir Putin.

I don't want the United States to rely on anything from Vladimir Putin. The solution is so simple: Use the resources under our own feet. The Alaska Right to Produce Act reverses the damaging policies from Joe Biden to unleash our domestic energy potential.

Alaska has been blessed with tremendous oil and natural gas deposits, and the people of Alaska are incredibly supportive of utilizing those resources.

This bill empowers the Native Alaskan communities and residents of the State to profit from the resources under their own soil. In a future where America is energy dominant, the only loser is Vladimir Putin, and others like him.

It helps our allies when we can provide them with oil and gas so that they are not reliant on Putin, either. It helps our own people by lowering costs and providing cleaner, more affordable energy sources, and it helps Alaska reap the benefits of the resources in their land.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HERN. It is just common sense, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this essential legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also appreciate Mr. HERN's leadership on the RSC and the establishment of the HEAT team and the efforts that they have been putting into making sure we are energy independent here in America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is getting almost comical. I have now heard yet another speech pretending to oppose Vladimir Putin and Russia less than a week after the gentleman who just spoke voted to hand Ukraine over to Putin, voted "no" on essential military aid to our Ukrainian allies who are fighting for their very existence against this terrible war of aggression by Vladimir Putin made possible and financed, of course, by the fossil fuel industry in Russia, which American oil and gas companies truly helped to develop.

You just have to wonder if there is not a lot of damage control underway right now across the aisle. Maybe folks realize just how reckless and dangerous that vote against Ukraine was last week, that vote that a majority, solid majority of my Republican friends

took right along with Moscow Marge and the rest of the pro-Putin caucus.

I am going to keep bringing this up each time I hear one of these anti-Ukraine voters pretend to care about Ukraine or pretend to oppose Vladimir Putin and Russia because last week they had a chance to actually show their colors, and we saw their colors.

There is another way in which they are really doing a great favor to Vladimir Putin and Russia, and it is by opposing the clean energy transition at every turn and in every possible way. Vladimir Putin's worst nightmare is to break the fossil fuel paradigm that made him rich and powerful, that enabled him to have all this influence and leverage over Europe because a clean energy economy would make him irrelevant. It would make him a lot less powerful.

Go ahead and keep helping Vladimir Putin with your votes, with your energy policy, but we are going to stand for a clean energy transition, and we are going to support Ukraine.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), the chairman of the Western Caucus.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for allowing me to join in this conversation in support of the Alaska's Right to Produce Act.

Alaska truly is blessed with abundant natural resources that could empower American energy and mineral dominance. Alaskan oil and gas production cannot be taken lightly. It is home to our Nation's fourth largest oil reserve and third largest gas reserve. It is so unfortunate that the President has made the political choice to lock up millions of acres where these resources could be utilized.

The list of attacks on Alaskan energy production from this administration is long. Just 2 weeks ago, he added perhaps the most egregious example yet, when the Department of the Interior announced new restrictions on oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska. These actions are not only detrimental to American energy production but also limit the future opportunities for prosperity in rural communities in Alaska that depend on energy projects.

When you look at what Alaska wants, the result is clear. The majority of Tribal communities and Alaskan residents support resource development. Why? Because these projects bring in unprecedented income and development to communities that desperately want and need it.

As chairman of the Western Caucus, I have been advocating for energy production across the United States of America. High domestic production keeps global prices down and ensures America is competitive with our global adversaries. That is why I am a staunch supporter of this bill to over-

turn the administration's restrictions on oil and gas development in the Last Frontier.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure robust, reliable production in Alaska, and I am proud to join my friend from Minnesota in support of the legislation to unleash the full potential of Alaskan energy.

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

I thank the gentleman from Washington for his refreshingly rare vote for Ukraine military aid and also the chairman, Mr. WESTERMAN, for joining Democrats in that very important vote in the interests of our national security.

I think, as we continue with this debate, it is worth talking about just what a fiscal and financial boondoggle drilling in the Arctic refuge is. It is, first of all, a proposition that is so deeply unpopular that the only way it became law was to sneak it into the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the Trump tax scam.

Two lease sales were included in the legislation to partly offset tax cuts for the wealthy. Initially, Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration claimed that these lease sales would bring in \$1.8 billion in revenues for the Federal Government and the State of Alaska through bonus bids, and they proceeded to give a whole bunch of tax cuts away to billionaires and corporations on the basis of this illusory offset.

Later, the Congressional Budget Office lowered the estimate to \$900 million, specifically \$725 million for the first lease sale. Fast forward to the first lease sale that finally took place in 2021 in the final days of the Trump administration. Guess what happened? Well, it generated less than \$15 million—not billion—in bonus bids, around 2 percent of what even CBO's reduced estimate had projected.

In 2022, two of those lessees actually asked BLM to cancel and refund their leases. They wanted out. Separately in 2021, two development companies, Chevron and Hilcorp, paid \$10 million to get out, just to walk away from their legacy leases in the Arctic refuge. At least five major U.S. banks and 18 other international banks have said they won't finance drilling in the refuge.

If my Republican colleagues are interested in Federal revenues, if they are interested in fiscal conservatism, I am sorry to say that the pristine Alaska wilderness is not their piggy bank, and, in any event, it turns out that it is empty.

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

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

I just have to take issue with this issue about lackluster sales or lackluster lease sales. I note that the first ANWR lease sale was held in early 2021

during the throes of the COVID pandemic when oil prices were historically low, and the argument is that the administration projected, the Trump administration projected \$1.8 billion from ANWR lease sales over 10 years, and my friends are arguing they only made less than 1 percent of those initial projections. They are not telling, as Paul Harvey would say, the rest of the story.

This one sale was held after the election of President Biden who said on the campaign trail that he would end oil and gas production on Federal lands. I have to point out to my friends that revenue comes from oil and gas royalties based on production, not leasing.

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

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

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources for leading on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I often wonder where in the world we are sometimes. We are under an administration that has set energy policies that are causing energy prices to go up, to increase for Americans.

My friend from California's home State, I believe the average gasoline price in L.A. County right now is \$5.40 a gallon. In my home State of Louisiana when President Biden took office, lowest gasoline prices were \$1.74 a gallon.

I struggle to understand why my friend from California would want to force their ideas and policies on the rest of the country. This is the State that is the most dependent State on Amazon Rainforest oil to power their State's economy. This is the State that has the least reliable energy grid in America, the State that has had the eighth-worst emissions growth in the country, and, according to the American Lung Association, just last week, the State that has the dirtiest air over and over and over again in all of these cities including where my friend represents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend, please keep his ideas to himself. Ruin California, but don't ruin the rest of the country. Don't ruin the other 49 States.

This is absolutely remarkable. We have watched as this administration comes in and does a ban on exporting American energy, on new exports of American energy, does a ban. That very tool would have been one of the most powerful tools available to actually reduce global emissions, but what my friend's policies are advocating and what they are supporting is supporting more Iranian energy because Iran is increasing their exports and filling the void.

The Biden administration's own figures show that there is going to be a 50 percent growth in global energy demand, 57 percent increase in natural

gas, and we have the cleanest sources of gas in the world.

I don't understand why my friend thinks that it is better to cede this, to give this to Iran. This is the Biden administration's figures. I don't understand why my friend thinks we should cede this to Russia, why we should cede this to Venezuela.

□ 1545

President Biden facilitated. He lifted sanctions that allowed for the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to be built, the pipeline that took Russian energy and sent it into the European Union. Then, in the same breath, he blocked pipelines in the United States.

Let's review. We support Russian energy and Russian pipelines. We support Iranian energy, including the \$65 billion they got that has gone directly to funding groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist groups that have killed American soldiers and invaded our ally, Israel.

We have watched as these very strategies have resulted in emissions actually going up. As the United States has led the world in reducing emissions, for every ton we reduce, China has multiple times more increases.

How many more times do we have to learn from these flawed energy strategies that harm America, enrich Venezuela, enrich Russia, enrich Iran, and harm the United States?

There is evidence all over the place. We can sit here and have these emotional arguments all day long. Math and science prove these policies are flawed. This bill helps to address it, and the fact we are even here when a law already says you are supposed to open up leases, including in areas called the National Petroleum Reserve. That is right. It is reserved for wildlife. What? This is outrageous.

The fact that we even have to be here doing this bill that the gentlewoman who represents the entire State of Alaska voted for in committee, that the gentlewoman who represents the entire State of Alaska has clearly said she will not oppose—yet, my friends from California are coming in and saying: Don't worry. We have the solution. We are going to impose our harmful strategies, our harmful energy policies, on you, as well. That way, maybe people stop leaving California.

Mr. Speaker, I can't even begin to emphasize how important it is that we move forward with this legislation, that we treat American energy fairly. I urge adoption of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes feel like, serving in this Congress, I need a good chiropractor because you just political whiplash one day to another, one week to another.

Just now, my friend from Louisiana, in service of the fossil fuel agenda, made a sanctimonious speech opposing Russia and Vladimir Putin as if the whole country, the whole world, didn't

watch his vote last week with the rest of his Republican Conference to hand Ukraine over to Russia, to vote "no" on critical military aid to Ukraine.

It is like that. It is remarkable whiplash.

My friend has the ability to actually criticize the air quality in California caused by catastrophic wildfires driven by the climate crisis caused by our fossil fuel addiction and suggests that that is because of California's climate agenda, which is absurd, while ignoring the fact that the one place of persistent air pollution and respiratory illness and other problems with air quality in California is in the oil patch, Bakersfield, former Speaker McCarthy's district where it is frankly a lot like Louisiana and Texas. It is pretty rich.

Yet, we also have a Record if anybody is interested in cutting through the political theater and seeing where people really stand, including last week's vote against Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. HUFFMAN, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6285.

Mr. Speaker, while Democrats are working hard to lower the cost of living for Americans and protect our communities, House Republicans seek to make their lives much more expensive. They seek to pillage the places that make America special, the special places that we value.

In doing so, here is the dirty secret: They are simply carrying the water for powerful special interests and polluters that have way too much power and influence here on Capitol Hill.

Fortunately, H.R. 6285 has no chance of becoming law, but it does provide a glimpse of the GOP's alliance with polluters over the best interests of the American people.

Whether we are talking about the Arctic refuge or my beautiful part of the country along the Gulf of Mexico, Republicans simply are aiming to sell out America's public lands and waters to their friends in Big Oil and the NRA.

One of the six bills that were considered today would roll back the Biden administration's rules supporting conservation on public lands. Another would prohibit the government from regulating the use of toxic lead in ammunition. That is the single-largest source of unregulated lead discharged into our environment. The so-called Trust in Science Act would make it easier to hunt and kill the endangered gray wolf.

The bill currently before us would threaten millions of acres of wildlands by mandating unfettered oil and gas development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, regardless of the impacts on wildlife and nearby communities or what it will do to increase the costs of the overheating planet.

We have to ask ourselves if this is really what the American people are asking the Congress to do right now. Does the average American really want to see Congress make it easier to pollute and needlessly develop our special places, our wildlife refuges? I don't think so.

There is an incredible contrast right now in our country between when it comes to who is on the side of the people and who is standing up to the polluters. We just celebrated the 54th Earth Day. Look at the actions of President Biden compared to the Republican pro-polluter messaging bills.

First, last week, the Department of the Interior finalized a new rule that would protect more than 13 million acres of irreplaceable wildlife habitat in the Western Arctic.

Then, President Biden announced the creation of the American Climate Corps, kind of modeled after the Conservation Corps of decades ago. It is a groundbreaking initiative that will put more than 20,000 young Americans to work, protecting our communities, building environmental infrastructure, and helping us to lower costs and be more resilient to the rising costs of the overheating climate.

Last but not least, the EPA rolled out awards under a new Solar for All initiative, a \$7 billion grant to help deliver cleaner, cheaper energy across this great country, especially to working-class communities that really need help on their electric bills. This is going to be a godsend in my State, the so-called Sunshine State. We are going to help families put rooftop solar on their roofs, lower their electric bills.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Because I couldn't help our good friend from Louisiana when he was talking about how unfettered oil and gas will really help lower bills, on the front page of my hometown paper today, the Tampa Bay Times, was a story about why our electric bills are so high. Do you know why they are so high? Because in the so-called Sunshine State, 75 percent of electricity is generated from gas. Our utilities are keeping us hooked on gas.

That is why Solar for All, helping to unleash the abundant, free energy from the sun to help lower electric bills, is vital.

It is time for the House to get serious about cleaner, cheaper energy. Enough with these messaging bills. Let's move to bipartisan legislation that will help us achieve a prosperous, sustainable future. Banning offshore oil drilling off of the beautiful Florida coast is where we should start.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that if our friends across the aisle are so concerned with American energy bills, you would think they would at some point say no to the LNG export extravaganza that all serious economic analysis shows is driving up U.S. energy prices. Yet, they continue to come to this floor to introduce legislation and advocate against the commonsense pause that the Biden administration has taken so that we can look at the impacts of more LNG export infrastructure on U.S. energy prices as well as our climate crisis.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a lot of things to contest here and issues to cover, but I want to start with this idea of environmental treasures and this idea that ANWR is this environmental treasure that was never intended for any kind of development. Let's look at a little history.

When ANWR was created in 1980, the law included a section, section 1002, setting aside 1.5 million acres of the coastal plain to be assessed for its development potential. After years of careful study, in 1987, the Department of the Interior recommended that the 1002 Area be open to responsible development projects.

The Alaska Native village of Kaktovik, which has public interest in the lands in ANWR and multiple entities as members of Voice, is the sole community located in the 1002 Area of ANWR and the only community located in all of the over 19 million acres of ANWR.

The president of Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation testified: "We are a small community that suffers as the Federal winds blow and feel the Biden administration is working to effectively erase us from the land that we have inhabited for hundreds of years. Since 1980, we have fought to open the 1002 Area, also known as the coastal plain, to oil drilling and pursue economic freedom."

On to another issue that my friend from California mentioned about the poor air quality there due to forest fires: if my colleagues would work with us on that, we could fix that issue, as well.

What California has is very poor forest management. They have a hands-off approach to forest management. As a result of that, we are even losing giant sequoias. As much as 20 percent of the ones on the planet we lost in 2 years due to catastrophic wildfire were not because of climate change but because fire had been suppressed in those groves for over 100 years. They finally had to pay the piper. You had white fir trees that grew up into the lower canopy of the giant sequoias. My colleague

from California knows I am a forester and would love to help fix some of those problems with forests in California.

Now, to this issue about energy cost and reliability, as my friends across the aisle are pushing for more and more solar and wind, I am an all-of-the-above energy kind of guy. I would love to have more solar and wind, but we have to have baseload power. We have to have either coal or natural gas or a lot more hydro or a lot more nuclear power.

Going back to an earlier discussion that nuclear power is generated from uranium and that we are now dependent on Russia, we have to buy our uranium—most of it—from Russia or Kazakhstan to generate our nuclear power.

When we talk about low-cost solar energy, I have a real problem with that. Maybe it is low cost in the United States because we pay solar farm developers 30 percent of their costs with our tax dollars. If you build a solar farm, you get a 30 percent tax credit back. If you spend a million dollars, you get \$300,000 back from your fellow taxpayers. If you build a windmill, you get 2.7 cents per kilowatt hour.

Maybe that is a way that it is lower cost, but if it is truly lower cost, why is the number one manufacturer of solar farms in the world building 50 gigawatts of coal power plants every year? That is China, which we rely on to buy not only the elements and minerals that we need to do electrification but also builds most of the solar panels with Uyghur slave labor. They are building a big coal plant every 5 days.

□ 1600

Now, natural gas in the United States has caused us to be able to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions more than any other country in the world. We are only around 13 percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions now, and China is over twice that.

When we become more dependent on China, when we become more dependent on Russia, who are big polluters, then we are becoming more responsible for global greenhouse gas emissions than if we would use our own energy and our own minerals to build things here, to build them more efficiently and more effectively than any place in the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Arkansas talk about energy subsidies and to criticize the subsidies that he believes should be questioned for clean energy.

I hope he has the same concern about the much greater amount of subsidy, especially if you consider all the environmental externalities that taxpayers just pick up the tab for and have for the past hundred years when it comes to the fossil fuel industry.

There is a lot of work we could do together to take inappropriate subsidies out of U.S. energy policy, and I hope the gentleman would be interested in that.

I want to assure him when it comes to the forestry and trees and air quality part of our conversation that the wildfires and the air quality problems in California, because of them, are not something you can log your way out of.

I know the gentleman is interested in forest management, and there is a lot that we could work on there together as well for healthy forests. Some of the worst wildfires in California that produced the worst air quality were through heavily cutover land where there had been all the clear-cutting anybody could ever want.

The same can be said for some of the terrible Canadian wildfires last year that gave us awful air quality right here in Washington, D.C. Much of that ripped right through heavily cutover, clear-cut land.

Logging, you know, is not the simple solution to these problems. A better solution is to step back and realize the climate crisis that is driving it and to begin working together to actually reduce the worst impacts of that crisis.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close as well and yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, I oppose this bill. We have massive wildfires, prolonged droughts, stronger hurricanes, and coastal flooding. All across this country, our communities are feeling the increased severity and frequency of tragic events from the climate crisis, sending us dire warnings.

The crisis is real, it is here, and we need to act now for the sake of this planet and future generations.

In the Arctic, temperatures are rising four times faster than the global average. In the indigenous communities in northern Alaska who are so disproportionately facing the devastating impacts of the climate crisis, we must also pay attention to the impacts on them.

The melting permafrost is creating our country's first but not last climate refugees. Changing species migration patterns are threatening food security and cultural continuity. Oil and gas development only exacerbates all of these impacts.

Of course, not all Alaskans, including indigenous Alaskans, share the same perspective on oil and gas development. Native American Tribes are not a monolith.

You can bet that whenever my friends across the aisle can find some indigenous individual or advocacy group or other entity that supports oil and gas development, they are going to wrap themselves around Tribal con-

sultation and pretend to be great champions for Indian Country.

In many other votes, when Indian Country opposes pipelines and dams and mining projects and other things that are against their interests, I am afraid the Tribes are thrown under the bus by my Republican friends pretty much every time.

Revenue from extraction often supports local governments and indigenous regional and village corporations.

That is part of the consideration in Alaska, but in so many cases, the tradeoffs create unacceptable impacts as well. That is why it is not a monolith when you talk to indigenous communities in Alaska.

This bill is an instrument of blunt force that allows for extraction across Alaska in places that are too special and too fragile to drill.

It would reinstate oil and gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an area known to the Gwich'in people as "The sacred place where life begins." These were leases the Biden administration canceled because they were based on shoddy Trump-era analyses.

The bill would withdraw the administration's rule to protect over 13 million acres of public land in the NPR-A, a region that is already feeling the impacts of oil and gas development.

It would undo protection of 125 million acres of the Arctic Ocean from offshore drilling, and it would undo the reinstatement of the Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area. In the Bering Sea, an oil spill would be beyond detrimental. It would be catastrophic.

Rolling back these protections is the wrong approach. We can't simply give these lands and waters away to the highest bidder.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

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

To close, I am going to quote from the testimony of Charles Lampe, the President of the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation who testified on the Biden administration's action in November.

We do not approve of efforts to turn our homeland into one giant national park, which literally guarantees us a fate with no economy, no jobs, reduced subsistence, and no hope for the future of our people.

I urge all my colleagues to show their support for Alaska and the Alaska Native communities on the North Slope by voting for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-477.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL AREAS OF THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not designate any new Special Areas, add resource values to existing Special Areas, or expand existing Special Areas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska unless an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act specifically authorizes the Secretary to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I rise to offer my amendment that strengthens the underlying legislation to prevent the Biden administration from taking further steps to block oil and gas production in the great State of Alaska.

In the Bureau of Land Management's press release announcing the final NPR-A rule, they teased future action by the administration to create new special areas or expand/adjust existing special areas within the boundaries of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. These special areas are a means to lock up acreage from oil and gas production. There is no disputing that.

My amendment prohibits the Department of the Interior from creating or expanding special areas without congressional authorization.

When the administration announced its moratorium and canceled leases in ANWR and withdrew millions of acreage from development within the NPR-A, the local Alaska Native communities on the North Slope weren't given a proper heads-up, just like members of the Navajo Nation heard about the Chaco Canyon withdrawal. Alaska Native community leaders learned of these policy changes in the media.

This administration did not even properly consult with the very communities this oil and gas development would benefit, and it is clear why, because they weren't in lockstep with the administration's policies.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning we had a hearing. I asked the Secretary of the Interior five times if she consulted with the North Slope Native American communities, and she would not answer.

I finally had to go get some emails where they requested a meeting with her, and she denied meeting with them.

Let's make it very clear. The Alaskans on the North Slope requested a meeting with the Secretary of the Interior prior to this rule, and she blew them off. She didn't have the courtesy to meet with them after she was up there in Alaska already.

The administration also held an incredibly short public comment period on these actions. When the Bureau of Land Management was pressed on this

timeline, which was right in the middle of whaling season for the sustenance fishing communities that support oil and gas development, a BLM official responded that the administration wanted a short comment period to rush a rule through in order to prevent it from falling into the Congressional Review Act window.

Mr. Speaker, not only did this administration fail to properly consult with local Native Alaskan communities on the North Slope, but they have taken explicit steps to subvert Congress' constitutional responsibility to serve as a check on the executive branch.

This administration cannot be trusted to do right by the American people. Policies coming out of this administration, especially energy and natural resources policies, undermine the American people and the hardworking men and women who stand ready to responsibly develop our vast natural resources.

That is why Congress must take every step to prevent the administration from pushing forward these policies. We must close every loophole that might be out there to shut down domestic energy production.

This includes preventing the administration from creating new or expanding existing special areas within the NPR-A.

They can't be trusted to do the right thing by the American people and the Alaska Native communities on the North Slope.

Congress must step in. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment, as well as joining me in voting for the underlying legislation.

The Alaskan communities deserve this. They have been producing energy under their feet in their natural resource space for years.

The energy production—we want to be energy independent, and again, the oil and gas royalties will help the North Slope communities, Mr. Speaker.

I said 10 minutes ago they had come to an EMR hearing stating that these royalties help us live, help us buy our food, help us build our infrastructure. Without those revenues, they can't do it. They simply can't do it. In fact, at the EMR hearing, there was a resident that actually was in tears, Mr. Speaker, because of this rule. It is going to be devastating for her and her family to not be able to live on the North Slope comfortably.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Louisiana, I actually liked his expression, and I think my colleague on the other side of the aisle may be offended by this, but you know, my good friend from Louisiana actually said—

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

We have a process problem. Last week, the Rules Committee issued a notice for amendment submission for this bill, and 16 amendments were submitted: 12 from Democrats, 4 from Republicans.

We really should be having an open, robust, and lively debate, but no. The amendment debate this afternoon will be really quick because all six Natural Resources bills up this week, with all six of those bills, this is the only bill that was open to any amendments, and Republicans made only one, this one, this fossil fuel industry wish. That was the only one made in order.

Republicans have made a mockery of what they promised, and they boasted about back in the early days of this Congress.

They guaranteed it would be a robust and open process. Half the time, the Rules Committee isn't even open, but when it is, it is cooking the books like we see this week with this one single amendment for us to debate.

With other bills that have been up this afternoon, the so-called Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, my colleague, Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ, filed several amendments, amendments that Ranking Member GRIJALVA previously offered at the bill's markup.

They would prevent foreign bad actors, for example, including adversaries like China from mining our Federal lands, something that is all too common today through their thinly veiled American subsidiaries, but no, that was not ruled in order, so we don't get to talk about it.

Yesterday at the Rules Committee hearing, Chair WESTERMAN told us he didn't accept the amendment because it wasn't worded properly.

Well, this language was already in the Republicans' prized H.R. 1 where it was included as a Republican amendment, so it is hard to take that argument seriously.

Maybe they realized H.R. 1 would never become law and that is why more than a year later, Republicans still haven't sent that bill even to the Senate, or maybe they realized foreign bad actors also happen to be padding their pockets.

□ 1615

If that is not the case, I am eager to continue working across the aisle to get these bad actors off our Federal lands, and we will be following up.

Now, back to Alaska. The amendment we are here to debate would do nothing but make the bill more extreme. It would prevent the administration from designating any further special areas without an act of Congress, preventing further protections for an area that is so fragile, special, and ecologically important.

They blocked debate on every other amendment, including my amendment to require a study on the impacts to subsistence resources, another to pro-

hibit the Secretary from issuing the lease sale until revenue is raised at least to the level that CBO estimates, and one to prohibit oil and gas leasing in the Arctic Ocean.

Representative PELTOLA, the sole House Representative for Alaska, filed an amendment to protect the critically important Northern Bering Sea Climate Resilience Area, but Republicans refused to let that proceed. This is not good faith debate.

I will end with a word about my friend's statement that he asked Secretary Haaland repeatedly about Tribal consultation. My friend would have been well-served to listen to Secretary Haaland and learn a thing or two about Tribal consultation. She is the highest-ranking indigenous person in American history. She knows a thing or two about this subject, including the fact that a nonprofit advocacy group, which is the consultation that my friend was referring to, is not a group she has to meet with or consult as part of Tribal consultation.

Tribal consultation is government to government. That is how it works. If there was a little more listening and a little less screaming and table-pounding, there might be a better understanding of Tribal consultation across the aisle.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on 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. CASTOR. 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. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6285 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Ms. CASTOR of Florida is as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6285 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION OF OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRELEASING, LEASING, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES IN CERTAIN AREAS OFF THE COAST OF FLORIDA.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) PROHIBITION OF OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRELEASING, LEASING, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES IN CERTAIN AREAS OFF THE COAST OF FLORIDA.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other law, the Secretary may not offer for oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or any related activity any tract located in—

“(A) any area of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico that is referred to in section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006;“(B) the portion of the South Atlantic Planning Area south of 30 degrees 43 minutes North Latitude; or

“(C) the Straits of Florida Planning Area.

“(2) LIMITATION ON EFFECT.—Nothing in this subsection affects any right under any lease issued under this Act before the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

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.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. 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.

ANTISEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 6090 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 6285;

Passage of H.R. 6285, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 2925;

Passage of H.R. 2925, if ordered; and Adoption of H. Res. 1112.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 320, nays 91, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—320

Adams	Fulcher	Meng
Aderholt	Garbarino	Meuser
Aguiar	Garcia, Mike	Mfume
Alford	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Allen	Golden (ME)	Miller (OH)
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Miller (WV)
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks
Armstrong	Gonzalez,	Mills
Babin	Vicente	Molinaro
Bacon	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Balderson	Gottheimer	Moore (AL)
Banks	Granger	Moore (UT)
Barr	Graves (LA)	Moran
Barragan	Graves (MO)	Morelle
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Moskowitz
Beatty	Griffith	Moulton
Bentz	Guest	Mrvan
Bera	Guthrie	Mullin
Bergman	Harder (CA)	Napolitano
Bice	Harris	Neal
Bilirakis	Harshbarger	Neguse
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Nehls
Bishop (NC)	Hern	Newhouse
Blunt Rochester	Hill	Norcross
Bost	Himes	Nunn (IA)
Boyle (PA)	Hinson	Obenoltz
Brown	Horsford	Ogles
Brownley	Houchin	Owens
Buchanan	Houlahan	Pallone
Bucshon	Hoyer	Palmer
Budzinski	Hudson	Panetta
Burchett	Huffman	Pappas
Burgess	Huizenga	Pascrell
Calvert	Issa	Pelosi
Cammack	Ivey	Peltola
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Pence
Carbajal	Jackson (TX)	Perez
Carey	Jackson Lee	Perry
Carl	James	Peters
Carter (GA)	Jeffries	Petterson
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Pfluger
Cartwright	Johnson (SD)	Phillips
Castor (FL)	Jordan	Posey
Chavez-DeRemer	Joyce (OH)	Quigley
Cherfilus-	Joyce (PA)	Raskin
McCormick	Kamlager-Dove	Reschenthaler
Chu	Kaptur	Rodgers (WA)
Ciscomani	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (AL)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rogers (KY)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Rose
Cohen	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Connolly	Kildee	Ruiz
Correa	Kiley	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kilmer	Rutherford
Courtney	Kim (CA)	Ryan
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Salazar
Crawford	Kuster	Salinas
Crow	Kustoff	Sarbanes
Cuellar	LaHood	Scalise
Curtis	LaLota	Schiff
D'Esposito	LaMalfa	Schneider
Davids (KS)	Lamborn	Scholten
Davis (NC)	Landsman	Schrier
Dean (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Schweikert
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin
DelBene	Latta	Scott, David
Deluzio	LaTurner	Self
DesJarlais	Lawler	Sessions
Dingell	Lee (FL)	Sewell
Duarte	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Duncan	Lesko	Sherrill
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Simpson
Edwards	Levin	Slotkin
Ellzey	Lieu	Smith (MO)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Escobar	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Eshoo	Luetkemeyer	Smith (WA)
Espallat	Luttrell	Smucker
Estes	Lynch	Sorensen
Ezell	Mace	Soto
Fallon	Malliotakis	Spanberger
Feenstra	Maloy	Spartz
Ferguson	Mann	Stanton
Finstad	Manning	Stauber
Fischbach	Mast	Steel
Fitzgerald	Matsui	Stefanik
Fitzpatrick	McBath	Steil
Fleischmann	McCaul	Steube
Fletcher	McClain	Stevens
Flood	McClintock	Strickland
Foxx	McCormick	Strong
Frankel, Lois	McHenry	Suozzi
Franklin, Scott	Meeks	Swalwell
Fry	Menendez	Tenney

Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew

Van Duyn
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Weinstrip
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—91

Amo	Donalds	McGarvey
Auchincloss	Evans	McGovern
Ballint	Foster	Moore (WI)
Beyer	Foushee	Nadler
Biggs	Frost	Norman
Blumenauer	Gaetz	Ocasio-Cortez
Boebert	Garamendi	Omar
Bonamici	Garcia (IL)	Pingree
Bowman	Garcia (TX)	Pocan
Brecheen	Gosar	Porter
Burlison	Green, Al (TX)	Pressley
Bush	Greene (GA)	Ramirez
Cárdenas	Hageman	Rosendale
Carson	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Carter (LA)	Hoyle (OR)	Sánchez
Casas	Hunt	Scanlon
Case	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky
Casten	Jacobs	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Stansbury
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Takano
Cloud	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Khanna	Tlaib
Clyde	Kim (NJ)	Tokuda
Collins	Lee (CA)	Underwood
Crane	Lee (PA)	Velázquez
Crockett	Leger Fernandez	Waters
Davidson	Lofgren	Watson Coleman
Davis (IL)	Luna	Wexton
DeGette	Massie	Williams (GA)
DeSaulnier	McClellan	
Doggett	McCollum	

NOT VOTING—18

Arrington	Galleo	Magaziner
Cleaver	Garcia, Robert	Murphy
Cole	Gomez	Nickel
Crenshaw	Grijalva	Sykes
De La Cruz	Grothman	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Langworthy	Trone

□ 1650

Mr. HUNT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BURCHETT and MILLS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed the vote on H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 172.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 172.

ALASKA'S RIGHT TO PRODUCE ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAMMACK). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the