

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "WASTE EMISSIONS CHARGE FOR PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS SYSTEMS: PROCEDURES FOR FACILITATING COMPLIANCE, INCLUDING NETTING AND EXEMPTIONS"

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 161, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 35) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions," 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 161, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 35

*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 Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions" (89 Fed. Reg. 91094 (November 18, 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 35.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 35, a resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions," sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

H.J. Res. 35 will repeal the disastrous rule by the Biden administration that punishes our small and midsize energy producers here in the United States. The so-called waste emissions charge starts at \$900 per metric ton for last year's reported methane emissions. It increases to \$1,200 per metric ton for 2025 emissions, and it increases one more time to \$1,500 per metric ton of emissions for 2026 and the years thereafter.

There are about 9,000 small and midsize independent petroleum drillers in the United States. These mostly small operations are responsible for developing 91 percent of oil and gas wells, producing 83 percent of America's oil and 90 percent of our country's natural gas. We should be thanking them, not punishing them.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not act, American jobs and energy production will be lost. This is really, for all intents and purposes, a punitive tax on natural gas. These folks are not our enemy. They help make the fuel that we use to heat our homes, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, I and other Republicans are not opposed to the regulation of methane. I see it as an asset that should not be wasted when it is practicably able to be captured, but there are cases where it is not practicable. However, we are opposed to bureaucratic overreach that, intended or not, will force some of these small producers out of business, making the energy supply in the United States less.

We should instead be making rules that work with industry to facilitate the progress that our country's energy producers have already made in reducing emissions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 35, a resolution that will drive up energy prices in the United States. It is a radical measure that will gut one of the Inflation Reduction Act's most critical programs: the Methane Emissions Reduction Program.

With this resolution, Republicans are doubling down on their commitment to lining the pockets of their special interest corporate polluter friends at Americans' expense.

Of course, we shouldn't be surprised that the House Republicans continue to prioritize billionaires and big corporations over everyday Americans. Just last night, Republicans moved forward with a budget that includes devastating, life-altering cuts to Medicaid and food assistance for our kids, our seniors, and our veterans, all so Republicans can give tax breaks to their billionaire buddies.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 35 is just another giveaway that saddles Americans with higher energy bills, plain and simple, all to help Republicans' corporate polluter friends. What is more, repeal-

ing the Environmental Protection Agency's methane polluter fee slashes revenue for the government, meaning this bill will cost American taxpayers a whopping \$7.2 billion.

This is really shameful and a massive waste of money and resources because the reality is that, without the methane polluter fee, it is cheaper for the oil and gas industry to waste valuable methane rather than install or upgrade equipment to control that pollution.

Currently, oil and gas companies waste enough natural gas from leaks, venting, and flaring to meet the energy demand of 14 million households every year. In other words, the oil and gas industry is throwing \$2 billion worth of American energy down the drain every year, which Americans then have to pay for.

That wasted methane has grave consequences for our environment and for public health. Methane is an extremely dangerous greenhouse gas that accounts for nearly a third of today's global warming and is a key contributor to smog.

That is why key pollution control programs, such as the Methane Emissions Reduction Program, are so pivotal. The program includes a suite of incentives to drive down excess methane pollution, including \$1.5 billion to help industry reduce methane emissions.

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of this program is the methane polluter fee, which is targeted by the resolution before us today. This fee is meant to correct the market failure that makes it cheaper for operators to waste methane rather than capture and sell it. It ensures that polluters pay for their own wasted energy and the harm that it causes, not American consumers.

It is not a tax. It is not at all. Unlike a tax, the methane polluter fee only applies to wasted methane above specific thresholds. These achievable thresholds are based on the oil and gas industry's own climate commitments and methane reduction targets. I have to stress that we worked with the industry when we were putting this together as part of the Inflation Reduction Act.

EPA then applies a fee for wasted methane that exceeds these thresholds, and the best part is that companies could avoid the fee altogether by simply not wasting methane. Members should understand that they don't even pay the fee if they don't waste the methane, and we actually have a fund to help them upgrade their equipment so that they do not waste the methane and actually improve the situation.

Many industry leaders are already meeting these thresholds that H.J. Res. 35 is trying to get rid of. Essentially, what my colleagues are seeing here is that the good actors are actually doing the right thing. They are not wasting methane anymore. Some of them have gotten help in order to upgrade their equipment, and then they don't pay any fee.

It is the bad actors, the dirtiest oil and gas companies and producers, I should say, that this helps because they don't want to have to upgrade. They don't care. They just want to pollute. That is really the unfortunate part of all of this. Instead of encouraging the good actors, we encourage the bad actors.

Mr. Speaker, addressing methane pollution can yield tremendous financial, climate, and public health benefits across the country. By incentivizing companies to capture lost revenue, the Methane Emissions Reduction Program and the methane polluter fee spur American innovation, strengthen businesses, and boost local economies.

In fact, in the 10 years between 2014 and 2024, there was an 88 percent increase in manufacturing firms in the methane mitigation industry, so this mitigation spurs industry and growth in the economy.

This sector employs thousands of Americans across the Nation with high-quality, good-paying jobs. Yet, in my opinion, this Republican resolution threatens those jobs and undermines American innovation.

It also not only blocks the EPA from implementing the program's waste emissions charge, also known as the methane polluter fee, but also prevents the EPA from ever taking similar action in the future.

Controlling methane pollution is a win-win for all Americans. It is unfortunate that my Republican colleagues are willing to throw all of this away in order to line the pockets of their corporate polluter friends, raising costs on hardworking Americans and the middle class in the process.

Make no mistake: President Trump, Elon Musk, and congressional Republicans have no intention of doing anything to lower energy bills for Americans, and H.J. Res. 35 is just the latest proof of that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a new day in America. Once again, House Republicans are standing up for hardworking Texans and Americans by rolling back another harmful rule pushed through by the Obiden administration.

Mr. Speaker, I call him "Obiden" because I think he is Obama's third term.

This latest scheme slaps new taxes on our energy producers, the very folks who keep our gas prices low and our economy running strong. We are not going to sit back and let the Obiden administration strangle our energy industry with unnecessary costs.

It is absolutely time to strike down this destructive natural gas tax and protect America's energy independence.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle want to claim that President Biden—I will use his name—his natural gas tax won't hurt producers who are "in compliance." I have a news flash for you. That is a bait and switch, Mr. Speaker.

Under the current waste emissions charge regulation, the so-called regulatory compliance exemption only applies if methane emission regulations are in place in every applicable State.

Here is the catch: Many States haven't adopted these regulations, which means producers can't even comply with these rules that don't exist.

In other words, the "exemption" isn't really an exemption at all. It is just another backdoor tax designed to squeeze the very industry that keeps America powered.

This isn't just bureaucratic red tape, Mr. Speaker. It is a direct attack on Texas jobs, Texas families, and energy producers that fuel our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support my colleagues in striking down this burdensome tax and standing up for the hardworking men and women of the Lone Star State and our great Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, strong opposition, to this resolution.

For the past 5 weeks, Elon Musk and congressional Republicans have been running around calling any Federal spending debt they don't like waste. The empowerment exercise of Elon Musk is a rather interesting saga. He is a person who did not have a background check, was not confirmed or had a process of approval through the United States Senate, and is functioning through a ghost agency of government oversight of efficiency. He is now the determinant to go forward and reduce government in a way that is not utilizing the strength of inspectors general or institutional memory that can best guide the academics to do that with the greatest degree of efficiency.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TONKO. Sure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. When debating this resolution, H.J. Res. 35, is it appropriate to discuss superfluous matters to the matter at hand currently on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, remarks in debate must be confined to the subject under debate, in this case, the pending legislation.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I was using that to set in context my comments because, again, waste addressed in an efficiency exercise is important, but ironically, today, we are finally on the House floor talking about an EPA rule that reduces actual, literal waste, and Republicans want to undo it.

The oil and gas industry is the largest industrial source of methane pollution. Each year, oil and gas operators emit the equivalent of \$2 billion worth of wasted natural gas, and that can come via venting, perhaps flaring, and leaks. The methane polluter fee makes certain that companies are held accountable for their waste.

This is an effort to provide for efficiency for the general public because methane waste is not only exacerbating climate change, but it is also bad for Americans, especially through their energy bills.

Consumers still pay for natural gas that is wasted, but this resolution will let those polluters off the hook. It also hurts American companies that are innovating new technologies enabling leak detection and repair, creating whole new pollution reduction industries.

These new technologies are turning waste into economic value, all while protecting our environment.

I suggest that that is an exercise we should all embrace, but oil and gas industry polluters aren't willing to take meaningful mitigation actions voluntarily if it eats into their bottom lines.

It is why we have historically enacted environmental laws to make sure polluters pay for the damage that they do to the public. The methane polluter fee is the next chapter of that environmental success story by incentivizing companies to perform leak detections and repairs that provide high-quality and good-paying jobs that employ thousands of Americans across our great country.

We should be holding polluters accountable, lowering energy costs for hardworking Americans, and supporting new domestic industries, but when it comes down to a choice between reducing everyday Americans' energy bills or lining the pockets of oil and gas executives, Republicans will choose Big Oil each and every time.

Let's stop wasting methane without consequence, and let's not leave American consumers to foot the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this resolution.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about this parliamentary inquiry. I yield myself such time if I can that there was a ruling on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PALLONE. Well, the problem that I have, Mr. Speaker, unless I misunderstood—yes, it would be a parliamentary inquiry. Unless I misunderstood, Mr. GRIFFITH was criticizing Mr. TONKO because he mentioned Elon Musk in the context of this debate.

I was in the back room before this debate started and the President had his first Cabinet meeting and Elon Musk was in charge of the Cabinet meeting, talking about every topic in the Federal Government.

As you know, he has used his position with DOGE to fire people at the EPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PALLONE. My question is, could you repeat that ruling and what it was about? Was it about Elon Musk?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair had advised Members that under clause 1 of rule XVII, remarks in debate must be confined to the subject under debate, in this case, the pending legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. All right. I don't have an—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may be recognized for debate.

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

Again, I am a little confused. If the gentleman—if Mr. GRIFFITH's comment was about the fact that we cannot bring up Elon Musk, who is essentially in charge of so many government programs, including everything at the EPA—again, I was in the back room. He was addressing the Cabinet. No one was saying anything. He was talking about every government policy. He has fired people at the EPA. He has commented on every government policy, including EPA policy.

Again, I don't understand what the ruling was. I don't want to get into it again, but we certainly will continue to talk about Elon Musk and the negative impact of DOGE on the EPA, on methane, on everything else. That is what we are going to do.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: I meant no offense and no criticism. As the gentleman from the other side of the aisle and from New Jersey knows, I love parliamentary procedure. One of the reasons that we have parliamentary procedures and rules of parliamentary procedures is to make the place more efficient.

We are talking about H.J. Res. 35 today. We are not talking about every other ill that anybody might think is going on. The focus today in this debate period is H.J. Res. 35.

That is my only point. I meant no criticism of Mr. TONKO or the Democrats in this matter. Just trying to get us on track with parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), my good friend.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GRIFFITH for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a new day in America. I remind my friends that, just 6 years ago, we had the greatest economy in our lifetimes, and we achieved energy independence. That is what this day is about.

The days of weakness on the world stage and dependence on foreign adversaries for our energy needs are over.

I am proud to rise in support of H.J. Res. 35 to repeal the Biden administration's harmful rule establishing a natural gas tax and help the United States reclaim energy dominance.

The Biden administration had an all-out war on fossil fuel. On their way out the door, the previous administration finalized this burdensome rule to effectively collect taxes on methane emissions released from oil and gas facilities and funnel that money to their radical climate allies.

What my Democratic colleagues won't tell you is that our clean natural gas is a major reason why the U.S. has become a world leader in reducing carbon emissions.

In partnership with President Trump, House Republicans are reinstating common sense in Washington. To lower costs for American families, we must unleash our energy capabilities and utilize the reliable natural gas right under our feet, not impose these outlandish taxes on domestic producers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of H.J. Res. 35.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose efforts to repeal the waste emissions charge, commonly known as the methane fee, which is a commonsense measure that benefits American industry, protects consumers, and provides much-needed regulatory certainty in the energy sector.

Addressing methane emissions, especially fugitive emissions from oil and gas, is one of the most effective ways to combat the climate crisis, protect public health, and ensure America's energy sector remains globally competitive.

Methane has a global warming potential 80 times higher than carbon dioxide over a 20-year period, meaning that even small leaks can erase the climate benefits of utilizing cleaner energy sources. Unfortunately, methane regulations have been caught in a cycle of constant change.

The first Trump administration repealed methane regulations from the previous administration. When President Biden took office, we led efforts to reinstate these crucial protections. Then, in 2022, House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act, which not only reinstated strong methane controls but also implemented a market-driven approach to reducing waste, the methane fee.

The methane fee is not a blanket tax on energy production. I think the gentleman from Virginia suggested that this was a tax on small polluters. Actually, it is a tax only on larger emitters because it is only applied for 25,000 metric tons annually, so it is on the larger ones.

It is designed to encourage companies to capture more methane rather than venting or leaking it. The methane fee provides proof to consumers and competitors that we are serious about producing the cleanest, most efficient natural gas on the market.

Repealing the fee would hurt American industry by eliminating incentives to modernize operations and remain competitive in an international market that increasingly values low-emission energy.

Now, I am supposed to get up here and bash Big Oil, but actually, Big Oil is for the methane fee. The largest companies—ExxonMobil, TotalEnergies, and Cheniere Energy—support strong methane rules. They oppose this repeal because they know reducing waste makes business sense. How is that? Because the customers for our gas around the world—Korea, South Korea, Japan, the EU—are demanding cleaner gas.

These companies know that the methane fee demonstrates that our gas is cleaner. Also, the consumer demand from those customers has led to the development of technologies to detect methane, its presence, and its concentration in a way that we can make much more efficient ways to regulate it.

□ 1245

A repeal would undercut responsible producers who have invested in cutting-edge methane detection and capture technologies that make them globally competitive.

Even if this CRA passes today, the problem doesn't simply disappear. My colleagues on the other side never miss a chance to point out that the natural gas revolution has contributed to our historic energy independence and cut our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from energy production. That is true, but even small leaks of methane wipe out that advantage from a climate perspective.

World markets and domestic politics are demanding that the industry can prove with real credibility and transparency that we fixed this methane problem. It is increasingly apparent that the viability of exporting U.S. liquefied natural gas depends on American policies to address methane pollution.

If we don't do this, we are going to have to pass bipartisan legislation to do the same thing to ensure that the industry standards provide for the cleanest, most efficient natural gas production.

Industry and ratepayers have asked us for certainty, consistency, and an assurance that America will remain a global leader in energy production and resilience. The customers want this to happen. The large producers want this to happen. I don't see why Democrats and Republicans can't agree on this.

We need long-term solutions, not more political whiplash. I urge my colleagues to stand with responsible energy producers and American consumers to reject efforts that repeal this vital provision.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support H.J. Res. 35, legislation to repeal the Biden administration's waste emissions charge.

During President Biden's term in office, he and his administration waged war on our domestic energy producers, limiting their production and expanding regulations that raise prices on the American consumer.

The waste emissions charge implemented by President Biden through the failed Inflation Reduction Act does nothing but shackle our energy producers, raising costs for consumers, and forcing our allies into the hands of adversaries.

By repealing the Biden administration rule, we can deliver on the mandate that Americans voted for in November and unleash American energy production. This will allow us to support hardworking constituents and our allies abroad, by producing more affordable and cleaner energy.

By simply repealing this overreaching regulation, our Nation can step forward, fully utilizing the energy resources that are underneath the feet of my constituents.

Soon, with the help of H.J. Res. 35, we will once again be energy dominant. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), a member of our committee.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 35, which will block the methane polluter fee, which is designed to control wasteful methane from the oil and gas industry.

This resolution is another attempt by Republicans to put corporate polluters ahead of hardworking American people. Much like their budget adopted last night, it is a handout for billionaires and large corporations.

Despite President Trump's promise to cut energy costs, Republicans are actively working to raise Americans' energy bills, not to mention the effect that reckless tariffs that, together with this policy, the Republicans are pushing will drive American energy bills and prices at the pump sky high.

However, I guess those high prices are worth the costs to Republicans if it means Big Oil and Gas are pleased.

The Methane Emissions Reduction Program was created to make sure that these big corporations pay for their own pollution, but I guess my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would prefer that American families cover the cost of corporate pollution.

Under this resolution, the American people will be stuck footing the bill.

That is egregious. It is egregious to let the American people bear the burden of industry's pollution. It is not just a cost to their wallets, but also a cost to their health and safety.

The oil and gas sector is the single largest industrial source of methane pollution in the United States, responsible for nearly a third of our emissions. We know that this pollution of our air has powerful effects on our climate and is driving worsening natural disasters.

The devastating wildfires and hurricanes that we have seen, fueled by climate change, aren't just our children's problem. They are here today. The pollution that this methane gas produces affects our children's health today. It affects their respiratory health, among other things.

While Republicans are pushing tax breaks for billionaires and corporate polluters, they will get a pat on the back from the industry today. Democrats are thinking about the future and the world that our children and their children will inherit.

Will it be livable? Will they be able to breathe?

I urge my colleagues to put the American people and families now and in the future over polluters and vote "no" on H.J. Res. 35.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH).

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 35, which repeals the Biden administration's natural gas tax, a misguided policy that drives up costs, stifles investment, and weakens our energy security. This so-called waste emissions charge won't reduce methane emissions, but it will punish American producers, increase reliance on foreign energy, and make life more expensive for America's working families.

While some claim this tax does not directly impact my home State of Alaska, what is bad for American energy is bad for Alaskan energy. Alaska holds over 100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and the Alaska LNG project is our best chance to bring it to market. Yet, burdensome Federal regulations discourage investment, keeping Alaska's energy potential locked away.

Meanwhile, Cook Inlet gas supplies are declining, threatening Alaskans in south central Alaska with higher heating and electricity costs. If we want long-term energy security, we must develop our resources.

Mr. Speaker, every job is an energy job because energy powers everything that we do. Supporting American energy production means creating good-paying jobs in oil and gas, construction, transportation, manufacturing, and small businesses that rely on affordable energy. The Alaska LNG project alone would generate thousands of jobs, strengthening our economy and

supply chains. If we want to grow opportunity for working families, we must stand with American energy and repeal the natural gas tax.

Let's be clear: Opponents of this bill are spreading falsehoods. They claim this tax will cut emissions, but the U.S. already leads the world in methane reduction, cutting emissions intensity by 42 percent since 2015. They say this is about Big Oil, but 90 percent of U.S. natural gas comes from small and midsize producers. They claim only gas producers are affected, but the Biden administration designed this rule to also hit oil producers.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, they argue this tax protects energy security, yet it increases reliance on foreign adversaries.

If we are serious about energy security, affordability, and economic growth, we must repeal the natural gas tax. H.J. Res. 35 is a commonsense step toward a stronger energy future. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 12½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Virginia has 19½ minutes remaining.

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

As I mentioned, I am very much opposed to this resolution, and a big part of it is because I think it will cost the American taxpayers and the Federal Government more money.

The CBO has a preliminary cost estimate for this resolution, and it is a whopper. The CBO estimates that this resolution would cost American taxpayers \$7.2 billion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an email from CBO regarding this.

H.J. Res. 35 would disapprove a final rule published by the Environmental Protection Agency in November 2024 that implemented a requirement in the 2022 reconciliation act (Public Law 117-169). The rule detailed how the agency would collect fees from certain energy-related facilities whose methane emissions exceed a threshold specified by law.

Estimated revenue effects of H.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for Congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions".

As posted by the House Committee on Rules on February 24, 2025.



who have far inferior environmental and labor standards.

A natural gas tax is a completely misguided tax on the working American people that will hurt their bottom line and benefit Vladimir Putin. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration has been the most antidomestic energy-producing administration and the most antimining administration in the history of this country. We are going to turn it around.

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

Mr. Speaker, I spoke before about how the Methane Emissions Reduction Program is a win-win and how this resolution is a lose-lose. The bottom line is that curbing methane waste is an opportunity for the oil and gas industry itself. The industry really wants to waste less methane.

It is simple logic. Each molecule of methane saved is one they can sell to people. Oil and gas operators emit the equivalent of about \$2 billion worth of wasted natural gas every year, and there is money to be made in that. On the other hand, repealing this program, which is what this resolution does, will cost us \$7.2 billion and at the same time pollutes our air. It is a lose-lose scenario.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 35 to repeal the Biden-Harris administration's natural gas tax. For the last 4 years, Americans witnessed firsthand the implementation of a heavy-handed, top-down regulatory agenda that put the interests of the environmental left first, leading to increased prices for families and businesses.

This resolution would overturn the rule implementing the EPA's waste emissions charge which was published following the 2024 Presidential election as part of the Methane Emissions Reduction Program established in the Inflation Reduction Act. Energy produced in the United States has some of the lowest methane emissions intensity in the world. U.S. upstream oil and gas producers have reduced their total methane emissions intensity by 42 percent since 2015.

We have our entrepreneurial spirit to thank for this success, not policies like the WEC, which are unworkable for American producers and will lead to our allies being forced to rely on gas with higher emissions coming from adversarial nations like Venezuela.

Businesses and consumers rely on the affordable and reliable natural gas underneath our feet. By putting new taxes on this baseload power, the

Biden-Harris administration put the interests of their far-left base ahead of the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that will enable us to enact President Trump's energy agenda and restore American energy dominance.

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

Mr. Speaker, I really stress that the Republicans keep talking about how this Methane Emissions Reduction Program harms the industry. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There are a whole bunch of incentives in this program to drive down excess methane pollution and remediate the effects of pollution that do occur, but the program provides over \$1.5 billion to assist the industry with reducing current and legacy methane emissions, including \$700 million of incentives for small producers.

The methane charge, or fee, only applies to wasted methane above specific thresholds based on the oil and gas industry's own climate commitments and methane reduction targets. We worked with the industry to put this together. They are cooperating with us. It is the opposite of the idea that somehow they are harmed. They are benefiting. They are actually making money from it.

Overall, the Methane Emissions Reduction Program recognizes the cleanest performers, holds companies responsible for their own leaks and wasted methane, drives innovation, and creates a lot of jobs. The whole idea is to get them to do the right thing. We even give them money in order to accomplish that with their equipment, and it is working. This idea that it is harmful is just nonsense.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.J. Res. 35, to nullify the EPA's rule on the waste emissions charge, also known as the natural gas tax.

With President Trump back in office, it is time to restore American energy. It is time to restore American energy dominance, which is why I am proud to lead this CRA to rescind the ill-conceived natural gas tax.

As part of his war on energy, former President Biden took radical steps to end fossil fuels during his administration, which hurt the hardworking energy producers not only in my district in the Permian Basin in Midland and Odessa but also across America.

This Congressional Review Act is a tool that Congress uses to overturn Federal agency actions, a direct example of congressional checks and balances on the executive branch and one of Congress' most important duties.

My CRA will not eliminate the program that collects this tax, but it will remove the EPA's ability to collect it. This is an essential first step in elimi-

nating this tax, while we work to undo the underlying statute: killing the natural gas tax once and for all. It is critical to negate these punitive regulatory requirements now to ensure that the United States can reclaim its place as the world leader in energy for generations to come.

In the waning days of the Biden administration, the EPA doubled down on Biden's disastrous energy policies, imposing a burdensome and harmful tax on oil and natural gas facilities called the waste emissions charge, also like we have been discussing, the natural gas tax or the methane tax. This natural gas tax was a blatant abuse of power and the first time that the Federal Government has ever directly levied a tax on emissions, creating a duplicative layer of red tape that would devastate American energy, if continued.

The specifics of this tax started at \$900 a metric ton in '24, increasing to \$1,200, and then \$1,500 in the subsequent years. While the statute directs the EPA to develop a formula to impose and collect a tax based on intensity, Biden's EPA did so by ignoring well-established international standards.

Actually, one of the things I have heard here today is that industry was consulted. That is false. Industry was not consulted. In a hearing, I asked a member of Biden's Department of Energy to tell me one producer they had worked with. I asked them to name one producer they had worked with, and they couldn't come up with that producer. They couldn't come up with even one until pressed. Then they said whatever producer they thought. I went back and double-checked that. They hadn't been consulted. They hadn't been talked to.

This is an important day. Taxes, like the one we are discussing, raise energy production costs. They discourage investment. They ultimately lead to higher consumer prices and costs. Not only is this a tremendous burden on both producers and consumers but this rule also completely ignores the significant progress that the United States private sector has made over the past decade or more.

U.S. emissions have decreased by 18 percent between 2005 and 2022, making the United States the world leader in reductions of emissions, while simultaneously increasing production threefold or fourfold.

Today's vote exemplifies the principles upheld in the Supreme Court's landmark *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo* decision. By overturning Chevron deference precedent, the court restored the judiciary's rightful role in interpreting statutes and checking agency overreach.

This is important for all of us. What Biden's administration did for 4 straight years was to overreach, to impose burdensome regulations, and to hurt innovation, the actual innovation that was reducing emissions. They destroyed that progress.



I am very proud to lead this CRA. I am proud that it will be bipartisan. I have had multiple Democrats who have told me that they are going to vote for this because it is common sense and it actually helps all of our goals: affordable, reliable energy that also helps the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes," and I thank the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for leading this.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEGICH). The gentleman from Virginia has 10 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from New Jersey has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the gentleman from Texas, and he described once for me his district, Midland, and the oil and gas production there.

I must stress, I actually did spend a lot of time talking to the industry when we were putting this methane emissions program together. I can speak firsthand that I spoke to the industry. The main thing they were concerned about is they did not want this program to be punitive. They said: We want to correct this problem. We don't want to waste methane, but you have to give us some sort of incentive to do this.

That is what we did. Rather than have a punitive program, we have \$1.5 billion to assist industry with reducing current and legacy methane emissions. Mr. Speaker, \$700 million of that is specifically set aside for small producers, which I know there are a lot of those in the district of the gentleman from Texas.

Unfortunately, much of that \$700 million to help the small producers has been stalled by President Trump with his funding freeze. That harms the small producers who are counting on those critical funds.

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

□ 1315

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK).

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 35, legislation I proudly cosponsored to stand up for North Dakota's energy producers and hardworking families who depend on affordable, reliable energy.

For my first action as a Member of Congress, I wrote to President Trump and Secretary Burgum urging them to repeal 20 unnecessary and burdensome rules that threaten affordable, reliable energy, including this rule.

The Biden administration's methane tax is a real attack on North Dakota's energy sector, and it is really a tax on

every aspect of our lives. This tax was the number one concern of the energy stakeholders in my State.

This heavy-handed Federal mandate punishes small and midsize independent producers who are responsible for 90 percent of America's natural gas. It threatens jobs, raises costs for families, and jeopardizes our energy independence.

North Dakota leads the way in responsible energy production, not because of government mandates but because of innovation and technology. My State is proof that we don't have to choose between a strong economy and a clean environment. We can and do have both.

This tax will have a huge impact on our energy sectors who already produce the cleanest energy in the world. This natural gas tax threatens American energy security, and we will be forced to rely on adversaries to meet our energy needs, countries that do not have strong labor or environmental laws.

This tax hurts energy producers who are already doing it right. America is leading the way in reducing emissions.

Since 2015, upstream oil and gas producers have reduced their methane emissions by 42 percent. Our innovation and technology have allowed us to reduce emissions while raising the standard of living across this country.

American energy solutions are clean energy solutions. We should be unleashing U.S. energy production, not taxing it and not making it more expensive and creating disincentives to production.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

I just want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the methane polluter fee corrects a market failure that currently makes it cheaper for owners and operators to waste methane instead of installing or upgrading their equipment to prevent leaks and flaring.

In other words, what we want them to do is to upgrade their equipment, prevent the leaks and the flaring. If they do that, we give them money, including a set-aside for small producers so that this happens and they don't pay the fee.

Leaked or intentionally wasted natural gas never makes its way to customers, but they are nevertheless stuck with the bill. They have to pay for that.

The Methane Emissions Reduction Program will ensure that American consumers no longer pay for wasted energy or the harm that these emissions can cause.

The bottom line is that wasted methane is bad for business. It is bad for consumers. It is bad for the climate. The problem with H.J. Res. 35 is it will allow this waste to continue unchecked.

This is a program that is working. Don't kill it with this resolution. You are going to kill jobs. You are going to kill our efforts to try to reduce meth-

ane in the environment, and you are not helping anybody in the industry.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" on H.J. Res. 35, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support for H.J. Res. 35 from the United States Chamber of Commerce, a letter from the National Federation of Independent Businesses, and last, but not least, a letter from the American Petroleum Institute.

February 24, 2025.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval aimed at overturning the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions rulemaking. Disapproving this rulemaking would help give consumers access to affordable energy to heat their homes and businesses to power manufacturing.

Disapproving EPA's natural gas tax rulemaking is expected to reduce energy costs for consumers, making heating, cooking, and electricity more affordable for households. For manufacturers, it lowers operating expenses, enabling greater investment in production and job creation, which in turn stimulates economic growth and strengthens the overall economy. Disapproving this tax will also provide relief to small businesses and industries so they can allocate more resources toward growth, innovation, and workforce expansion.

This natural gas tax threatens to increase costs to consumers and businesses and undermines economic competitiveness. We urge Congress to act swiftly in passing this resolution of disapproval.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY,  
Executive Vice President, Chief Policy  
Officer, and Head of Strategic Advocacy,  
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

NFIB,

Washington, DC, February 25, 2025.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in support of H.J. Res. 35, the Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) rule establishing a methane fee for oil and natural gas production, processing, transmission, and storage. This fee will increase costs for energy producers, which will be passed on to families and small businesses. A vote in favor of H.J. Res. 35, will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 119th Congress.

In a recent ballot, more than 88 percent of small business owners support streamlining regulations to facilitate the production and transport of oil, natural gas, and other energy sources in the United States. Small business owners also report the cost of electricity, natural gas, gasoline, and diesel fuel, as top 10 problems when asked to assess their top 75 issues.

The EPA's methane fee would apply to oil and gas facilities that report annual methane emissions above a certain threshold. In 2024, a \$900 fee per metric ton of methane would kick in above the threshold. By 2026, the fee will increase to \$1,500 per metric ton. This fee will increase the cost of energy production which will be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher energy costs. In its rule, the EPA acknowledged that this regulation would increase the price of gasoline and decrease gas production.

Small businesses want affordable, abundant, and reliable energy. NFIB strongly supports H.J. Res. 35 and will consider support for H.J. Res. 35 a Key Vote for the 119th Congress.

Sincerely,

ADAM TEMPLE,  
Senior Vice President for Advocacy,  
NFIB.

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, February 26, 2025.

Hon. BRETT GUTHRIE,  
Chair, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GUTHRIE AND RANKING MEMBER PALLONE: The American Petroleum Institute (API) writes in support of H.J. Res. 35, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions" (the WEC rule).

The WEC rule is a duplicative layer of red tape that creates a punitive tax on American energy, stifling innovation and hampering the industry's ability to produce the energy that American consumers and allies abroad rely on, and we appreciate your committee's leadership in repealing this harmful policy.

Methane emissions from the oil and gas sector are already regulated by EPA under the new and existing source rule, which prescribes extensive requirements for industry. At the same time, industry is voluntarily doing more to continue reducing our emissions, and those efforts are working. Thanks to innovation and industry actions, methane emissions fell by 42 percent between 2015 and 2023 according to the EPA, even as production increased by 51 percent to meet demand.

Operators have taken significant voluntary steps to identify and implement cleaner engineering technology solutions within their operations and facility designs. For example, since 2018, members of The Environmental Partnership, a voluntary industry initiative administered by API and whose members represent nearly 70 percent of U.S. onshore oil and gas production, have removed or replaced more than 180,000 gas-driven pneumatics, resulting in the permanent reduction of an estimated 355,421 metric tonnes of CH<sub>4</sub> per year released into the atmosphere based on 2023 EPA reporting. Operators are also implementing vapor recovery units to capture methane emissions from higher-emitting equipment like tanks and compressors. In addition to traditional ground-based monitoring approaches using optical gas imaging (OGI) technologies, companies are also implementing the use of laser absorption spectroscopy and sensors technologies on the surface, in the sky and in space to improve leak detection efforts and further reduce emissions.

In addition to the duplicative nature of the fee, API also contends that the Biden Administration failed to implement it consistent with congressional intent for several key reasons:

The Inflation Reduction Act allowed for an exemption from the fee if (1) the final EPA rule addressing methane emissions is in effect; and (2) as determined by the Administrator, the given state rule will result in greater emission reductions than would have been achieved by the proposed rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review" (86

Fed. Reg. 63110 (November 15, 2021)) had that rule been finalized and implemented. Those conditions have been met, but the compliance exemption is still not as broadly available as Congress intended. The availability of the exemption should not have been delayed until all 50 states have fully implemented the requirements.

The WEC rule also disqualifies sites from using the compliance exemption if they have a deviation. Sites should not be disqualified from using the compliance exemption unless and until a violation (not a deviation) is proven through adjudication or admitted by the owner/operator of the site, and disqualification should be limited specifically to the emissions resulting from the adjudicated violation.

The final rule allows netting at the parent company level, but owners/operators who have made substantial investments to mitigate emissions in advance of any regulatory requirement are not currently able to include those facilities that now fall below the Subpart W reporting threshold in netting calculations.

The WEC rule requires combustion emissions to be reported under Subpart W and subject to fees, instead of under Subpart C, consistent with other industries and congressional intent around the netting provisions.

Repealing this misguided rule is an important first step towards providing industry with relief from one of the previous Administration's anti-energy policies, and we appreciate your work to advance a pro-consumer regulatory environment that embraces U.S. energy.

We urge Congress to pass H.J. Res. 35 to repeal the WEC rule, and API and its members stand ready to work together with your committee to follow this with full repeal of the underlying statutory mandate in Section 136(c)-(g) of the Clean Air Act.

Sincerely,

AMANDA E. EVERSOLE.

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

It is interesting. I heard some speakers—and everybody is just trying to talk about these issues from their viewpoint. I get it. However, I heard some speakers on the other side of the aisle say today that we are just catering to Big Oil and others.

Then I hear there were discussions with larger folks, and those are the people who are okay with it. I hear from Representatives from places like Alaska, North Dakota, and Texas whose constituents oftentimes are small mom-and-pop operations. It is hard to think of oil and natural gas that way, but that is the way it is in those regions. They say this will, in fact, hurt them and this is disastrous.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have this dichotomy, this difference, is that a lot of times bigger institutions, bigger organizations, can afford to take on a new regulation. It will cost them a little bit of money. It will make the cost of production go up a little bit, but because they are large, they can spread that out over a lot of different items or a lot of different—I guess, in this case, it would be oil and gas measured in cubic feet, or whatever the measurement is these days. As a result, they can say this is a cost spread out over a large piece of the pie so it is not that big of a deal to us.

As I said in my opening, there are 9,000 small and midsize independent pe-

troleum drillers in the United States. These, mostly small, operations are responsible for developing 91 percent of oil and gas wells, producing 83 percent of America's oil, and 90 percent of our country's natural gas.

Those are the folks who are most upset about these regulations and why we need to repeal them. We are going to break the back of those 9,000 small and midsize independent petroleum drillers who are providing us with affordable gas, affordable heat for our homes through natural gas, and affordable products made out of natural gas and petroleum.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right thing to do, and I encourage all Members, both Democrat, Republican, and any who may think of themselves as independent, to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 35.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 161, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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 will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 11. Joint Resolution 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".

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 119th Congress: The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following Senator as