

voiceless were heard and reflected in our policymaking.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Grant for his work, which has inspired so many, including myself.

God bless.

VETERANS DESERVE BETTER

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

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, Louisvillian Tim Nicolazzi has dedicated his life to service. He served in the Air Force and then Army, deploying to Kuwait and Iraq, where he earned a Bronze Star.

After his honorable discharge, Tim's call to public service brought him to HUD, where he has helped victims of domestic abuse in Louisville find safety, helped veterans get off the streets, and helped first-time home buyers achieve their American Dream.

A few weeks ago, Tim was fired with no notice and no severance or compassion.

As we speak, the Trump administration is carrying out the biggest layoff of veterans in history, including tens of thousands announced just last night.

That is why today I am cosponsoring an act to protect veterans' jobs and to reinstate veterans who have been illegally fired by Elon Musk and DOGE.

Veterans put on the uniform. They served something higher than themselves. They deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tim for all of his service. I won't stop fighting for veterans like him.

RECOGNIZING BILL JARTZ, THE VOICE OF LAMBEAU FIELD

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

Mr. WIED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a Green Bay local legend, Bill Jartz, who is retiring from WBAY after more than four decades, including 27 years at the evening anchor desk.

Bill grew up right in Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District in Clintonville and started his career with WBAY as a sports reporter in 1983. He made the jump to evening news in 1998.

Bill's legacy extends far beyond the newsroom. It lives in his warmth, wit, and unwavering dedication to our community. In fact, Bill is known for not being able to say no to any charitable cause where he can make a difference.

He has been a familiar voice emceeing, speaking, or judging countless local fundraisers and events for charitable organizations, including the CP Telethon and Make-A-Wish's Gourmet Wishes. Throughout his career, it is estimated that he dedicated more than 5,000 hours of community service.

While all of us in northeast Wisconsin will miss Bill's news coverage, thankfully, we will still get to hear the

voice of Lambeau Field during Green Bay Packer home games.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Bill for his many years of service to northeast Wisconsin and congratulations on his retirement. May this next chapter be as fulfilling as the legacy he leaves behind.

RECOGNIZING JENNIFER AND STEPHANIE HAN

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jennifer and Stephanie Han, two remarkably accomplished sisters from El Paso whose dedication and success in women's boxing has inspired all of us.

Jennifer Han, former IBF world featherweight champion and soon-to-be member of the International Women's Boxing Hall of Fame, has paved the way for women in the sport, making her one of the most accomplished female boxers in the country and the world. She now lives a quiet life as a mother and trainer at a local gym where she teaches youth programs.

Her sister, Stephanie Han, has built her own legacy in boxing with an undefeated record. She earned this year's WBA lightweight title by way of knockout in the first round in under 2 minutes. She is ranked as number two in the world, and beyond her success in the sport, she is a dedicated mother, wife, and officer with the El Paso Police Department where she dedicates herself to public service.

We are so proud of both of them.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION BURDENS TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the costs of illegal immigration to this country and to my home State of California according to a 2023 report, the benefits and services provided to the estimated 3.23 million illegal aliens just in California costs local taxpayers just under \$23 billion annually. Factoring in about 1.15 million U.S.-born children of illegal aliens, sometimes known as anchor babies, adds more than \$8 billion in costs making it roughly \$31 billion total.

This total cost under these findings of \$31 billion works out to a per capita cost to Californians of \$7,074 annually.

This report pegs the combined Federal, State, and local costs nationwide associated with illegal immigration at \$182 billion annually, and that is probably a low number.

State and local taxes paid by Californians accounts for one-sixth just in my home State of the nationwide costs associated with illegal immigration, including in K-12 education, housing, and nutrition assistance, in-State tuition

at public colleges and universities, health coverage under the State's Medi-Cal program, which is the trouble, and sweeping sanctuary policies that make our cities less safe.

□ 0915

RECOGNIZING SHERIFF RANDY RETTER

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

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the outstanding leadership of Sheriff Randy Retter, who dedicated 37 years of law enforcement experience to my district in Wayne County.

Over that career, Sheriff Retter has worked tirelessly, holding positions of ever-increasing responsibility, beginning as a road patrol officer before being ultimately elected sheriff of Wayne County and having served as president of the Indiana Sheriffs' Association.

It was as sheriff that Mr. Retter met with the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to diligently detain illegal criminal migrants, making the Sixth District far safer for Hoosiers to live and work in.

It was this past Tuesday in the joint session that I had the privilege of hosting Sheriff Retter as my guest for the President's joint address to Congress. It was our first. We shared that experience together.

It was there that the President reaffirmed his steadfast support for our Nation's law enforcement officers and their vital work to protect our communities.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT RELATING TO "PROTECTION OF MARINE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES"

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 177, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management relating to "Protection of Marine Archaeological Resources", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 11

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management relating to "Protection of Marine Archaeological Resources"

(89 Fed. Reg. 71160 (September 3, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution 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 Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 11.

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 S.J. Res. 11, a resolution to express disapproval of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's misguided protection of the "Protection of Marine Archaeological Resources" rule.

First, I thank my colleagues, Senator KENNEDY and Representative EZELL, for championing this effort and collaborating with my team to bring this resolution to the floor today. Additionally, I acknowledge Democratic Senators HICKENLOOPER, CORTEZ MASTO, and ROSEN for supporting this resolution in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, S.J. Res. 11 is a commonsense measure that would repeal a burdensome and unnecessary Biden administration rule that forces offshore energy operators to conduct costly archeological surveys and submit reports for every exploration and development plan on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Under the rule in question, operators must comply with this blanket mandate, even in areas with no known archeological risks, adding millions in unnecessary costs and delays despite existing State and Federal protections under the National Historic Preservation Act.

Eliminating this one-size-fits-all rulemaking will ensure that energy production isn't bogged down by duplicative red tape. S.J. Res. 11 uses the Congressional Review Act to nullify a rule which BOEM acknowledges places "100 percent of the increased Gulf of Mexico compliance cost for survey[s]" on operators that are small entities.

This resolution would end the Biden administration's needless overreach and return the regulatory regime to a targeted, evidence-based approach.

Notably, this repeal preserves America's ability to tap its offshore resources efficiently. It will not weaken genuine historic preservation but will stop a pointless cash grab that inflates administrative burdens. In fact, this

resolution could boost Federal revenues by speeding up leasing and production timelines that are critical to U.S. energy security.

Offshore oil and gas from the Outer Continental Shelf accounts for 15 percent of U.S. production, supporting jobs, powering homes, fueling transportation, paying for conservation, and lowering costs for goods we all need. Yet, this rule, part of a broader pattern of Biden-era restrictions, threatens that stability with added costs of more than 500 additional labor hours per year across operators.

Federal regulators shouldn't stifle energy development. This resolution offers a rational fix by eliminating a rule which was intended to add burdens to a vital industry. S.J. Res. 11 will protect American energy security and keep energy costs down for families as part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are just 2 months into this Congress, yet we have already seen one favor after another to Big Oil from our friends across the aisle.

Republicans just can't get enough, and so we are back here once again giving another favor to Big Oil. One gets the feeling that the majority is just warming up and that this is going to be a recurring theme in this Congress.

Meanwhile, we are 1 week away from a government shutdown. We are on the heels of what we know is a Republican plan to gut Medicaid to pay for tax cuts for billionaires. Today, are my colleagues across the aisle talking about any of those things? No.

Republican Members have brought us here to talk about repealing a minor rule that simply protects marine archeological resources. If that sounds ridiculous to my colleagues, that is because it is.

This bill targets a rule from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, which is the agency that regulates offshore energy development in Federal waters. The rule says that underwater surveys, which these companies already conduct before they drill, simply have to meet some basic, consistent standards. Wow, the heavy hand of government.

Republicans have argued that this is simply too burdensome for their friends in Big Oil. Yet, the rule doesn't even require companies to conduct any new surveys. Companies already do these surveys.

The rule simply states that future surveys need to adhere to minimum standards to be used for archeological reports. No matter how my colleagues slice it, this rule will not cause a substantial financial burden to operators. It just ensures that the data that companies collect can be used to look for things like shipwrecks and other historically important objects.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman said in his opening remarks that he doesn't like the fact that they need to look for these things in areas where they are not known to exist.

That is kind of the whole point. If you are not going to look for them while already there doing a survey, we may never know that things actually exist in some areas. Without these surveys, operators might not discover these archeological resources until they go to drill.

Here is what happens when they find out at that point: It forces costly delays for their friends in the oil industry because, regardless of whether this survey work is completed beforehand, companies still have to comply with laws that protect shipwrecks and mitigate impacts to sites that were once above water and home to indigenous peoples.

The rule actually promotes efficiency, something Republicans say that the majority cares a lot about. It prevents delays and extra costs for good actors who report unexpected finds, as they are required to do under the law. It keeps bad actors from just quietly working and hoping that no one notices, something that is much easier to get away with if you are not required to do those studies in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, why do Republicans want to roll this rule back? Well, for one, my guess is that Republicans saw that it was a Biden regulation on offshore oil and gas. If Biden did it, it must be bad.

My colleagues want to pick a fight with anything that Republicans perceive to be a threat to Big Oil, even a minor rule that actually helps the industry avoid unexpected costs.

The second very likely reason that we are here is that my Republican colleagues are looking for ways to kill time. The majority needs some pretext to chew up some floor time here in Congress to distract the public.

This resolution does that, and it allows Republicans to keep working behind the scenes on their plan to find tax giveaways for their billionaire friends and working behind the scenes on their plan that we know is coming to cut Medicaid and SNAP deeply, hurting working families all over this country. My Republican colleagues have voted on the framework for that last week and are still squabbling with the Senate over the details and what comes next.

Clearly, we are not doing work this week to fund the government or to stop Trump's new tax on energy, which he calls a tariff, standing up to self-dealing billionaires who are taking a sledgehammer to our Federal Government, or dealing with their illegal firing of workers and constituents of many of us and causing complete chaos across the country.

Instead of holding this administration accountable for all of that, House Republicans are urgently tinkering,

trying to create the appearance that my colleagues across the aisle are busy doing something here in Congress on a minor rule that simply requires scientific standards for underwater surveys.

Republican Members don't want people to remember that the majority voted just last week to set in motion devastating cuts to Medicaid and SNAP or that, a few days ago, Elon Musk said that Social Security is a Ponzi scheme. Yet, the other night, my Republican friends stood and applauded for him like he was Elvis Presley.

The majority also doesn't want people to remember that the Trump administration has announced plans to cut staffing in half at the Social Security Administration, guaranteeing that services for seniors will suffer, or that the Trump Secretary of Agriculture just went on television and told Americans who are struggling with food prices to get a chicken.

That is why House Republicans want to talk about something else. That is why we are here to debate and vote on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this farcical resolution and the theater that it represents, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not about repealing anything that is going to add any protections or viability to anything that is happening on offshore exploration. The rule was not even about wearing a suspender with a belt.

This rule was put in place to hamper offshore energy production. Under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, protections already exist for offshore operators, and it requires them to identify and avoid marine archeological sites, making this rule totally redundant.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Biden-era rule wasn't just for redundancy. It was to put shackles on offshore energy production and to put higher costs on American consumers, who are already struggling with inflation that has resulted from the policies of the previous administration.

Good governance doesn't have redundancy and duplicative rules in place that hamper Americans from building and producing.

What we are doing is releasing the shackles off of energy production so that we can provide the things that our country and our economy need.

That is why I really appreciate the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL) for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL).

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of S.J. Res. 11, a Congressional Review Act to reverse the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or BOEM, rule that targeted oil and gas production in our Outer Continental Shelf.

The Biden administration spent the last 4 years steamrolling our American energy sector with burdensome regulations. Instead of unleashing our Nation's vast resources, the administration handcuffed U.S. oil and gas production with red tape, driving up costs, stifling innovation, and making us more dependent on foreign energy.

BOEM'S rule is not about safety or environmental stewardship. It is not about protecting archeological resources. This rule is nothing short of a universal mandate. It even applied to areas known to have no archeological risk.

This is about forcing an extreme agenda that weakens our energy independence and hurts hardworking Americans. The result: higher costs at the pump, fewer jobs in the energy sector, and a direct hit to our economy.

That is why I am proud to stand up today for the American workers and consumers by leading the House version of this CRA to reverse this detrimental rule. Under the Trump administration, we have the power to push back against these reckless policies and restore commonsense energy solutions to put America first.

In just the last 2 months, we have seen what happens when government gets out of the way. Energy prices drop, jobs flourish, and we become a net energy exporter.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of future we should be fighting for, not where Washington bureaucrats make it harder for American businesses to succeed.

Let's send a clear message: We stand for affordable energy, good-paying jobs, and an America that leads, not one that follows bad policies straight into higher costs and economic decline.

I thank Senators KENNEDY and HYDE-SMITH for their leadership in the Senate, and I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for advocating to get this resolution introduced on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11, and I look forward to the President signing this into law.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle are arguing that the rule is duplicative and that the offshore drilling industry is already doing these surveys.

Mr. Speaker, that is kind of the point. The fact that these surveys are already being done is exactly why this rule is so simple and not burdensome. The rule does not require any new or standalone surveys for the vast majority of leases. It simply makes sure that these surveys are done right, these surveys that are already being performed, so that we can protect archeological sites by identifying them before the work starts.

This is common sense. It is a tweak that will provide important protection for offshore archeological resources, bring the agency into compliance with the law, and actually promote efficiency.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. ELFRETH).

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 11. As has been said, historic artifacts serve as evidence of ancient civilizations. They teach us about the development of science, trade, transportation, and culture.

So many of these artifacts are buried on the seafloor from shipwrecks and storms to indigenous artifacts. When that seabed is disturbed, these priceless pieces of history get damaged or destroyed. More importantly, they cost the company seeking to do this work more money when they disturb these artifacts and are faced with fines and cleanup like the Mica shipwreck, which was bisected by a pipeline in 2001.

It cost ExxonMobil \$250,000 in fees to mitigate the damage it caused that could have been found from the beginning had there been a consistent survey, saving that company money.

This is not new. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has had guidelines on marine archeology since 1982, and since have been updated during administrations from both parties to create greater consistency and predictability for everyone involved.

These rules have stood for 40 years because they protect artifacts and protect the oil and gas companies from the liability of unknowingly destroying irreplaceable pieces of history.

Each update to the rules has served to codify industry practice, use the best available science, and ensure compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

Each update has provided oil and gas companies with more clarity and consistency. S.J. Res. 11 seeks not only to undo all of that work that has been done, but it will prohibit such a rule from ever being enacted in the future. Counter to some arguments, this rule is not financially burdensome.

BOEM reports the total annualized financial impact for the entire oil industry is less than \$400,000 a year. For an industry with a reported pretax profit of \$83.9 billion in 2024, this has a negligible impact.

The rule does not negatively impact America's energy dominance and independence. The U.S. is still the number one producer of oil and gas in the world and has been since 2009. We are producing more oil than any country ever.

In fact, we are exporting energy, which is what is really hurting American energy prices. This rule didn't even meet the threshold to require a Statement of Energy Effects report because it has such a negligible possibility of impacting energy supply, distribution, or use.

This rule actually promotes efficiency as has been stated. It provides consistency to businesses and protects oil and gas companies from that liability. Doing these surveys before drilling saves time and money in the long run.

It is much more damaging to a company's bottom line to stop operations suddenly when they find a shipwreck or artifacts.

Nobody gets everything they want in the public policy that we debate on this floor, but this final rule, at the beginning of the day, is a good policy that benefits every stakeholder involved, and banning this rule would set a dangerous precedent for solutions-oriented policymaking. It will roll back decades of bipartisan work that we have all done to preserve history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider the cost of this action, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on S.J. Res. 11.

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

Mr. Speaker, our country is at a point where we need more energy and every form of energy when we look at the demands for data processing, when we look at transportation demands, when we look at demands for energy to grow our economy and to produce more things here. I don't think anybody on either side of the aisle would question the fact that we need more energy and our energy consumption is on an exponential increase.

This rule that the Biden administration made is not about an all-of-the-above energy approach. It is not about producing more energy, more clean reliable energy that comes from America. It is about attacking an industry.

If you don't believe that, just look at the rule itself. We produce more than one kind of energy offshore. We produce oil and gas. We also produce wind, but magically wind farms don't trigger an archeological review, I guess, because they are not included in this analysis, this redundant process that the Biden administration put in place.

The reason they are not is the same reason that oil and gas should not be included; because there is already a process to do the National Historical Preservation Act section 106 requirements when you are getting a permit.

This rule was added by the Biden administration just to create another level of bureaucracy, another level of regulatory hurdles to stop offshore oil and gas exploration and production. That is the only purpose they could have put this rule in place for. Otherwise, they would have said, if they really cared about archeological features and artifacts in the Gulf and offshore, they would have included the wind farms in this, but it is only targeted at oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 11, which nullifies the Biden administration's politically driven rule to mandate all off-

shore oil and gas exploration and development projects complete costly and burdensome archeological surveys and reports. Over the past 4 years, the American people have seen the most anti-oil, antigas, anti-traditional energy, and antitiming administration in this Nation's history.

When energy here in the United States and around the world is growing, as the chairman just said, rather than supporting an all-of-the-above energy strategy, Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration sought to stop traditional forms of energy like oil and gas.

Prior to the Biden administration's rule, oil and gas companies were only required to complete these reports when BOEM, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, had a reason to believe an archeological resource may be present.

Instead, the Biden administration made that archeological report mandatory, even when it was clearly unnecessary.

These unnecessary reports would lead to millions of dollars in additional compliance costs to complete the required survey work and deal with the additional red tape. This is in addition to the significant staff time reviewing these reports would eat up at BOEM, leading to further delays in important energy projects that we need to build for the American people.

It is clear the Biden administration's rule wasn't actually necessary. It was just another example of their death-by-a-thousand-paper-cuts agenda to crush our domestic oil and gas industry and raise energy prices for all Americans in the process.

After we pass this resolution today—and it will pass the House. It already passed the Senate, and President Trump will sign it. After it passes this House today and when it is overturned, these oil and gas projects won't be waived from historic preservation rules.

This resolution does nothing to weaken the National Historic Preservation Act. These developers will still be required to take necessary steps to ensure they do not harm historic properties or archeological sites.

As was the case before the Biden rule, BOEM will still have the authority to require operators to perform these additional surveys and reports when it is actually necessary and actually warranted, Mr. Speaker. This resolution will just return us to the previous process.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will argue this is necessary to preserve historic and archeological sites on the Outer Continental Shelf.

If that is the case, why did the Biden administration's rule only apply to oil and gas operations? Why didn't this rule apply to offshore wind development?

This was politically driven. I am not arguing we need these additional necessary requirements for offshore wind.

I am just pointing out the blatant hypocrisy of the past administration. It is clear where their intentions were. Overturning this rule is good for our energy security and for our energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, a couple nights ago, the President of the United States addressed this House and the Senate. He talked about energy independence, energy dominance, critical mineral dominance, and a critical mineral powerhouse for our Nation.

It is crystal clear that the Biden administration wanted to diminish the tried and true respect of traditional energies we had and have because they didn't include wind in this. It is complete hypocrisy.

If you are going to do it for one, you do it for all. They tried to choose winners and losers. They tried to do it, but here in the House, we are going to follow the Senate's bipartisan passing of the CRA.

Today, it is going to pass in a bipartisan fashion in the House and very soon the President of the United States will sign this into law. It will change one of the many disasters of the prior administration, the prior administration, as I opened up, that was the most anti-oil, gas, and mining administration in the history of this country. I come from a rich mining State; biggest untapped copper-nickel find in the world.

The Biden administration banned mining in northeastern Minnesota. He took the mineral leases away that were in place since 1966. Yet, they want us to compete in defense, Nassau and other areas of our communities, with adversarial governments when we have to buy their minerals for the F-35s, the F-22s, the F-16s, our submarines.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to vote on this CRA because it gives me one more opportunity, once again, to change the direction of this country that the previous administration was derelict in doing. I am very happy to stand here today with my Democrat and Republican colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to get this across the finish line.

The American people deserve it. The cost of energy and the need for our energy is going to be increasing. As the chairman just said, Mr. Speaker, we need to win the AI war, and that is going to mean we need energy to do it. We are going to need energy, Mr. Speaker, when these businesses come back to our country. When we reshore these manufacturing facilities, we are going to need the energy to do that. Now, we have an administration that understands it and will not be politically driven by just a few people.

Mr. Speaker, with my comments, I will say one last thing. Energy independence and critical mineral dominance is a Trump administration agenda. That is the America First agenda that is going to employ a lot of people.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about this claim of a double standard and of hypocrisy. Oh, the poor fossil fuel industry is being singled out.

Poor Big Oil with its record profits and its record exports and its executive bonuses and its collusion with OPEC to gouge American consumers, they are just such a victim in the telling of my friends across this aisle.

I hate to intrude on that narrative with a little bit of truth, but the fact is, the offshore wind industry already does this stuff. They have to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act.

The reason that the fossil fuel industry is the subject of this regulation is to bring them into compliance. I guess it reflects the radical proposition that the Big Oil oligarchs, your pals in the industry, should play by the same rules as everyone else. That is not socialism or wokeness or anything else. It should just be common sense and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I will talk about the real human cost of our Republican friends' allergy, opposition, reflexive opposition, to any type of regulation and what this CRA would mean for working men and women on the Outer Continental Shelf.

□ 0945

Marine archaeological surveys are not just a nice idea. They actually are safeguards that protect workers from hidden dangers lurking beneath the waves. These surveys can detect unexploded ordnance, UXOs, which are military ammunition, that has never detonated.

There is actually a lot of that out there. From World War II into the 1970s, the Federal Government dumped massive amounts of UXOs into the ocean, including depth charges, torpedoes, munitions, mustard gas, and even chemical weapons, all in designated explosive dumping areas. If that wasn't bad enough, these same waters were used to dispose of radioactive waste.

The old technology used to map these areas was crude at best, leaving countless unexploded devices scattered beyond known dumping areas, but modern marine archaeological surveys can identify these things and save lives before disaster strikes.

Rather than protect workers from these deadly hazards, Republicans want to repeal this commonsense rule, rolling the dice with human life in the name of corporate profits. They wrap it all up in a phony pitch about prices like they are standing up for the little guy while they look the other way when their oil oligarch pals collude with OPEC to gouge American consumers.

Well, what about the working-class men and women who power our offshore energy industry? What about their safety? Are they just collateral damage for the latest favor to Big Oil? Let's be clear. This resolution isn't about helping the common worker, it is about Republicans making good on their promise to deliver for Big Oil billionaires destroying our planet.

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 continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

My Republican colleagues decided that the best use of our time today is to debate whether or not we should keep a commonsense rule that protects Tribal resources, worker safety, and our Nation's history. They claim we must do this because this rule is too burdensome for oil and gas companies and will create higher energy prices for American consumers. All of that is nonsense.

What does this rule actually require of companies like Shell, BP, ExxonMobil, companies that make between \$28- and \$85 billion a year? It requires them to tweak surveys that oil and gas companies are already doing so that they can proactively look for marine archaeological resources or unexploded ordnance, discoveries that would actually stop oil and gas development if they didn't do this proactively.

Even without this rule, this is a commonsense look-before-you-drill provision that benefits the American people and keeps offshore workers safe.

Republicans aren't delivering for everyday Americans. If they were, they would take a stand on ridiculous tariffs that Trump is imposing on our closest allies or unconstrained exports of liquefied natural gas that are driving up energy prices or repealing energy tax credits in the IRA, all policies on their side that are going to raise energy prices.

If they were delivering for everyday Americans, they wouldn't allow working-class people to go out into the Outer Continental Shelf without the guarantee that they aren't working on top of unexploded military ammunition or radioactive waste. That is what this rule does. It protects workers and the public interest.

If they were delivering for everyday Americans, they would not allow massive firings of essential employees who protect public lands.

If they were delivering for everyday Americans, they would not vote for healthcare to be ripped away, like they just did last week.

The Republican agenda in the House today accomplishes one thing and one thing only—selling out the American people and our planet so they can continue to enrich the oil baron oligarchs and billionaire class. This resolution is just the latest favor to these elites.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of S.J. Res. 11. I thank my colleagues across the aisle for actually making our point on why this regulation that was put in place by the Biden administration is totally unnecessary.

We made the point that it is targeted specifically for oil and gas and that wind is exempted. They tried to say that wind is exempted because they are already doing the analysis under the National Historic Preservation Act, section 106.

Guess what? Oil and gas is doing the same thing. They are already making these archaeological assessments under existing rules.

This is redundant, but it is not just redundant. It is punitive. It was a rule put in place to attack what our colleagues like to refer to as the Big Oil bogeyman. Apparently, because they have been successful and they can actually turn a profit because there is a demand for their product, they should be attacked by the Federal Government; they should have more regulations put on them. We should do anything we can to stop producing more energy offshore if you are in the mindset of the previous administration.

That is not helping America. That is not helping the American consumers. That is not helping the American economy, and it is certainly not helping America on the world stage. It is ridiculous that we are having to come here and do Congressional Review Acts on horrible policies that were put in place by the previous administration, but thank goodness we have the tool to do that. Thank goodness the Senate has already done it, and we have bipartisan support in the Senate to do the CRA on this rule.

State and Federal laws, as has already been mentioned, provide robust oversight for marine historic resources, again making this added layer of Federal bureaucracy pointless and wasteful. The repeal will lower energy costs for American families, strengthen U.S. energy independence, and support an industry critical to our economy and our security, all while maintaining responsible stewardship of historic resources.

One thing that BOEM failed to analyze that often gets overlooked, it is not just Big Oil in the Outer Continental Shelf, it is also small producers, family-owned businesses, and thousands and thousands of people who make a living working in the Outer Continental Shelf.

This burdensome regulation will be detrimental to those small businesses. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of S.J. Res. 11 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the adoption of H. Res. 189.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 202, answered “present” 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Goldman (TX)	Miller (OH)
Alford	Gonzalez, V.	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gooden	Miller-Meeks
Amodei (NV)	Gosar	Mills
Arrington	Graves	Moolenaar
Babin	Gray	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Green (TN)	Moore (NC)
Baird	Greene (GA)	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Griffith	Moore (WV)
Barr	Grothman	Moran
Barrett	Guest	Murphy
Baumgartner	Guthrie	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Hageman	Newhouse
Begich	Hamadeh (AZ)	Norman
Bentz	Haridopolos	Obornolte
Bergman	Harrigan	Ogles
Bice	Harris (MD)	Onder
Biggs (AZ)	Harris (NC)	Owens
Biggs (SC)	Harshbarger	Palmer
Bilirakis	Hern (OK)	Perez
Boebert	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Bost	Hill (AR)	Pfuger
Brecheen	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Bresnahan	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Huizenga	Rose
Burlison	Hunt	Rouzer
Calvert	Hurd (CO)	Roy
Cammack	Issa	Rutherford
Carey	Jack	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	James
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Johnson (SD)
Ciscomani	Cline	Johnson (TX)
Cline	Cloud	Jordan
Cloud	Clyde	Joyce (OH)
Cole	Collins	Joyce (PA)
Collins	Comer	Kean
Comer	Costa	Kelly (MS)
Costa	Crane	Kelly (PA)
Crane	Crank	Kennedy (UT)
Crawford	Crenshaw	Kiggans (VA)
Cuellar	Cuellar	Kiley (CA)
Davidson	Davidson	Kim
De La Cruz	DesJarlais	Knott
Donalds	Donalds	Kustoff
Downing	Downing	LaLota
Dunn (FL)	Edwards	Lawler
Edwards	Ellzey	Lee (FL)
Ellzey	Emmer	Letlow
Emmer	Estes	Loudermilk
Estes	Evans (CO)	Lucas
Evans (CO)	Ezell	Luna
Ezell	Fallon	Luttrell
Fallon	Fedorchak	Mace
Fedorchak	Feenstra	Mackenzie
Feenstra	Finstad	Malliotakis
Finstad	Fischbach	Maloy
Fischbach	Fitzgerald	Mann
Fitzgerald	Fleischmann	Massie
Fleischmann	Flood	Mast
Flood	Fong	McCaul
Fong	Fox	McClain
Fox	Franklin, Scott	McClintock
Franklin, Scott	Fry	McCormick
Fry	Fulcher	McDowell
Fulcher	Garbarino	McGuire
Garbarino	Gill (TX)	Messmer
Gill (TX)	Gimenez	Meuser
Gimenez	Golden (ME)	Miller (IL)

NAYS—202

Adams	Garcia (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Garcia (IL)	Olshewski
Amo	Garcia (TX)	Omar
Ansari	Gillen	Pallone
Auchincloss	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Balint	Gomez	Pappas
Barragán	Goodlander	Pelosi
Beatty	Gottheimer	Peters
Bell	Green, Al (TX)	Pingree
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pocan
Beyer	Hayes	Pou
Bishop	Himes	Pressley
Bonamici	Horsford	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Houlahan	Ramirez
Brown	Hoyer	Randall
Brownley	Hoyle (OR)	Raskin
Budzinski	Huffman	Riley (NY)
Bynum	Ivey	Rivas
Carbajal	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Carson	Jacobs	Ruiz
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Ryan
Casar	Jeffries	Salinas
Case	Kaptur	Sánchez
Casten	Keating	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Kennedy (NY)	Schneider
Cherfilus-	Khanna	Scholten
McCormick	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Chu	Landsman	Scott (VA)
Cisneros	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	Latimer	Sherman
Cleaver	Lee (NV)	Sherrill
Clyburn	Lee (PA)	Simon
Cohen	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Conaway	Levin	Sorensen
Connolly	Liccardo	Soto
Correa	Lieu	Stansbury
Courtney	Lofgren	Stanton
Craig	Lynch	Stevens
Crockett	Magaziner	Strickland
Crow	Mannion	Subramanyam
Davids (KS)	Matsui	Suozzi
Davis (IL)	McBath	Swalwell
Perez	McBride	Sykes
Davis (NC)	McClain Delaney	Takano
Dean (PA)	McClellan	Thanedar
DeGette	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McDonald Rivet	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	McGarvey	Titus
Deluzio	McGovern	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	McIver	Tokuda
Dexter	Meeks	Tonko
Dingell	Menendez	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Meng	Torres (NY)
Elfreth	Mfume	Trahan
Escobar	Min	Tran
Espallat	Moore (WI)	Underwood
Evans (PA)	Morelle	Vargas
Fields	Morrison	Velazquez
Figures	Moskowitz	Vindman
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Wasserman
Fletcher	Mrvan	Schultz
Foster	Mullin	Waters
Foushee	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Frankel, Lois	Neal	Whitesides
Friedman	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Frost	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Nunn (IA)

NOT VOTING—8

Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)	Pettersen
DeZales, Tony	Kamlager-Dove	Rulli
Grijalva	LaHood	

□ 1019

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RULLI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 61.

CENSURING REPRESENTATIVE AL GREEN OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfin-

ished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 189) censuring Representative AL GREEN of Texas, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 198, answered “present” 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gimenez	Miller (WV)
Alford	Goldman (TX)	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Gooden	Mills
Amodei (NV)	Gosar	Moolenaar
Arrington	Graves	Moore (AL)
Babin	Green (TN)	Moore (NC)
Bacon	Greene (GA)	Moore (UT)
Baird	Griffith	Moore (WV)
Balderson	Grothman	Moran
Barr	Guest	Moskowitz
Barrett	Guthrie	Murphy
Baumgartner	Hageman	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Newhouse
Begich	Haridopolos	Norman
Bentz	Harrigan	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Obornolte
Bice	Harris (NC)	Ogles
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Onder
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Owens
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Perez
Bost	Hinson	Perry
Brecheen	Houchin	Pfuger
Bresnahan	Houlahan	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Burlison	Hunt	Rose
Calvert	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Cammack	Issa	Roy
Carey	Jack	Rulli
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Ciscomani	Case	Scalise
Cline	Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)
Cloud	Cline	Jordan
Clyde	Cloud	Joyce (OH)
Cole	Clyde	Joyce (PA)
Collins	Cole	Kaptur
Comer	Collins	Kean
Costa	Comer	Kelly (MS)
Crane	Costa	Kelly (PA)
Crank	Crane	Kennedy (UT)
Crawford	Crank	Kiggans (VA)
Crenshaw	Crawford	Kiley (CA)
Cuellar	Crenshaw	Kim
Davidson	Cuellar	Knott
De La Cruz	Davidson	Kustoff
DesJarlais	De La Cruz	LaLota
Donalds	DesJarlais	LaMalfa
Downing	Donalds	Langworthy
Dunn (FL)	Downing	Latta
Edwards	Dunn (FL)	Lawler
Ellzey	Edwards	Lee (FL)
Emmer	Ellzey	Letlow
Estes	Emmer	Loudermilk
Evans (CO)	Estes	Lucas
Ezell	Evans (CO)	Luna
Fallon	Ezell	Luttrell
Fedorchak	Fallon	Mace
Feenstra	Fedorchak	Mackenzie
Finstad	Feenstra	Malliotakis
Fischbach	Finstad	Maloy
Fitzgerald	Fischbach	Mann
Fleischmann	Fitzgerald	Massie
Flood	Fleischmann	Mast
Fong	Flood	McCaul
Fox	Fong	McClain
Franklin, Scott	Fox	McClintock
Fry	Franklin, Scott	McCormick
Fulcher	Fry	McDowell
Garbarino	Fulcher	McGuire
Gill (TX)	Garbarino	Messmer
Gimenez	Gill (TX)	Meuser
Golden (ME)	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
	Golden (ME)	Miller (OH)

NAYS—198

Adams	Amo	Auchincloss
Aguilar	Ansari	Balint