

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask for a moment of silence to remember those who perished on that fateful day.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House.

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

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate, and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider an omnibus appropriations package so the House and Senate can both pass it before March 11. As the Republican minority whip knows, on March 11 at 12 o'clock, if we have not passed additional authorization for the funding of the government, the government will shut down. It is imperative that we act.

In light of the fact that many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle will be going to Philadelphia for a legislative retreat on the Wednesday preceding March 11, March 9, we need to act by that time and send something to the Senate. I hope we can do that.

The House will also consider H. Con. Res. 70, condemning threats of violence against historically Black colleges and universities—too many of which we have seen in recent weeks—and reaffirming support of HBCUs and their students, introduced by Representative ALMA ADAMS. That will be considered under suspension of the rules.

The House will also consider other bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. Additional legislative items, of course, are possible.

I want to say that, clearly, one of the principal focuses that we have is the onslaught and criminal behavior led by Vladimir Putin, which is occurring in Ukraine. The President spoke to the country and to us on Tuesday in the State of the Union message, in which he made it clear that we need to be unified. In fact, we passed a resolution in which—for the most part, save three of our Members—we were unified.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would remain unified in the face of what is the breaking of international law and could be called a genocide of the Ukrainian people by Vladimir Putin. I am hopeful that we will remain unified and focused on that issue as we proceed.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's expression of unified support with the people of Ukraine. Clearly, we stand with the heroic people of Ukraine, President Zelensky, and the inspiration he has been showing to the world, and the strong people of Ukraine.

What we are seeing from Russia is barbaric. One of my colleagues, Representative SPARTZ, who actually was born in Ukraine, she has been very outspoken about the genocide that is happening to the people of Ukraine. As the gentleman mentioned, the resolution that we passed with Mr. MEEKS and Mrs. SPARTZ, it was bipartisan, and an overwhelming vote of support standing with the people of Ukraine.

Clearly, they have asked for a number of very specific things: some military equipment, supplies, as well as humanitarian relief. We need to continue to push as hard as we can to make sure it is delivered as expeditiously as possible as we watch continuous barbaric attacks, raids, bombing, carpet bombing, cluster bombs, things that are illegal under international law, yet Putin continues to commit these barbaric crimes against the people of Ukraine. They are tough people, and they are not going to give up their country. We need to do everything we can to help them.

One other thing that was mentioned in this resolution because people, obviously, want to know what they can do. There are a number of steps that are being taken and there are other steps that we would also like to see this Congress take. In the resolution there were two provisions specifically that I wanted to bring up.

One of the resolution requests was that we—the United States Congress—pledge support working with Europe and international partners to bolster Europe's energy security and reduce its dependence on Russian energy imports.

The resolution that we passed also goes on to say: We resolve that we underscore the importance of maintaining United States' energy independence for the benefit of the American people and United States' allies. With that there was a piece of legislation that was just filed earlier this week to do just that. H.R. 6858, offered by Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. WESTERMAN, the ranking members of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Natural Resources Committee, goes to the heart of what we can do as a country and as a Congress to take leverage away from Vladimir Putin as it relates to energy.

We can all see over the years how Europe has become very dependent on Russian energy. They, unfortunately, get over 40 percent of their oil from Russia. This is also putting billions of dollars in the pocket of Vladimir Putin. When you look at the price of oil today, over \$110 a barrel, just look at the daily benefit that that gives to Vladimir Putin. He is making over \$700 million every single day selling oil to

the United States and Europe. Think about that.

Vladimir Putin is pocketing today over \$700 million, and he is going to get another \$700 million tomorrow and another the day after by selling his oil to the United States and to Europe. There are things we can do to stop that. That is what H.R. 6858 goes to the heart of. Some of those things are very specific.

President Biden, just a few weeks ago, put a complete freeze on all oil and gas projects in America. All oil and gas projects. That means we are not allowing the United States to provide for the resources of our country and our allies. We used to be exporting oil to our allies around the world, it is becoming harder to do that because those policies by President Biden are shutting off American energy, and at the same time President Biden was asking Vladimir Putin to produce more oil for us.

There is no reason we should be asking Russia to do what we in America can do, yet that is a policy that was put in place. President Biden can reverse that today. I have called on President Biden to reverse all of these specific actions today. This legislation would at least show that Congress is ready to allow ourselves to be energy independent so that we can take that leverage away from Putin. We can take that \$700 million away from Putin.

□ 1115

Obviously, there are a number of other things, just permits for things like LNG—natural gas—Putin is supplying a tremendous amount of natural gas to Europe. There are six projects right now sitting on the Biden administration's desk to approve LNG permit applications for major projects, multi-billion-dollar, private-sector-funded projects in America to allow us to ship natural gas to our European allies so they don't need to get it from Putin. Not one of those permits has been approved in over a year.

Same thing, permits for pipelines. It is not just the Keystone pipeline. There are many other pipeline projects including two States in the Northeast. In the United States, States like Massachusetts are importing their oil from Vladimir Putin because they can't get it through pipelines in America. This opens that up.

It does a number of other things to allow America to become energy independent, but, more importantly, to take the leverage away from Vladimir Putin that he has today that he is using to pocket over \$700 million a day by selling his energy to us and Europe. I would love to see that bill on the floor, and I think a lot of other people would, too, to send a message to Putin that we are not going to be a part of helping him finance this barbaric war on Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if we could look at bringing H.R. 6858 to the floor, have a full debate, and pass a strong piece of legislation that would send a signal to our

friends around the world, surely to the people of Ukraine, but also to Vladimir Putin that he is not going to be able to finance his war off the backs of oil he is selling to the United States and Europe and using that against the people of Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, I hope we can be unified and seek to pursue that which unifies us. If we did everything that the gentleman suggests is in that bill, it would not make an immediate difference, and the gentleman knows that. The gentleman knows that there are literally millions of acres available for additional pumping, oil rigs to be arrayed both offshore and onshore. The gentleman knows we just released 300 million barrels from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. SCALISE. Thirty million, I believe it is.

Mr. HOYER. Excuse me. Thirty million.

So this administration has taken actions immediately to assist the Europeans. In addition, of course, the Europeans have done something. As the gentleman knows in terms of reliance, the Germans, in a very difficult political decision for them, have canceled any further actions dealing with receiving energy through a pipeline in Germany known as Nord Stream 2.

He knows further that there is consideration to reactivate or to not decommission nuclear plants which provide not only clean energy but abundant energy. In my part of the world in a southern Maryland district that I represent, we have a nuclear power plant that produces clean energy for us in abundance. Very frankly, I have heard this argument when we had recession; I have heard this argument when we had the stock market go down, and the stock market go up. We are producing more energy than any other country on Earth right now. We are exporting energy right now.

Now, the issue as to whether or not—we have a relatively small sector, but the gentleman is correct, we are receiving oil in some jurisdictions from Russia—as to whether we ought to continue that, I think that is a valid argument, and we ought to pursue it.

But I want to say to the gentleman very, very frankly that we need to be focused on what we have done and what we are doing. NATO is unified. NATO is taking unified action. All the nations of NATO are taking actions both with respect to stopping any benefits to Russia which may facilitate the funding of their operations. We have taken very, very substantial sanctions, as you know, and we have cut off the Russian central bank which freezes Putin's strategic reserve funds. He had \$600 billion that he was relying on that he called the "war fund".

We have imposed full sanctions on Russia's other major financial institutions, state-owned enterprises critical to its economy. We have removed Russian banks from SWIFT, an action that

nobody thought the Europeans would join us in, but they have. We have secured new export controls to cut off Russia's access to tech inputs, including microchips. We have frozen the assets of Putin and oligarchs close to him and launched a task force to hunt down and freeze more of their wealth. We have stopped the Nord Stream 2 pipeline that I talked about which would have made Germany and some of Europe even more dependent on energy from Russia.

Again, some months ago, nobody would have thought that was possible. President Biden has achieved that.

We have done \$1 billion in security assistance to Ukraine over the past year—a massive increase over past administrations—and have also announced a \$1 billion sovereign loan guaranty to shore up Ukraine's economy.

America, essentially, is energy independent. As I said, we are exporting energy. If we didn't export energy, we may be fully independent. Having said that, the gentleman comes from an area of the country that refines some of the kind of oil we get from Russia, heavy crude, as the gentleman knows much better than I do because he is very, very familiar with that industry.

Energy is important. We believe as well that assuring energy that is not damaging to our global health is also important. I would be for not buying any oil from Russia. Then what would happen is—and may happen yet—is the price of oil would go up. The gentleman knows that. And then the gentleman would rise and say to me: How can you possibly allow prices to be where they are?

I want to honestly tell the American people that we are not sending troops. We will not have people on the front lines. But we will pay a cost to take the actions that the President has courageously taken and that President Zelensky has courageously taken to defend Ukraine's freedom. We will pay a cost.

So the President is trying to balance that with doing what needs to be done. I, frankly, think he is doing what needs to be done, and I am very proud of the fact that, as I said yesterday, we joined together in a bipartisan way to support the Ukrainian people.

We have differences of opinion on energy policy. For the most part, I think many of your Members don't believe global warming is the threat that we believe it is on this side of the aisle. So we have differences of agreement on energy. But what we don't have differences of opinion on, I hope, is that we ought to decrease to the extent we possibly can any economic benefits to Putin—not the Russian people, but to Putin and the war machine that he has put in place, and, as you and I have agreed, killing Ukrainians unprovoked, unjustified, and illegal under international law. So that is the real issue we ought to be focused on.

Yes, we ought to continue to have a fulsome debate on energy policy—very,

very important. But I will tell the gentleman, as I said before, there are millions of acres—millions—currently available to produce more energy in this country.

The gentleman's party was in charge for a long period of time of both the House, Senate, and the Presidency under President Trump, and essentially the policies that the gentleman—I don't know all the policies in that bill, obviously, I haven't read that bill—that could have been affected during that period of time.

So the bottom line is, the gentleman is correct. We need to make sure that Putin pays a horrific price and that we substantially reduce the resources he has available to perpetrate this international crime. And in the process, we ought to remember that this Congress appropriated over \$400 million some years ago to help Ukraine, and President Trump held that money hostage, urging Mr. Zelensky to see if he could get dirt on President Biden. President Trump has recently said how brilliant he thinks Mr. Putin is and that our President is dumb. That doesn't reflect unity. That doesn't reflect a country that is together to confront an enemy. That undermines our democracy.

Mr. Pompeo has also said he thinks Putin is brilliant. I think Putin is an international criminal. He says he is very shrewd and very capable. There are many dictators and tyrants of the world that you can say that about. He didn't say he was a criminal—I am talking about Pompeo and Trump—or that he was committing a genocide, as you and I have said. Those were not words that either the former of Secretary of State or the former President of the United States used just recently after the invasion.

So I say to my friend very sincerely: We have differences of views on energy. We don't have difference of views, however, on diminishing very radically any resources which Putin could rely on to perpetrate his unjustified and criminal invasion of a sovereign country who has shown no threat to Russia or the Russian people.

At some point in time we will continue this argument about drilling and production of more oil. We will continue, I think, to try to be unified on the issue at hand. America's unity expressed to the rest of the world will give the Ukrainians, I think, more confidence and give NATO more confidence. And I might say when I mentioned that NATO has taken extraordinary steps, President Biden, unlike his predecessor, created respect and unity among the NATO allies. Germany, in particular, on Nord Stream 2, the former President uniformly demeaned Ms. Merkel and the Chancellor of Germany, and our relations with Germany were very strained. President Biden has put those together—critically important in facing Putin down at this point in time.

As General Milley said in our briefing—this was not classified—he said he

thought Russia was going to lose in the end—or at least Putin was going to lose.

The Russian people do not want this war. The Russian people do not feel threatened by Ukraine.

Putin wants to create empire, and that is what I think we ought to stay focused on and unified on. We will debate energy policy, but let us not deceive the American public that any policies of this administration have undermined the ability to drill and produce additional energy on those millions of acres that are available on public lands and in public waters right now. Right now.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, there are many areas where we have been unified in our response to Ukraine, but it is not unifying to say leave Russia's oil off the table in terms of sanctions. That was left out by President Biden. When he issued sanctions he specifically exempted Russia's oil, and that is not unifying. There are a lot of people who are angry about that because we are watching the amount of money that Putin is putting in his pocket every day, and he is using that money.

So you take other sanctions, you take other things off the table, the banking system might be hit hard, except if he is able to put \$700 million—and it is probably closer to \$1 billion a day now with this higher price of oil because of what he has done and because of what our country has done to take energy off the table.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield so I can clarify?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I do not believe energy ought to be taken off the table. I want to assure my friend that is not my position, nor is it our collective position as a party. I understand what the gentleman said. I agree with the gentleman that to the extent that we can decrease any—any—underline any—resources available to Putin and his war machine, we ought to do it.

□ 1130

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that clarification because it is in President Biden's set of sanctions that he specifically exempted energy. Clearly, that is not unifying, even to us.

But it is the money that is still allowed to be flowing into Russia, into Putin's pocket, to finance the war that many of us want to get at.

If H.R. 6858, after the gentleman looks at it, has some provisions that we could work on, I think it would be very unifying to the country to say we are finally going to confront what might be Vladimir Putin's largest source of funding, and that is his oil exports to the United States. It offends many, many people that, today, we are getting over 100,000 barrels every single day from Russia because we took things like the Keystone pipeline off the table.

That would have brought us oil from Canada. Canada is a friend, by the way.

And it is not like the need and the demand just went away. The demand is still there.

President Biden said no, we don't want Canadian oil. But it wasn't because he didn't want any oil. He didn't say no, we don't want any pipelines. He just said no to the Canada-to-America pipeline, but he said yes to the Nord Stream 2, initially. But he also said to Vladimir Putin: Would you produce more oil?

And let's keep in mind—I know there is this conversation about the planet. Let's be honest about carbon emissions. Carbon is emitted all around the globe. So if we shut down production in America, which has been done—and it is not just on Federal lands where the President is not issuing permits. He put a freeze just 2 weeks ago on all new permits.

But it is also the banking system that he is using to go after oil and gas companies, so there is no investment being made in America. They are making investments, billions of dollars of investment, in other countries. They are just not making it here in America because of those policies.

Again, that just gives more leverage to Putin. We were paying less than \$2 per gallon under President Trump. I know the gentleman wanted to bring up President Trump.

President Trump stood up to Putin, by the way. You didn't see an invasion anywhere in Ukraine under President Trump. You surely did under President Obama and Vice President Biden when Putin walked in and took Crimea with no consequence. Afghanistan, the weakness that was being showed clearly was being watched by Putin and Xi and other adversaries as a preface to then go and start marshaling troops on the Ukraine border.

President Trump didn't let that happen. He stood up to Putin and pushed back on Putin. He also used energy as a weapon against our enemies because we were producing enough to not only meet our needs but to export to our friends around the world.

Surely, lower pricing was a benefit to Americans, but it also helped our allies around the world. That has been taken off the table.

But let's talk about the carbon emission side because oil is being produced. It is just that a lot of it isn't being produced here that would otherwise be in the mix.

So if you look at, for example, Russian oil, Russia emits probably 40 percent more carbon to make the same oil that otherwise would be made in the United States because we have better standards in America.

I know a lot of people love beating up on America. We do it better than anybody else. Our technology is better than anybody else. In fact, our technology for producing energy is the envy of the world. It should be the model for the world because if we are not making it, Russia is going to be making it.

Believe me, futures prices of oil have an impact on price today, which is why, when President Biden walked in and shut the spigots off in America—sure, there is production going on from previous leases that happened under previous administrations, including President Trump, that was driving the price down. But when he walked in day one and said no to the Keystone pipeline—in other words, no to Canada's oil but yes to Russia's oil—that had an impact on price.

When he said no to Federal drilling, which then he expanded to all drilling, any new permits—sure, the stuff that is going on out there is still going on, but there is no new investment being made in America. It is being made in other countries, including Russia, including OPEC nations. Because of that, they are able to control the price because they are cartels.

We had literally taken the monopoly away from OPEC and Russia when we were producing enough and using the resources of this great Nation, by the way, in a much more energy efficient way than anywhere else in the world. We were reducing carbon emissions in America while producing our own energy, while manufacturing more in America. The more things are shut down here, they are being made in other places, and those other places emit more carbon.

China is building a coal plant probably every single week. China emits more carbon, probably five times more carbon, to make many of the same things we make in America.

So the less we make here, it is still being made; it is just being made in other countries. They get the jobs, but they also emit more carbon. So, as people talk about carbon emissions, don't leave that point out because it is an important point.

Again, it was President Biden himself who asked Putin to produce more oil, just last year. The oil produced in Russia has a higher carbon price than made here in America.

And it makes us less secure. It makes Putin more strong. It gives him hundreds of millions of dollars a day that we can take off the table.

I think that would be very unifying if we had that debate and said: Can we get an agreement on some of these provisions that would actually strengthen our country?

Even if Russian wasn't invading Ukraine, it would be smart American policy. It would reduce carbon emissions. But especially considering what is going on in Russia, this is much more pertinent today to have this discussion. Again, I think it can be unifying.

Just because right now we may not see eye to eye, I think there is a way to see eye to eye on this if we actually had that debate and looked at it from a global perspective, not just in a silo in America because, again, there is a global market for oil. Carbon emissions are global.

The countries that are taking the things away that we are shutting down here in America emit more carbon. It is a fact. Why shouldn't we be talking about that, too, and, frankly, taking away the leverage that Putin would have?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

First of all, the Speaker just announced, minutes ago, she is opposed to importing any oil from Russia. So the comment I just made to the gentleman, if you are trying to project that we want to see Russia advantaged by any expenditures we have on imports, now the Speaker has said exactly what I just said. We are not for that. Okay?

There are 26 million acres right now available and unaffected, as I understand it, by any of the constraints that you have talked about, available for additional drilling. There are 11 million acres, so that is 37 million acres currently available for production of additional product in the United States of America, right now.

So the red herring of somehow President Biden is constraining the production of oil in this country, as I understand it—now, you are much more aware of this because you come from a producing State and, obviously, are focused on this.

But the fact of the matter is, I am told that these 37 million acres are unaffected and are ready for production right now.

Now, the debate we have, Mr. Whip, is about what kind of fuels we ought to be using. You talked a lot about carbon emissions. Scientists tell us that carbon emission is a danger. As a matter of fact, the Department of Defense, the Pentagon, testified when asked, "What is the greatest threat to America's security?" some—I think it was last year; it may have been the year before that—said global warming. That is what they said.

Right now, we have an immediate challenge. Nothing you suggest will affect that immediate challenge beyond the Speaker and I both telling you we agree, and I hope the President pursues this: No money to Russia, period. No buying of Russian products.

Now, the gentleman mentions that, oh, he urged Russia to produce more energy last year. Why did he urge that? He urged all OPEC nations to produce more energy. Why? Because he did not want Americans to pay more at the pump. I think that is a policy you would probably support, trying to keep prices down.

With the oil cartel, when you constrain supply, what happens? Demand doesn't diminish because people have to drive to work; they have to get their kids to school; they have to get home. Demand stays steady.

What happens, inevitably, when supply is constrained and demand stays where it is or it goes up, prices rise.

Yes, you are right, the President stands accused of trying to get more supply on the market to bring prices at the pump down.

But we do have a fundamental disagreement, and frankly, we ought not to be talking about it now. We had an energy bill that most of your side did not vote for. We get that. There is a legitimate difference of opinion of where we ought to invest our dollars. We believe we ought to invest our dollars in renewable energy that will be there for some time and does not pollute our air, increase our heat, and make our storms worse for the safety of our globe and our people for decades and centuries to come.

But, we do agree that we want to stop Putin.

Now, the reason I pointed out Trump, because Trump didn't stop Putin. He regaled Putin: He is my friend. I know him. We can get together.

Putin is a thug. He is a criminal thug. He is an international criminal. I think we all agree on that. And it doesn't help for the former President of the United States to tell the world I think their guy, this criminal, this thug, is smart, or in Pompeo's words, brilliant and our guy is dumb.

Our guy is not dumb. He is very smart. I have known him for 50 years. He may disagree on policy, but that is not because he is dumb. He has a different perspective.

Very frankly, he is not withholding money from Zelensky. He is making sure Zelensky gets money.

Trump tried to hold hostage money for Ukrainian security that we appropriated because we wanted early on to make sure that Zelensky and the Ukrainian people had the resources they needed. Mr. Trump withheld them. Now, ultimately, he paid them out, after it was disclosed—after it was disclosed.

We are going to continue to differ on energy policy, but don't mislead the American people when you have 37 million acres available for additional production unaffected by the restraints that you talk about. He is talking about new stuff.

So, my friend, let's focus, in this instance, at this time of crisis, on how we can make sure that America is perceived as unified and of one mind, as we did right after 9/11 and as we did yesterday.

But we abandon that very quickly in this polarized society in which we are living. We need to be unified, and we need to be honest with the American people. It is not going to be cost-free because neither Biden—and Biden, by the way, is urging the Saudis to increase production and others to increase production.

But as the gentleman knows, we far outstrip any of those nations in the production of energy and oil. China, a country that is three times, four times our size, four times our size, is producing 25 percent of what we produce.

America is producing a lot of energy. It did so under Obama. As the gen-

tleman knows, energy production in the country rose during the Obama years. It rose during the Trump years. And it still is at a high plateau.

The only thing I would say to my friend, the whip: We have differences on energy policy. We ought to discuss those. That is an honest difference of opinion. I want to be energy independent.

I hope you heard the President talk about Make It In America. All of my colleagues rose and sort of pointed at me because I have been talking about making it America, which is producing energy as well, for a good period of time. I started the Make It In America agenda in 2010 and have been talking about it every year since.

We need to be energy independent, and we can use energy as an element of foreign policy and strategic policy as well, which is why the Speaker said, just minutes ago, as I said to you, we ought not to be buying oil from Russia, period.

Mr. SCALISE. As we talk about this energy policy difference, again, I do think it could be unifying. I do think we can get to a point where we recognize some of the impediments that are real today. While the President says Make It In America, there are things that President Biden is doing that are blocking the ability for us to make it in America.

Again, I have talked about some of the regulatory agencies that are making it very hard even on some of those lands the gentleman references that could be open for production where they can't because they reinstated some of the things like WOTUS and some of the other regulations that were removed so that States could look at the ability to permit applications where now they are not able to do that, where banking systems, through Treasury, through the SEC, are blocking financial institutions or bullying financial institutions to not allow investment by American banks into American production of energy.

It is real. It is going on. It is a problem. And it is why many of those energy companies are making their billions of investments in other countries right now.

□ 1145

Again, when you have John Kerry, the President's global warming czar, just the other day saying he hopes Russia helps us with this.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman clarify when he says, "just the other day"?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, probably about 4 days ago, where he was talking about getting energy production addressed and some other things addressed. We shouldn't have a strategy that involves Russia helping us right now or Putin helping us right now.

So don't give Vladimir Putin that leverage. He has leverage. While Nord Stream 2 is blocked today, Nord Stream 1, the original Nord Stream

pipeline, is still operating, providing over 40 percent of Germany's energy. That was what President Trump was critical of Merkel about, why are you signing contracts that make your country more dependent on Russia? He said that verbatim. He was right back then. Germany probably wishes they wouldn't have done it today because they were hamstrung in the beginning of this. They are now helping, but they are also dependent on Russian oil.

We should be looking at things that we can do to not only wean ourselves off of Russian oil but our allies around the world. There are real specific things we can do and there are impediments in this country today that exist that are unnecessary, that are hurting our ability to shut down Russia's ability to use energy as leverage. They are doing it right now. They are using it not only as leverage but as a financing source. Putin still is pocketing over \$700 million a day by selling oil to Europe and America.

If there are things that we can come to an agreement on that would address it, I think it would be important that we do it as fast as possible to take away those points so that Putin has to think twice about continuing what he is doing, this barbaric genocide that is happening in Ukraine.

So just saying that while it might not be something we recognize as unifying today, I think it could end up being something unifying in a short period of time, if we can keep working through those differences. I would just encourage that we try to do that.

If there is anything else on that, I would yield, but there is one other issue I wanted to raise as well.

The Senate just a few days ago passed unanimously a resolution asking to open up the Capitol again to the American people, our constituents, who still are not able to come to the Capitol to visit with Members of Congress, to sit in the gallery, to participate even in the State of the Union. It was a unanimous resolution in the Senate.

There is a companion resolution by Congressman STEIL that was filed, H. Res. 961, that would do the same thing and express from the House side what the Senate just expressed, that it is time to open the Capitol to the public again. The Senate Republicans and Democrats came to an agreement to do it. I would just ask that we do the same and show the American people that the people's House is open to the people of the Nation. If the Senate can come to an agreement on it—again, I don't think there is anything controversial in the resolution, but I would ask that we would bring that up as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that question. The answer to it is the Office of the Attending Physician and the Sergeants at Arms in both the Senate and the House are looking at that, both from a health

standpoint and from a security standpoint.

I think all of us agree that the American public's access to the Capitol ought to be as fulsome as possible, given constraints of health concerns and of security concerns. So I join the gentleman in saying, as I have said to the press, as soon as we can do that responsibly, we ought to do it. I agree with the gentleman.

I want to add something that is of great concern to me. I hope we have agreement in this House, and I hope we have agreement in the United States Senate. I have been shocked, deeply saddened, when your party passes a resolution and tells the American people that January 6 was legitimate political discourse.

If we are telling people in this country that January 6 was legitimate political discourse, we are going to have great concerns about opening up this Capitol for the safety of our Members, for the safety of the public who wants to visit, and for the safety of our staff.

I would ask my friend; does he believe that January 6 reflected legitimate political discourse?

I was shocked, astounded, that a major political party in this country would tell the American people what they saw on January 6 was legitimate political discourse.

Will he please reject that concept, reject that conclusion, that what they saw on January 6 had anything to do with legitimate political discourse.

Yes, I want to open up the Capitol, but I don't want to make any representation to the American people, Mr. Speaker, that what happened on January 6 bore any resemblance to what we as Americans believe is legitimate political discourse.

Rightfully, Senator MCCONNELL and former candidate for President of the United States, MITT ROMNEY, rejected that out of hand. I would hope you and your party would do so on this floor and tell the American people, yes, we want to open up this Capitol, but do not delude yourself that anything you saw on January 6 bears any resemblance in any way to legitimate political discourse.

I had not brought that up, but I am constrained to do so as we talk about opening up our Capitol.

Tuesday night, we were an armed camp. You saw it, I saw it, we all saw it, the fence around the Capitol, men and women with automatic weapons, both military and civilian, because of what happened on January 6, because of the concern they had for the safety of our democracy and of the ability of the President of the United States to come and give a State of the Union address to the assembled Members of the Congress of the United States and the United States Senate. That is why all of that was there.

Very frankly, inexplicably, the Republican Party's national committee passed a resolution, apparently overwhelmingly, that told the American

people that January 6 was legitimate political discourse.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have been very clear from the very beginning, anyone who broke into this Capitol ought to be held accountable and is being held accountable. More arrests have been made than probably all of the cities where people were burning down cities across America in the summer. That is something that ought to be addressed, and the Democratic Party doesn't want to talk about that. They just want to talk about January 6.

These resolutions are not about January 6. It is allowing the American people to exercise their First Amendment right to come and meet with their Members of Congress, which they are not able to do right now.

If you look at that resolution, the head of the RNC even came out and said that is not what they were referring to, what the gentleman just alluded to. They said they were talking about the people who weren't even in the District of Columbia on January 6 who are being targeted right now. That is what they said that they were doing. Go take that up with them.

I have been clear about what has happened to the people who broke into this Capitol and that everybody who breaks the law ought to be held accountable, not just the people who broke in here on January 6, but also people who burned the cities down over the summer of 2020 who haven't been held accountable. That is something that angers people all over the country. They want to see the law equally carried out for people who broke the law, no matter where they were, here or in cities across America.

If you want to criticize one side of it, at least be willing to criticize the other side of it, too. I surely have. I haven't heard it from the other side. I would be more than happy to hear the gentleman talk about people who were shooting at cops, killed cops, beat up people in streets, burned down police stations, government buildings in cities, took over cities, and haven't been held accountable. Shouldn't they also be held accountable? I say both should be held accountable. Does the gentleman agree with that?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the equivalency that my friend from Louisiana tries to make between citizens, some who committed crimes, but citizens who are acting because they are seeing their children's lives taken because of the color of their skin and what happened on January 6 to undermine our democracy, our Constitution, and our election of a President of the United States, reflects the resolution the Republican National Committee passed, legitimate political discourse.

They weren't talking about the people—some people saw, obviously, the President incite those people to come from where that political discourse, that discussion—which sounded like incitement to me, maybe not to you—and

they came from the White House, at the President's instruction, Mr. Speaker: Go down to the Capitol, stop the steal, give them hell, fight like hell. Instructing the Vice President of the United States to do what the Vice President of the United States concluded was illegal, not within his power, and they came into the Capitol calling for the life of the Vice President and the Speaker of this House.

There is no equivalency. But they continue, Mr. Speaker, to make that equivalency, to justify what was done on January 6, that, oh, well, everybody does it. No, they don't. It is the first time in history that it has happened.

The whip and I are talking about what I think we both want to do, open up this Capitol, make it more accessible, have people come in, gun free, weapon free—come into this Capitol and see their democracy in action. That resolution was read by the American people as, oh, it is okay, legitimate political—there was nothing about January 6 that was legitimate political discourse, including what the President of the United States had to say, at that point in time, Donald Trump. That wasn't legitimate at all.

Sixty courts determined Joe Biden was elected. He still, to this day, lies to the American people. Sadly, too many people believe him, which led to January 6 and the violence. I am sure that the whip believes they ought to be held accountable if they came in here and waved guns at people and killed a police officer. I appreciate that he said that.

If he believes, as ROMNEY believes, as MCCONNELL believes—MCCONNELL didn't say they were talking about the people talking in political discourse, should we do this, should we do that. MCCONNELL responded to that resolution exactly as I have, understanding exactly what it meant, inexplicable.

Very frankly, if we are going to open up this Capitol, we need all of us to tell every American we are opening up the Capitol to peaceful—sure, political discussion; that is what this place is all about. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this discourse is about, differences of opinion, how we resolve them, how we reach consensus, how we hopefully bring people together. But not by waving racist flags, not by hanging a gallows in front of the Capitol. That is not how we do it.

We ought to all, all 435 of us, reject it out of hand. We should not in any way try to make it look like, well, some other people did this, and some other people did that, and, therefore, it is okay.

They attacked our democracy, our Constitution, this country. They were traitors. We ought to all reject that kind of conduct out of hand, not try to rationalize it with some other group did this and some other group did that, people with grievances.

The Constitution does not guarantee being able to shoot at people, police or nonpolice. It doesn't justify destroying

property. That is criminal activity. I agree with that 100 percent. And no city was burned down. A little bit of hyperbole there, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1200

Were there things done that shouldn't have been done? Yes. Were there things that shouldn't have been done and things that happened on this Capitol? Yes.

But January 6 was not analogous to any of those things. It was an attempt to undermine our democracy, our Constitution, and the election of the President of the United States by this Congress in approving what we should have no discretion in one way or the other. That is what lawfully is done in each State when they send their electors here.

What President Trump kept asking Mr. Pence to do was ignore the votes of the American people, ignore the lawfully elected electors and the result of their deliberations.

Mr. SCALISE is my friend. He is a good man. A famous quote says that nothing is necessary for the spread of evil but that good men do nothing. And that is why I tell my friend I was so appalled at the rhetoric of that Republican National Committee resolution and what it says to people around this country who may have a grievance, who may be angry.

As Senator MCCONNELL interpreted it, the resolution was speaking to what happened on January 6, whether it was at the White House and incitement, whether it was at the White House and deployment, or whether it was here in execution of what was clearly a coordinated effort to prohibit the Congress from carrying out its constitutional duties. Expressed and acted out.

So I say to my friend in conclusion, I didn't mean to get into this today, but your questions obviously spurred my feeling about this because, yes, we want to open up the Capitol, but I don't want to give any citizen the thought that the Capitol is being opened so they can come in here, threaten the lives of a Vice President, threaten the lives of a Speaker, threaten the lives of the minority leader or the Republican whip or any others of us.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican whip is my friend. He was badly injured by a criminal who may have been deranged or whatever, but no excuse, who attacked him because he was a Republican. Totally unjustified. Totally heinous in its execution. The whip has shown extraordinary courage, Mr. Speaker, in coming back. I know it has been hard. It has been tough for him, and all of us admire him for the courage he has shown in coming back, and we condemn in the severest terms any kind of action that would have put him or any other of our Members, our staff, or the visitors to this Capitol at risk.

We are considering it. We want to open it up. The American people ought to have access to their Capitol.

Mr. SCALISE. Just again, we condemn violence of all kinds: Political vi-

olence, people that just commit violence because they want to or they think they can get away with it or they think somebody will bail them out if they do it. But we should do it across the board, and the punishment fits the crime. The laws are on the books. It is the prosecutors who go after the people, and they are in some instances. It should be in all instances.

I will continue to call it out on both sides. I would hope on the other side we hear that as well, not just when they see it in one place, but when they see it in all places, and I would hope we would open up the people's House and get the Capitol back open to the American people who want to and have a right to come and express their views on issues.

They might want to send an email, they might want to make a phone call, but they also might want to go to the office and sign that log book and try to sit down either with the Member of Congress or their staff to convey their feelings, and we just hope that happens. Again, the Senate unanimously said they want that to happen. I would hope the House would do it, too.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE REQUIRES ACTION

(Mr. CASTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, "climate change effects are outpacing our ability to adapt." That is from the recent IPCC report.

Here is what that means in America in 2022:

We have coastal communities where flooding has washed out roads before the bond used to pay for that road was fully paid off.

We have mayors with no budget for seawalls who are being forced to tell their constituents that the only solution is for them to abandon their homes and their businesses and relocate to higher ground.

NOAA reported recently that sea levels in Florida will be 18 inches higher by 2050. What that means is that there are properties in Florida today that will be underwater before their 30-year government-backed mortgage is fully repaid.

What happens in your community when that happens, if voters are told they have to abandon their home, or that their town can't connect them back to their grocery store, or that their local bank has to write down Federally backed mortgages? We know the political pain that that drives, and we know what measures are necessary to protect American families from that pain.

Yet my Republican colleagues in the Senate, who claim to be so focused on the economy, are withholding their confirmation for new Federal Reserve appointees because they have the temerity to suggest that we should not