

Price (NC)
(Manning)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Sires (Pallone)
Stanton
(Huffman)
Suoizzi (Beyer)

Swalwell
(Correa)
Taylor (Van
Duyne)
Tenney
(Jackson)
Titus (Pallone)
Trahan (Stevens)

Wagner
(McHenry)
Walorski
(Bucshon)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)

Suoizzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)

Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Boyle, Brendan
F. (Neguse)
Brooks (Weber
(TX))
Brownley
(Kuster)
Bustos (Mrvan)
Cárdenas
(Correa)
Carter (TX)
(Weber (TX))
Costa (Correa)
Crist
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Davids (KS)
(Neguse)
Davis, Danny K.
(Beyer)
Doggett (Beyer)
Evans (Beyer)
Garcia (IL)
(Takano)
Gohmert (Weber
(TX))
Gomez (Huffman)
Gonzalez (OH)
(Meijer)
Guest
(Fleischmann)
Johnson (GA)
(Manning)

Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Katko (Moore
(UT))
Kelly (IL)
(Neguse)
Krishnamoorthi
(Neguse)
Lamb (Neguse)
LaMalfa
(Valadao)
Lawrence
(Stevens)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Lieu (Beyer)
Long
(Fleischmann)
Loudermilk
(Fleischmann)
Mace (Carter
(GA))
McEachin
(Beyer)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo
(Fleischmann)
Payne (Pallone)

Peters (Jeffries)
Pingree
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Porter (Neguse)
Price (NC)
(Manning)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Sires (Pallone)
Stanton
(Huffman)
Suoizzi (Beyer)
Swalwell
(Correa)
Taylor (Van
Duyne)
Tenney
(Jackson)
Titus (Pallone)
Trahan (Stevens)
Wagner
(McHenry)
Walorski
(Bucshon)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—221

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans

Feenstra
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath

McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Lee (CA)
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gibbs

NAYS—204

Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)

NOT VOTING—4

Armstrong
Casten

Garcia (CA)
Zeldin

□ 1156

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei
(Balderson)

Bergman
(Stauber)

Blunt Rochester
(Brown (MD))
Bonamici (Beyer)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5828

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 5828.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The gentleman's request is accepted.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1735

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 1735.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

□ 1200

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2374

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) as cosponsor of H.R. 2374, the Peace and Tolerance in Palestinian Education Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the House majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, before I start on the colloquy and go through the schedule, I was just talking to the Republican whip, my friend, Mr. SCALISE. We were talking about a friend of ours, his name is John Bresnahan; he is

a reporter. He has covered Capitol Hill since 1994, I believe, is the note I had. He is an excellent reporter.

He reports the facts. He reports the truth. As I know Mr. SCALISE agrees, reporters who do that not only serve us, but more importantly, their major purpose is to serve the American people because we know that a free press telling the facts and the truth to the American people give them the opportunity to make solid decisions for our democracy.

I wish John Bresnahan a happy 60th birthday, and hope that he has many, many more. I have had 23 more than that, so I appreciate the fact that he is still going strong.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the confession about how many 60th birthdays he has shared. Here is to many more for you, but also for Bres.

As the gentleman points out, a fair and free press is vital to democracy. It is the First Amendment to our Constitution: freedom of speech and freedom of the press. While they might not report our press releases verbatim all the time—as we might like them to—they serve a vital purpose. Bres is one of those that we see in the halls, like the press that is around here making sure that the country knows what is happening here in the greatest democracy of the history of the world.

As a 60th birthday gift to him, I promise not to sing “Happy Birthday” to him. I wish Bres a happy birthday, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to tell Mr. Bresnahan that he made the same promise to me, which is why we did this. If he was going to sing it, I was a little reluctant to do this, and he didn't. I join the whip in wishing John Bresnahan, a friend, a very careful and honest reporter, the very best 60th birthday and many more to come.

Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

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

Madam Speaker, on Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

On Monday, we will be celebrating Juneteenth as a Federal holiday for the second time in American history. Juneteenth is the day on which the last slaves who were in Texas learned of their new status as free Americans, an extraordinary day in the history of our country, eliminating one of the great blights on the history of America. As de Tocqueville pointed out, we tried to heal our wounds and tried to heal our wrongs, and we are still working on that.

Last year, the Congress took the historic step of enacting legislation to recognize Juneteenth as a Federal holiday, at long last. I look forward to

celebrating as we pay tribute to freedom to all men and women being created equal in the image of God. We celebrate the history of the African-American perseverance and triumph over injustice and adversity.

I say triumph—it has been a triumph—but there are battles yet to be won. Juneteenth not only looks back but it looks forward to winning those battles.

Madam Speaker, I see Mr. GREEN on the floor, who has a resolution on the recognition of the blight of slavery. I thank him for that resolution and look forward to having that considered.

On Monday, we will be celebrating that holiday, but we will be celebrating it as we do Martin Luther King's birthday, as we ought to be in celebrating Washington and Lincoln's birthday, and committing ourselves to the realization of the principles for which they stood.

Madam Speaker, the House will consider bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of those suspension bills will be announced at the close of business tomorrow.

Next week, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 7666, which is titled Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act, a bipartisan package of bills led by Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member McMorris Rodgers, to address the mental health and opioid abuse crisis.

The legislation expands access to treatment for opioid use disorders, promotes behavioral health integration, and reauthorizes critical programs to support mental health and substance use disorder, prevention, treatment, and recovery, including in our children.

Madam Speaker, the House will also consider legislation under suspension from Chairman BOBBY SCOTT and members of the Education and Labor Committee to address the mental health, addiction, and suicide on college campuses, which is far, far too prevalent.

Our young people have faced stresses by the pandemic, stresses within our Nation, the divisions on which prey on their minds, so this is a very important piece of legislation. I hope it will be—and I believe it is going to be—bipartisan.

The House will also take up H.R. 6411, the Veterans Affairs' Committee Chairman MARK TAKANO's STRONG Veterans Act, again, bipartisan legislation to combat veterans' suicide and address mental health, and help our Nation meet its commitment to those who risk their lives and safety for our country.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 5585, Representatives Eshoo's ARPA-H Act. This legislation would establish the Advanced Research Project Agency for Health, an independent agency tasked with accelerating biomedical innovation and making transformative breakthroughs in the fight against the most challenging diseases confronting our people.

This agency will oversee the next steps in the Cancer Moonshot program and help meet the President's goal of cutting the cancer death rate by at least 50 percent over the next 25 years, and hopefully sooner.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Pride Month, the House will consider H.R. 4176, the LGBTQ Data Inclusion Act.

Madam Speaker, I anticipate that the House will vote on a compromised, bipartisan Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring Our PACT Act, after the Senate takes action on the version agreed upon in May. As the whip knows, that Act was a bipartisan act that dealt with those who were exposed to burn pits and other toxic substances of which they did not know while they were serving on bases, both here and around the world.

This bill, we believe the Senate will take action on, a version agreed upon in May, which preserves much of the House-passed legislation to care for veterans exposed to burn pits and other toxic chemicals during their service.

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

□ 1215

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that update. As we celebrate Juneteenth next week, also right here in this House Chamber over 150 years ago is where the 13th Amendment to the Constitution was debated and passed. So history is made here on a regular basis. And then we celebrate the freedoms that result and continue as our Founders talked about to aspire towards a more perfect Nation so we will do that next week.

I do want to thank the gentleman because last week during this colloquy I know I asked my friend if we could bring the Supreme Court protection bill, the bill to make sure that Supreme Court Justices and their families get proper protection, as we were watching and saw a man arrested for trying to murder a Supreme Court Justice. Leader MCCARTHY, I know, urged that as well. So I appreciate that we got to bring that bill up, debate it, and quickly pass it to President Biden's desk where we can get that in place.

I would hope that the Attorney General, Merrick Garland, would start enforcing 18 U.S. Code 1507 to give protection properly as Federal laws dictate, but it is not being enforced at the homes of those Justices. But, again, I appreciate that we got a very overwhelming bipartisan vote on that bill this week.

Does the gentleman have anything to add before we talk about the schedule for next week?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

I would simply observe, as I observed the other day, that we all want to make sure that our Justices are safe.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, there is a very important reason for that. We want to keep all our people safe. But nine Justices of our Supreme Court represent that we are a nation of laws. They are one of the three branches of our government. Just as I was extraordinarily concerned about the attack on this institution, the Congress of the United States, as we were preparing to elect a President of the United States, an attack on the Supreme Court and the lives of the Supreme Court Justices are an attack on our democracy, on a separate branch of government that is charged with continuing to make us a nation of laws.

So, very frankly, the Supreme Court Justices, under existing law, were protected. There were security people there. Luckily, there were security people there. But the gentleman is absolutely right. We want to make sure whether we agree or disagree with the individuals, whether we agree or disagree with the opinions or the judgments that Congress makes, we are a nation of laws, and the way to resolve our differences is not through violence but through the democratic process.

I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. SCALISE. I share those comments by the gentleman from Maryland.

As we look towards next week—we have had this conversation a number of times—one of the items I don't see on the agenda is an item to address the problem of high gas prices, and, of course, we have now crossed an average of more than \$5 a gallon. It is a major burden for families, especially lower-income families who are being forced more and more to make those tough decisions of can they even afford to drive to work, and can they even afford to drive to see their doctor or to drive to the grocery store where they are paying maybe 20 percent more for some of the food items.

We have had a bill for over a month now, H.R. 6858, that would address these problems and allow us to actually have more control over our own energy production in America, to be able to drill in America for energy to lower the cost of gasoline, by confronting so many of the problems that this Biden administration has imposed that are making it hard for us to produce more energy in America to the point where you now have President Biden announcing that he is going to go to Saudi Arabia to beg them to produce more oil.

As we try to confront this challenge—and again, H.R. 6858 would allow us to do that—if you look at President Biden's proposed trip to Saudi Arabia, the President likes talking a lot about carbon footprints, carbon emissions, and global warming.

Why would the President get on Air Force One and fly 5,700 miles to Saudi

Arabia to beg them to do something that we can do right here in America?

In fact, he could go less than 1,000 miles to Port Fourchon, Louisiana, in my district where they can produce hundreds of thousands of barrels a day in America which, by the way, because America has the best standards in the world, would emit less carbon than the oil produced in Saudi Arabia.

While the President will be flying over to Saudi Arabia, he won't know the answer he is going to get. They are an OPEC nation. They typically support a limited supply of oil because they want a higher price. So he doesn't know what the answer is going to be. He is going to fly 5,700 miles over and another 5,700 miles back to the United States. There are no solar panels on Air Force One, so that is going to be a lot of jet fuel and a lot of carbon emissions to do something that he could pick up the phone and call Port Fourchon. We would love to see him down there, but he can call them. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, the answer would be "yes."

They would say: Yes, we will produce more energy here in America.

But they are not allowed to right now because of limitations put in place by the Biden administration. So while we push to get this bill, H.R. 6858, brought forward, it really begs the question of first: What is the carbon footprint of President Biden's trip to Saudi Arabia?

But why even do this trip? Why go to Saudi Arabia and ask them to produce oil when we have it right here?

It is President Biden's policies that are stopping that oil from being produced, and, by the way, at a much lower carbon footprint than anything that Saudi Arabia, Russia, Venezuela, or any of those countries would produce if it were their countries meeting the demands of our Nation and so many others.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman, hopefully, to see if we can get the bill scheduled for next week.

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

We continue to talk about this as if this were the President's fault. First of all, in a much wider range, this is a result of the pandemic.

Why is it the result of the pandemic?

Not solely the pandemic but let me take the pandemic first. Everybody stayed home—this body and businesses across America.

What did that mean that they stayed home?

They stopped buying gas.

What did the oil companies do?

They shut down some of their production, a very substantial reduction in production. But then as the prices went up, they were making as much money or much more money. So in making much more money, they didn't increase production, as the gentleman says will be an answer to the question, in a country that does, in fact, have regulations and does have rules, and

because of those regulations and rules the production of our energy is, in fact, as the gentleman asserts, more efficient and more environmentally considerate.

The oil companies—acting from what they thought was good business practice, demand was down, but prices were going up—were making profits. They bought back stock, which, of course, increased the value of the stock that remained. They increased dividends, which, of course, encouraged people to invest in them. It made people happy about their investments.

But they didn't increase production. They didn't have to increase production. They were making good profits and making, from their standpoint, good business decisions.

As I indicated in the last colloquy that we dealt with this problem, there were millions of leases put on the market by this administration, as I recall, some 80 million acres. Approximately 2 percent of the leases were bid on, and then the Court said that this was not a legal process.

But it is interesting how small was the interest in additional production at that time irrespective of what happened subsequently.

The gentleman mentions a bill, as he has done in the past, H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

But before I say that, let me say, I hope the President is going to Saudi Arabia to talk privately, not publicly trying to embarrass or harangue, and certainly not to beg. The United States of America doesn't need to beg any nation in the world, and this President is not begging anybody.

This President should say, however, Madam Speaker: Saudis, stop controlling the supply unreasonably and driving the prices up of your product.

Yes, they are making more money, and they have a cartel. That is called a monopoly. That cartel has made sure that the lack of supply drove up the international market price. And then Russia went to war.

Now, Russia going to war has affected to some degree the supply of oil, but, very frankly, buying Russian oil supports their criminal war effort, their vicious and murderous war effort. We are all against that. So we agreed that we would not take any oil, and we urged our European allies not to rely on it either.

Now, what did that create?

It created a lack of confidence in the stability of the market.

What happens when you have lack of confidence in the stability of a market?

Prices go up because it is a bet on what is going to happen with the price of that product in the future that the market really reflects.

Now, the reason I say it that way is because these are not Biden prices. Even if tomorrow we snapped a finger and said: "Okay, go ahead," nothing would happen tomorrow, nothing would

happen next week, and nothing would happen next month. It would take a substantial period of time because the oil companies, based upon the lack of demand, shut down, nor did they pursue further production.

Now, let me say something about the price of oil. The national price of oil now does not reflect the increase as part of the market response to what is called the West Texas Intermediary, which I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana, an oil-producing State, knows much more about than I do.

But let me say this: In 2008, that benchmark for crude oil peaked at \$147.02 in July of 2008. Adjusted for inflation, that is \$199.57 today.

In that time, 2008, the average U.S. gasoline peaked at \$4.14 per gallon. Adjusted for inflation, that would be \$5.62 today.

So, in other words, in 2008, otherwise known as the last year of the Bush administration, gasoline prices were higher than they are today notwithstanding the fact that the world price was \$31 less.

Excuse me, yesterday, June 15, that West Texas Intermediary oil—the benchmark for crude oil prices—was \$116 a barrel, \$31 less, without accounting for inflation, which would make it greater than it was in 2008. That wasn't George Bush's fault. It was the international market's fault and also this cartel that controls a large part of the supply of the oil in our country.

Now, my point—I still have to deal with H.R. 6858. One of its tenets is to approve the Keystone pipeline. The problem with that is, for whatever reason—and I understand my friend will have a response, Madam Speaker, as to well, because you disapproved it, meaning the Obama administration. They want to open the Keystone pipeline. The problem is the company that had the Keystone pipeline has abandoned it. Even if it were approved, they would have to get back in business and we would be well over a year—well over a year.

Now, I happen to have agreed that we should have approved that pipeline. I have said that publicly. I said that to the press. That didn't happen. But it would not solve the problem. And particularly, when you look at the figures that I just gave with respect to the world market price, we are paying a lot more now than we did in 2008 when it was higher.

So I would say to my friend, he also had a provision that expedites the LNG facility approval process. One of the problems we had is 20 percent of the LNG export capacity is now shut down.

□ 1230

It was shut down because the regulations that the gentleman speaks of, correctly, were not followed, and the LNG plant had an explosion. It shut down because it violated regulations that were imposed upon it.

What I would say to my friend—I have talked to the committee about his

bill. The LNG process is working. As I told him, I have an LNG export plant in my district, which has changed from substantial exports to the Pacific region, and now, 80 percent is going to Europe to try to bridge that gap as the Europeans retreat from being dependent upon Russian oil.

I tell my friend, with all due respect—and I am not going to plead with him, but I am going to suggest to him—we are going to Saudi Arabia, I hope, to tell them in private: Look, this is not a game you want to be playing. You are making our consumers pay far more.

We have acted. We acted, and we passed, some time ago, a bill that said you cannot have gas prices that are set at unreasonable levels, which we know as gouging. It is like you have a flood in your city and 80 percent of the grocery stores are wiped out, and the grocery stores that remain triple their prices. That is called gouging. We passed that bill.

We also passed a bill today which, unfortunately, most Republicans voted against—"most," I say, not all—which will, again, seek to bring the price down at the pump. How? By utilizing American products to supplement and expand the supply of gas and, we believe, bring the price of a gallon down some 40 cents—that is what the experts say—if we continue to use a mix of fuel.

But let me say in closing, on these remarks, which I know have been relatively lengthy, we are in this together, Republicans and Democrats.

FOX News criticized me for saying we are at war. We just sent a billion dollars for a war we are not in because we believe in freedom. We believe in international law.

We believe that we have a dictator, a dangerous dictator, who is committing war crimes through his men and women in eastern Ukraine in particular and did it in western Ukraine as they came into Kyiv.

We are in this together, one Nation, one America, on behalf of freedom. We have taken tough action. As part of that, we are paying the price at the pump because of that invasion.

The pandemic shut down production and shut down the purchase of gasoline by people because they didn't go to work. They didn't need to get in their cars. They didn't need to commute.

I would simply say to my friend that we are on the same team. Our President is leading our effort to defeat this despot, to stop this war, to ensure the freedom not only of the Ukrainian people but of all people, and to ensure that we respect international law.

I looked at the gentleman's bill. I would be glad to talk about other ways, including maybe some of the things that are in his bill. But I will tell the gentleman, the first couple that I looked at, the Keystone pipeline is not going to be reopened. The gentleman and I may lament that as a policy because I was publicly, during the

Obama administration, for the approval of that pipeline. So, I am prepared to work with the gentleman to see what we can do.

But we have done today's bill. It may not be perfect. It may not work. But it is certainly worth a try, to try to bring these awful prices down at the pump because I know all of our constituents, whether they live in Louisiana or Maryland, are struggling because they have to use their cars. They have to use that gasoline. They don't have an alternative. And they don't have an alternative to buying food.

Both of those are tough, and we need to act together to try to see if we can solve that problem in the context of an extraordinary pandemic, a historic pandemic that shut down the world, and we are just trying to get back.

We are trying to get supply chains going, including gasoline pipelines, which is why the President is going to Saudi Arabia, not to beg, but to assert the economic fact of the ramifications of the cartels stifling supply.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, if there is common ground we can find on the components of H.R. 6858, I would be happy to help facilitate that negotiation because there are a number of very specific items in that bill that address the shortfalls, the deficiencies, the inability to produce energy in America. The Keystone pipeline might be one of the more well known.

President Biden, on his first day in office, canceled the Keystone pipeline.

Of course, it is not moving forward because he canceled it. It would provide a vital supply of oil from our friends in Canada that we wouldn't need from other people.

But there are a number of other pipeline issues. No new pipelines have been approved in the country. You have to have an ability to move energy around the country if we are going to be able to produce our own.

If a conscious decision was made in the White House that they don't want any pipelines, because that impedes the ability to produce energy in America, it just means we have to import more of it from other countries. Whether it is Saudi Arabia, Russia, any of them that I would not want us to have to get it from, it is going to come in some form. It might be a tanker. It is going to get here, and it is going to have to be put on rail or an 18-wheeler if it can't be put in a pipeline.

Let's get more pipelines produced, LNG export facilities. There are multiple, at least four, LNG export facilities that are sitting on the desk over at the Department of Energy ready to go. These are multibillion-dollar, privately funded projects that can't move forward because they won't move, yes or no, on those requests that have been pending for over a year.

Obviously, you look at leases, not being able to develop your lease. If you are a farmer and you own land, you could talk about all the thousands of acres of land, but if you need a permit

from the Federal Government to plant food and the Federal Government won't give you a permit to plant the food, then you can't use the land. The land is worthless.

You own leases on Federal or State lands, but the Federal Government, through President Biden, said you can't get permits to go and exercise that lease. Then the lease is worthless.

There has been a lot of talk by the White House about who to blame. By the way, I have never heard of President Biden pointing the finger at himself or looking in the mirror and going, is there something I can do? We have a list for him that he can do, and he won't.

But Joe Biden, as a candidate for President, has said things like this multiple times since being President: "No more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore. No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period." That was Joe Biden.

Then, Joe Biden continued to carry out policies that followed through on those promises to kill drilling in America, and each step of the way, the price kept going up.

Prior to Putin's invasion—I know the President loves trying to blame Putin. Well in advance of Putin's invasion, the price of oil was going up. In fact, the President was—whatever terminology you want to use—pleading with, begging, asking Putin to produce more oil prior to the invasion of Ukraine. That was who Joe Biden was asking back then as he was carrying out his promise, "No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period."

He only applied that, by the way, to America. He was asking other countries to drill. He was just saying you can't do it here. Putin said no, by the way.

In the meantime, Putin was making \$700 million a day selling his oil to America and Europe during that period when President Biden was carrying out all the steps to stop drilling in America.

Then you fast forward. The price keeps going up. President Biden, again, doesn't look in the mirror.

The gentleman mentioned they blamed the pandemic. That didn't fly because that wasn't the case because people started getting out again, started going again.

Energy companies asked to start producing again and filed permit after permit application and got denied and denied and denied, so then the President blamed the oil and gas companies. They had hearings up here, brought in all the oil and gas companies.

Do you know what the oil and gas companies said under oath? They want to drill more, and they can't drill because of President Biden's policies. It is President Biden's policies stopping them from drilling.

Again, if the oil and gas companies or Putin were the reason that there was this inability, and President Biden, as he has done multiple times, blamed

them, if they were the reason that they had this shortfall, he would continue to be blaming them. But he knew the public wasn't buying it because it wasn't them, so he just blames more people.

Then, he goes to price gouging. As the gentleman pointed out, there was a bill here on the House floor a few weeks ago to try to shift the blame over to price gouging, and the answer was to allow you to sue your local gas station if you didn't like the price of gas.

Well, none of us like the price of gas. Suing your gas station is only going to make the price higher. Obviously, that had no impact because that wasn't the reason. But that was the answer and the attempt to try to blame somebody else.

Then we moved forward, and it is all of these other issues—refineries. This week, the White House started blaming refineries.

While the White House keeps throwing spaghetti at the wall, trying to figure out if somebody else will take the blame, he is going to go to Saudi and ask them to help us lower the price. Saudi's ability to produce is irrelevant to the price if we produce in America because we have the ability to drive down that price because we are not an OPEC nation. We are not a monopoly. We are a free-market economy when the free market is allowed to operate.

But President Biden, through his promises—"No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period"—in essence, he took the free market ability for America to produce energy off the table, which means he gave that leverage to monopolies, to cartels. They are taking advantage of it because President Biden gave them that.

Instead of asking them to produce more when they are fine with the high price of oil, whether it is Brent, West Texas, it doesn't matter what it is. He has taken it off in America so that they can limit the supply.

Let's not limit the supply. Again, if it is about saving the planet, if it is about carbon emissions, why not produce more here? There is no country in the world that produces oil that does it cleaner or better than us.

If you take America off the table, as President Biden has done—"No more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore." That was Joe Biden. He took it off the table here. That means you are going to need oil from countries that emit more carbon to produce the same oil, so you get higher carbon emissions.

Again, that doesn't even count the carbon emissions that will occur when President Biden gets on Air Force One and flies over 5,700 miles to go have this conversation that he doesn't need to have because he can have that conversation right here in America at a place like Port Fourchon, where the answer would be yes, and it would be cleaner. And by the way, it would bring billions more dollars into America's Treasury. It would lower the price of

gasoline. It would create more jobs in America.

Every answer says yes, except President Biden keeps saying no. We want to address it through this legislation, which would counter some of those many things that President Biden has done to turn off the spigots in America.

If we can work on ways to confront this, I would be more than happy to have that negotiation, and we could go through, offline, how to do that. That is why I continue to bring up this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for all of that information.

It continues to befuddle me why our Republican friends would much prefer to blame President Biden and so avoid placing blame on Mr. Trump's friend, Mr. Putin. I don't understand that, Madam Speaker. It is not a nation indivisible.

Now, Madam Speaker, I used a statistic some weeks ago that I have heard not at all disputed. The Biden administration has approved more drilling permits on public land in 2021, in 1 year, than the Trump administration did each year during its first 3 years in office.

□ 1245

Not compared to the combined 3 years, just compared to each individual year. Number one.

Number two: Domestic oil production is greater today than it was under Trump. Not a whole big difference, 10,968 versus 11,185, but nevertheless, it speaks to the fact that the representation that somehow Biden has shut down the industry, and therefore, he is to blame.

We don't want to talk about the pandemic that shut down oil production. In Trump's last year—in Trump's last year—refineries in the U.S. reduced their capacity by more than 800,000 barrels. So, under the Trump administration, production was decreased.

Maybe they will look at the records and see whether or not that representation is accurate, and if it is not, I stand to be corrected. But those are the figures I have.

I notice that my friend did not respond to my representation that prices were higher under George Bush in 2008 than they are today. Now, because of inflation, the number is different, and compared to the world price, prices are higher.

So, I will say to my friend, we had at least 80 million acres, 2.5 million taken. As the gentleman pointed out before, the court said, No, that wasn't legal, so it was never effected. But we have those 800,000 that are not back online.

Don't blame them, though. Don't blame Putin. Don't blame the pandemic. Politically, let's blame Biden.

Now, I'm not sure why Bush had the higher price. Maybe it was that he was shutting down the oil business, the President from Texas. Maybe.

But there is more today being produced. Not by enough. Still, there are 800,000 barrels shut down. That is per day, by the way; not just 800,000—per day.

So we can argue back and forth on this. We are passing legislation. Our Republican friends, for the most part, voted against it. It won't work. It won't do.

I don't know whether they are right or wrong, but it is worth trying. It is worth trying because our consumers are hurting.

People at the grocery store—I go to the grocery store every weekend, Madam Speaker. I live alone. I don't buy a lot of groceries because they will go bad, so I go every weekend.

I see the shelves that are empty. I see the price of bacon has gone up now over \$10. I see the price of the eggs I get, the price of the half and half I buy, or the orange juice I buy. It is going up.

I am in the fortunate position where I can pay for it without it binding me someplace else. But I know that a whole lot of people that I see shopping, they have got that list out, and they are very worried about their costs.

I don't know whether this bill we just passed is going to solve that—certainly, not overnight. I don't know whether a month from now it will help somewhat, 5 cents or 10 cents on a pound of bacon or a dozen eggs.

I don't know that, but it was worth a try, and we passed this bill. We got some Republican support, including, I think, the ranking member of the committee that reported the bill out.

We are not technically at war, but we are spending a lot of money on behalf of freedom, and we ought to be together. We ought not to be carping about our President who is doing everything he can think of to try to get a handle on this, both on inflation, on the cost to consumers, and on the supply of a product that we all need.

So, I would simply make a request that let's work together to try to get this problem solved. Saudi Arabia is not the answer, but it is part of the answer. The cartel is part of the answer. The Russians are part of the answer.

Maybe none of them are the entire answer. But when you understand that this administration has given more leases on public land than the prior administration did in its first 3 years, it is hard to say that this administration is the reason for this. Other than politically, it is a very salient argument, but that is all it is.

Mr. SCALISE. Just for clarification, the ranking member voted "no" on the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Oh, okay. Sorry.

Mr. SCALISE. The 800,000 leases—and I know we talked about this before. You can have 800,000 leases, but when you need, then, permits to actually utilize the lease—so you have a lease to go and develop oil, but you need to drill. You need to do seismic. You need to build pipelines, infrastructure to move

it. If you don't get those permits to actually utilize the leases, the leases are worthless. That is what H.R. 6858 addresses. We have been raising that issue for a long time. The lease is no good if you can't, then, use the lease.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. What I said was, in Trump's last year, refineries in the U.S. reduced their capacity by more than 800,000 barrels. That didn't have anything to do about leases.

That had to do with an economic decision, which probably made sense because what happened is the economy was contracting.

Madam Speaker, 2.8 million net jobs were lost during the 4 years of Trump, and 8.7 million have been gained.

As they have been gaining, people are getting back in their cars. They are getting back and driving. They are spending on the economy. But what happened?

The pandemic had shut down supply lines. And the oil companies, rationally, when demand went down, they reduced capacity. They don't need a new lease to go back up to the 800,000. They were doing it under the present authorization that they have.

That was my point. It continues to be my point. The companies have made a decision and they are not moving ahead rapidly to try to get more production.

One of the reasons is—I get it—they are making a lot of money. Some oil companies have got 300 percent greater profits now than they had some years ago. 300 percent.

So, why do we need to do more product? We are making great money. Chevron says it had the most successful year in 2021 than it has ever had. It may be another oil company. I may be wrong on that.

Was it Chevron? I am asking somebody who probably knows the answer better than me. One of the oil companies reported that.

I am not criticizing them for that. What I am saying is, this is a multifaceted challenge that confronts us, and we ought to address it in a way that it deserves, and that is in a bipartisan way that will have effect.

I am going to work with the gentleman. As I said, I was for Keystone. I was not for shutting Keystone down. I was approving it to go ahead. I thought it made sense. Our friends in Canada have an extraordinary supply.

As the gentleman observes, though—interestingly, because I think many of your colleagues oppose those rules and regulations—it is cleaner. It is better for the environment to produce it here.

Why? Because we adopted regulations—either the administration adopted or we passed them in legislation, and very frankly, I think that many of those were opposed by—I don't know whether you, but many in your party, so it is better to do it here.

So I don't want to dispute that, but it is also necessary to have production, particularly among the cartel countries, and Russia has no interest—Russia has an interest in additional production.

Why? Because that is how they are funding this war. But we ought to spend time on criticizing Putin and his war and the crimes that are being committed in his name in Ukraine, and our determination to make sure the Ukrainian people who have displayed extraordinary courage, and Zelenskyy, who has displayed extraordinary leadership, make sure they know that we are focused on them. And we are focused against Putin, not our own President, any more than I did when, you know, George Bush was President.

Very frankly, I supported, as the gentleman probably knows, the trade bills. I thought it was good to do business. A lot of our people didn't support him on that. I supported him on that.

So I think we need to be not so critical of our President. We have one President at a time. We had a pandemic. It wasn't on his watch we got a pandemic. It was on his watch that we got a handle on the pandemic.

On his watch, he has been giving more access to public lands than his predecessor did. We can debate the nuances of differences, but we ought to focus on why we have this crisis.

The gentleman knows these prices in many ways reflect the confidence and the stability, or the lack of confidence and the lack of stability in the market, and the war directly relates to that issue.

Mr. SCALISE. Obviously, we will continue to debate this. Hopefully, we will debate it over H.R. 6858 where we can actually be talking about how we work together to solve the problem.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, Congress did come together, Republicans and Democrats, to give our friends in Ukraine the tools to go and push Putin out of much of Ukraine and, hopefully, all of Ukraine.

We will continue to stand with the incredibly strong, resilient people of Ukraine in standing up to Vladimir Putin.

We will, hopefully, have this debate further as we are talking about the legislation that we would like to bring.

Unless the gentleman has anything else—Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge Juneteenth, which on Sunday, will be celebrated for a second year as a Federal holiday.

Now, on June 19, 1865, news of the end of slavery finally reached Galveston, Texas, more than 2 years after the