

ever, this technology cannot function without semiconductors, without these chips.

Just one example is, look at the Javelin missiles that we are sending over to Ukraine to defeat the Russian Federation invasion. Each one of these Javelin missiles that the Ukrainians are using to such good effect requires more than 200 semiconductors in just one Javelin missile, and so far we have sent 5,500 of them to Ukraine.

But it is not just these big items that need chips, it is things like the helmets that our fighter pilots use to fly and navigate; communications devices like radio sets to call in reinforcements to save American lives; smart hand-held cameras that attach to our troops' gear that see around the corners to keep them out of harm's way; and even advanced body armor uses semiconductors.

If we ever needed to deploy the full force of the U.S. military and ramp up production to replenish our supplies, we would need an astronomical number of semiconductor chips.

That is why bringing that manufacturing capacity back onshore, back home to America, is so important.

This had been a big bipartisan priority, as I said, for the last couple of years, and this isn't the first time that semiconductors have been regarded as a matter of national security.

Interestingly, in the 1980s, it was a big priority item for President Reagan. At that time, our country was up against the Soviet Union's expansive military forces. President Reagan knew that maintaining our edge would be a result of smarter military systems, not just bigger ones or more of them.

As two national security and foreign policy experts from the University of Texas put it, "Reagan didn't merely outspend the Soviets, he . . . sought to out-innovate them" as well.

He pushed to maintain our competitive edge in chips, thereby helping us lead in the advanced weapons and airframes that they enabled.

But this isn't just about what happens tomorrow or 6 months from now; we are talking about safeguarding the developments that will underpin our national security in 10, 20, or 30 years. That is why so many people from diverse political viewpoints support this effort.

As we all remember, the CHIPS for America Act received broad bipartisan support when we first voted on it. It was adopted as an amendment to the annual Defense authorization bill by a vote of 96 to 4. Ninety-six percent of the U.S. Senate supported the bill.

Since it became law a year and a half ago, we have heard from a range of voices and stakeholders who don't typically align.

For example, former USTR—U.S. Trade Representative—Robert Lighthizer, who served in the Trump administration, has been a vocal advocate for chips funding.

At a Senate Finance Committee meeting 2 years ago, he said semiconductors are a key part of our economy as well as the future of American security.

Biden officials have shared this same sentiment. The Secretaries of Defense and Commerce recently sent a letter to Congress urging swift passage of this chips funding, saying it is "an imperative to our national security."

Countless organizations, experts, businesses, and industry groups have expressed the same point of view. Some of the most respected men and women in the national security world wrote a letter to Congress urging quick action on this funding. That group included a former Secretary of Defense, former CIA Director, and former Director of National Intelligence.

We have also heard from the National Governors Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which represents State and local leaders across the country.

We have heard from groups that represent automakers, the defense industry, consumer electronics, and telecommunications companies as well.

Last month, a group of more than 120 tech CEOs sent a letter to congressional leaders urging quick action on this legislation.

It is rare, especially today, to have such a broad consensus from so many different perspectives on a single issue advocating one priority, but that is how important this legislation is.

I am optimistic about where we are at the moment after 2 long years of getting here, and I am glad Speaker PELOSI has said the House will take up the Senate bill as early as next week.

The bottom line is, there is a lot at stake here, and I hope we can deliver a major win for our national security in the coming days.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### ENERGY POLICY

MR. MARSHALL. Mr. President, well, summer is in full swing, and all across the Midwest, people are preparing for lake vacations, for family barbecues, but new to this year's agenda, they are also preparing for Biden blackouts.

The shocking new inflation numbers show Americans already paying 42 percent more for energy than this time last year, but now, due to the White House policies, we may not be able to generate enough electricity to meet demand.

Now, let us not forget that under Republican leadership, we had a nation completely in control of our energy security. We were the global leader in energy production, and we were a net exporter of oil products.

However, under Democratic leadership, we are making plans for the lights to go out, and I hope everybody has their candles ready to go at home.

But it isn't this administration's fault, of course, so just ask them—just ask them. No, this White House states

they are powerless to the whims of a global marketplace, and don't bother asking them to own the consequences of their actions.

Did President Biden actually believe canceling the Keystone XL Pipeline on his first day in office would not have negative effects on the global energy markets? Think about it. The United States, the largest oil producer in the world, stopping the transport, the importing, of nearly a million barrels a day, over 5 percent of our supply—who could have ever predicted decreasing supply could impact the cost at the pump?

And who could have predicted that halting all leasing on Federal lands would impact global supply? I even asked the Interior Secretary if this policy made it more difficult for oil companies to drill, and she couldn't give me an answer. She didn't care. This administration doesn't care about the cost of gas at the pump; that is, until they get it high enough to make driving electric cars more comparable.

Don't even think about implying that John Kerry, Biden's climate envoy at COP26, would cause private companies to take coal-powered plants offline and eliminate baseload without a plan going forward. After all, he said in Glasgow:

By 2030, in the United States, we won't have coal. We will not have [any] coal plants.

Well, we may not have coal, but we will have blackouts.

And it was Joe Biden on the campaign trail, in his own words—I am sure you all remember—who said:

Kiddo, I want you to just take a look . . . I want you to look into my eyes. I guarantee you, we are going to end fossil fuels.

And we wonder why Americans won't invest tens of millions—hundreds of millions—of dollars into this energy sector to drill new oil. Yet this President has declared war on American energy, and every American is paying the price at the gas pump. And yet this President wonders out loud why companies won't invest in any more exploration when it takes 5 or 10 years for a payback on these types of investments. He continues to create uncertainty.

It doesn't have to be this way. Republicans have been sounding the alarm on the negative impacts of this administration's policies since President Biden took office. Honestly, this should be surprising to no one. Yet the left seems confounded, stupefied, and without a plan except to turn off your air conditioner and your freezer.

Even more, they have resorted to outright lies. In fact, they repeat these lies over and over, hoping America will eventually fall for them. They repeatedly claim they have not been interfering with American energy production and now deceptively spout they support the industry that they have been vilifying for years.

It is clear, we need more traditional fuel production. I know it; the American people know it. And to be completely clear, I think the White House knows it as well.

Why else would he have gone overseas to Saudi Arabia to beg for more oil? Why is the White House reaching out to dictators in Venezuela or countries that sponsor terrorism like Iran instead of supporting American production in places like my home State of Kansas?

When I asked the Secretary of Energy in committee about the price of gas, she cheekily replied that she drives an electric vehicle. This is the same Secretary of Energy that laughed and found it "hilarious" when asked about her plan to increase oil production in America. That is how this administration responds to the pain of the American people: laughing as they ride away in their fancy electric vehicles.

All that said, I truly hope that those of us forced to experience a Biden blackout are able to get safely through it. For many, a short-term blackout might prove a mild inconvenience. But with the seasonal heat waves we are seeing across the State of Kansas, across this Nation and the rest of the Midwest, it could lead to life-threatening complications. These Biden blackouts show that it is well past time for the President to stop the climate extremism, stop the anti-American policies devastating our communities, and stop looking overseas to fix problems that we have the answers to right here in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I hear from families in Louisiana every day that they are struggling to keep up with gas prices at historic heights. It is becoming unaffordable to drive to work or drop their kids off at school. The 15-year-old pickup that they drive—not because they don't want a new car but because they cannot afford a new car—now costs \$100 a tank to fill up. And for those who say: Tell them to buy an electric vehicle, that is the modern-day equivalent of Marie Antoinette saying to the peasants "Let them eat cake."

Families are forced to choose between buying groceries or buying gas. And the Biden administration doesn't seem to be listening, so I am here to make their voices heard.

Let me just read from letters we received from constituents, just kind of like sending us a line. Here is Lorrie from Jamestown, LA.

Dear Mr. Cassidy, Is there any relief in sight for gas prices? We had affordable gas under the Trump administration. There is no reason we should have these prices now if the oil and gas production in the United States was in full force. Why would we ever depend on other countries for anything when we have already been energy independent just a short time ago? Families in our country are suffering.

Next letter, Gwendolyn from Prairieville:

Dear Senator Cassidy, please do whatever it takes to get American oil and gas used as resources. I am a divorced 60-year-old woman on a limited income. Gas has gone up, elec-

tricity has gone up, groceries have gone up, medical expenses have gone up, and insurance has gone up drastically, and my pay has not kept up at all.

Here is Donnis from Singer:

Dear Senator Cassidy, I just wanted to voice my opinion about how it makes no sense that our government will not renew oil leases off the coast of Louisiana . . . There is no reason we need to be held hostage by countries who do not care about our sovereignty.

This is Philip from DeRidder:

Please help with these high gas and food prices. I am retired and on a fixed income and these higher gas prices and food prices are starting to hurt me and my wife.

Here is Gregory from New Iberia:

This is not about party affiliation. We're coming into a bad crisis. Both parties need to come together and talk about drilling. We have all the resources we need to start drilling again, and I know you are trying. I see it on the news. Please keep trying.

Here is Laura from Vinton:

I want to express my concern for us Louisiana citizens. Gas prices are rising every day, food prices are rising everyday also. It's coming down to having to choose between to get gas or get groceries. Something needs to be done. U.S. citizens are suffering daily. Please help us Americans!

Here is Daryl from Mooringsport:

As your constituent, I urge you to publicly call for and vote in favor of the immediate and permanent expansion of domestic oil and natural gas production. No more Green New Deal nonsense. Energy dependence is driving higher gas and diesel prices that are causing skyrocketing gas and food prices. We can't rely on Iran or Venezuela to save us. We need to produce our own energy here—in America—and NOW.

Lastly, Karen from Gretna asked:

Why are we importing any oil? Energy independence is of vital importance to us and our national security. Louisiana was a leader in domestic energy production. It is shocking to see how quickly our country has changed. Please continue to work on our behalf to force our government to reinstate the energy independence policies that were in effect during the Trump administration. Speak loudly for us.

Speak loudly for us.

Speak loudly for us.

What these letters make clear is that Americans are hurting. That is why I call for an Operation Warp Speed to lower the prices at the pump, to unleash American energy, and to regain our energy independence.

President Biden needs to stop prioritizing far-left climate activists over the families sitting at the dinner table asking what they have to give up next in order to make ends meet.

President Biden, as one of my constituents says, needs to go where real people live.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, that whole concept of going where real people live is an important one. When people are facing higher utility bills every month and a bigger bill every time they fill up their gas tank, it doesn't take long for them to figure out that

policy decisions somewhere have changed something—and something that really dramatically affects their quality of life. And then it didn't take long to figure out that those policy decisions in Washington are the decisions that made that kind of difference.

When a blackout causes the lights to go out and your refrigerator to stop working, the impact of energy policy becomes pretty tangible and you understand pretty quickly that this is impacting you. That is a prospect that a lot of Americans are facing this summer. It is not theoretical, but in too many places, it is happening and happening over and over again.

In late May, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation released a report that said that nearly two-thirds of the United States could experience blackouts this summer as a result of reliability challenges of the electric grid. Now, that group is a non-profit regulatory authority that monitors the grid in the United States and Canada and some of northern Mexico.

They could see this coming and Americans can now see this happening. They said that it was sobering. They said that it was an understatement, really, in many ways, to see it any other way. The understatement is, in particular—and the report said—that in the West and the Midwest, there was a heightened risk of reliability challenges and energy shortfalls.

This report on the electric grid cited several reasons for heightened risk people are facing. One of them is that there is simply too little electric-generating capacity in the middle of the country where I live following the closure of older baseload generators. You can't make these decisions about energy policy without having a replacement in mind and not expect to see bad things happen to families, to individuals, to our economy. And that is what we are seeing now.

Earlier this year, the Energy Information Administration projected 85 percent of the generators closing this year would be coal-fired power plants.

So, if you close these plants and don't have a replacement in line, look what happens. Maybe we should ask Germany what happened when they shut down one of their major energy sources without having a replacement. Before you know it, they were dependent on a source of energy and a kind of energy and a country to get that energy from that didn't work out at all.

From day one, the administration has advanced policies to restrict the production of affordable and reliable American energy. We have gone from being a net exporter of energy to an importer—in fact, even a pleading importer of energy—in an unbelievably short period of time.

Electric prices in that period of time have gone up nearly 20 percent. Gasoline prices have more than doubled. If you are at the gas pump and you fill up your tank, whatever you are paying, cut that in half. That is what you

would have paid under the policies just a couple of years ago. Now you are paying 107 percent more than you were paying then. The push of a rapid transition to renewable energy sources will cause prices to go up even higher. We have already seen what happens. We should be able to figure out what happens if you do more of it without a plan.

What the administration wants to do here doesn't have to be painful. Transitioning from fossil fuels over a period of time doesn't have to be a painful thing. You just have to have a replacement in mind. You have to understand the economic consequences and understand, if your timeframe is right, there are no economic consequences.

Fossil fuels accounted for just over 60 percent of the electricity generated in the United States last year. Nuclear power generated nearly 20 percent of the electricity; wind, 9 percent; hydro-power, 6 percent; solar power was about 3 percent. When you dedicate yourself to eliminating 60 percent of the electricity generated in the country, you have got to expect that bad things are going to happen, and they are.

We are seeing what happened with reliability challenges in California in its leading the way in this transition. But last summer, the State was doing everything they could, as quickly as they could, to build gas plants, natural gas plants, to supplement its power and to avoid blackouts. You went from plenty of power to new sources of energy and then, suddenly, to not enough power and then back to fossil fuels to desperately try to replace the power.

Surely, we can learn that this doesn't have to be the way you make these realistic transitions from one way of powering things to another. Just to replace every vehicle in the country with electric models would require 25 percent more electricity than we produce today. Forcing the electrification of homes and buildings will drive demand even higher and will cost more. Families will suffer.

For now, all of the above still works. For the long term, we have to find out what works for all Americans and how we may have reasonable energy policy moving forward. All of the above is serving us well. As we move from that, we need to know what we are moving to, how we are moving there, and how we can do it with the least impact on the economy, on individuals, and on families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to join my colleagues here in an important discussion as it relates to American energy.

My colleague from the great State of Missouri said it well in so many different ways: Now we are pleading with dictators to import more energy. That is one element of what, certainly, has been the Biden administration's most

colossal, strategic mistake of its entire first year in office. Trust me. There have been a lot of mistakes on the Biden administration's watch. There has been nothing that has undermined American interests in terms of working families, in terms of skyrocketing inflation, in terms of national security, in terms of energy security, and—yes, I am going to talk about it—in terms of environmental policy for America and the world. Nothing has been more harmful to America's interests and the interests of American working families than the reckless policies of the Biden administration's approach to American energy.

I have talked about this issue a lot because a lot of those policies are zeroed in on my State and my constituents, but as many have already said and as Senator BLUNT has already said, it can be summed up, in my view, in kind of four key areas.

No. 1, from day one, they have come in and said: We are going to limit the production of American energy.

That is happening. It is certainly happening in Alaska. On day one, the President made an order on ANWR. We got ANWR done in this Congress, but he shut that down, and they are canceling lease sales. As for the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, they are taking half of that off the table. Everywhere you look, they are trying to limit the production of American energy. That is a fact. It makes no sense, but it is a fact. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is the slow rolling and killing of energy infrastructure, the ability to move energy through pipelines or LNG terminals. They are stopping it, slow rolling it, or killing it. That is a fact, OK? That is what they have been doing from day one.

No. 3, they are going to the American financial community—John Kerry, Gina McCarthy, and all of these far-left, crazy, policy folks—and saying to American banks and insurance companies: Don't invest in American energy.

This is choking off capital to this incredibly important sector of the U.S. economy. When they are not doing that, they are appointing senior officials—just think Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, the SEC Chairman—who are undertaking policies to choke off capital to the American energy sector. That is happening.

No. 4, when they have seen prices spike and hard-working American families paying hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars more to get to work in their cars or trucks, the administration is going around, begging dictators for more energy production.

This is an insult. We have the highest standards with regard to the environment and American energy production in Alaska and in other places. Do you think the Saudis care about their environment? Do you think the Venezuelans care? Do you think the terrorists in Iran care? They don't, but the administration is going and begging dictators for more energy.

So those are the policies of the Biden administration on energy, and we all know it is not working. It is having the predictable consequence of driving up energy costs on all American families—and, of course, giving pink slips to American energy workers, who I believe are heroic workers: union workers and others—and empowering our adversaries. So that is what is happening.

Today, the President is in Boston, so I want to talk about a couple of policies—energy policies—emanating from people and the communities of Boston that further show just how irrational the far-left Democratic Party is on energy.

Let me first talk about this issue, which I like to trot out a lot, on this chart. This is a factual chart of emission changes from major economies in the world from 2005 to the present. You don't hear about this a lot, but take a look. Take a look at this chart.

What does it show?

Of all of the major economies in the world, the one economy with the biggest reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is America, the United States of America, by far. Take a look. We have reduced emissions since 2005 by almost 15 percent. EU didn't do that. Germany didn't do that. Japan didn't do that. And here you go: In China, there is a new coal plant every couple of days, it seems. In India, it is the same thing.

Why am I bringing out this chart? A, people need to know that we are the leader; we are not the bad guy. I know John Kerry keeps thinking we are the bad guy; he goes around telling everybody we are. We are not. If every other country in the world had emissions profiles like we had, you would see a much, much cleaner and less emitting planet. That is a fact. So let me talk about a couple of these policies.

John Kerry, the climate envoy, has been reported as going to certain countries in Asia, saying: You know, we really don't like hydrocarbons in America, so don't buy any of that American LNG.

What? We are paying this guy's salary to say that? Whose side is he on?

By the way, exporting clean-burning American LNG to places like India or China or Japan is exactly what we need to do to reduce global emissions. So you have got this one guy out there—and I am not sure why he is being paid by the U.S. Government; he should be paid by the Chinese Communist Party Government. There are recent press reports that John Kerry's private jet—that he flies all around the world on—last year, emitted over 300 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>.

What? Yes.

Look, he is smug, hypocritical, and his policies are hammering the middle class—and now this. John Kerry is one of the single biggest polluters and greenhouse gas emitters in the world for an individual.

In Boston, one of the best things the President can do today is to either fire John Kerry or ask him to resign. That would be great. That would probably do a lot for climate in America.

Let me give another policy that should be raised in Massachusetts.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this Boston Globe editorial—a very long one—from February 12, 2018, be printed in the RECORD. It is called “Our Russian ‘pipeline,’ and its ugly toll.”

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial: Boston Globe, February 12, 2018]

#### OUR RUSSIAN ‘PIPELINE,’ AND ITS UGLY TOLL

To build the new \$27 billion gas export plant on the Arctic Ocean that now keeps the lights on in Massachusetts, Russian firms bored wells into fragile permafrost; blasted a new international airport into a pristine landscape of reindeer, polar bears, and walrus; dredged the spawning grounds of the endangered Siberian sturgeon in the Gulf of Ob to accommodate large ships; and commissioned a fleet of 1,000-foot icebreaking tankers likely to kill seals and disrupt whale habitat as they shuttle cargoes of super-cooled gas bound for Asia, Europe, and Everett.

On the plus side, though, they didn’t offend Pittsfield or Winthrop, Danvers or Groton, with even an inch of pipeline.

This winter’s unprecedented imports of Russian liquefied natural gas have already come under fire from Greater Boston’s Ukrainian-American community, because the majority shareholder of the firm that extracted the fuel has been sanctioned by the US government for its links to the war in eastern Ukraine and Russia’s illegal annexation of Crimea. Last week, in response to the outcry, a group of Massachusetts lawmakers, led by Senator Ed Markey, blasted the shipments and called on the federal government to stop them.

But apart from its geopolitical impact, Massachusetts’ reliance on imported gas from one of the world’s most threatened places is also a severe indictment of the state’s inward-looking environmental and climate policies. Public officials, including Attorney General Maura Healey and leading state senators, have leaned heavily on righteous-sounding stands against local fossil fuel projects, with scant consideration of the global impacts of their actions and a tacit expectation that some other country will build the infrastructure that we’re too good for.

As a result, to a greater extent than anywhere else in the United States, the Commonwealth now expects people in places like Russia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Yemen to shoulder the environmental burdens of providing natural gas that state policy makers have showily rejected here. The old environmentalist slogan—think globally and act locally—has been turned inside out in Massachusetts.

But more than just traditional NIMBYism is at work in the state’s resistance to natural gas infrastructure. There’s also the \$1 million the parent company of the Everett terminal spent lobbying Beacon Hill from 2013 to 2017, amid a push to keep out the domestic competition that’s ended LNG imports in most of the rest of the United States.

And there’s a trendy, but scientifically unfounded, national fixation on pipelines that state policy makers have chosen to accommodate. Climate advocates, understandably frustrated by slow progress at the federal level, have put short-term tactical victories against fossil fuel infrastructure ahead of strategic progress on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and so has Beacon Hill.

They’ve obsessed over stopping domestic pipelines, no matter where those pipes go, what they carry, what fuels they displace, and how the ripple effects of those decisions may raise overall global greenhouse gas emissions.

The environmental movement needs a reset, and so does Massachusetts policy. The real-world result of pipeline absolutism in Massachusetts this winter has been to steer energy customers to dirtier fuels like coal and oil, increasing greenhouse gas emissions. And the state is now in the indefensible position of blocking infrastructure here, while its public policies create demand for overseas fossil fuel infrastructure like the Yamal LNG plant—a project likely to inflict far greater near and long-term harm to the planet.

“ALL IS GLOOM AND ETERNAL SILENCE,” wrote a 19th century English traveler in an awestruck account of the Kara Sea, then still a largely uncharted domain of ice floes and fog. Though more powerful vessels and melting ice have enabled more human activity in the Arctic, the area around Yamal, an indigenous name meaning “edge of the world,” remains a refuge. An estimated 2,700 to 3,500 polar bears live in the Kara Sea region, along with the ring seals that form a crucial part of their diet.

Opening a gas export facility in such a harsh environment required overcoming both political obstacles—the US sanctions delayed financing—and staggering triumphs of industrial engineering by a workforce that reportedly reached 15,000 people. Dredgers scooped away 1.4 billion cubic feet of seabed to make room for the ships and built a giant LNG facility on supports driven into the permafrost, all in temperatures that can plunge to less than minus 50 degrees Fahrenheit.

The oil and gas industry poses serious threats, especially in an area like the Arctic that recovers slowly from damage, and in 2016 the Russian branch of the World Wildlife Fund issued a report warning of Yamal LNG’s potential dangers. White toothed whales, a near-threatened species, breed in the vicinity of the facility, and the noise from shipping and the presence of more giant vessels “may force toothed whales to leave this habitat, which is crucial for their living, feeding, and reproduction.”

The giant “Yamalmax” ice breaking tankers, longer than three football fields and designed to mow through ice up to six feet deep, are also “extremely bad news for any ice-associated mammals that should be in the vicinity of their path,” said Sue Wilson, who leads an international research group based at the University of Leeds in the United Kingdom. The group has recently published a paper in the journal *Biological Conservation* on the impact of icebreakers on seal mothers and pups in the Caspian Sea and is currently studying shipping impacts in the Arctic.

“The captain is unlikely to notice—or even be able to see—seals in the vessel’s path ahead,” she said. “Even if the captain does notice, the fact that the ship is designed to proceed at a steady pace means that it is unlikely to attempt to stop for seals or maneuver around them, even if the ship can be slowed or stopped in time.”

Advocates also worry that increased Arctic production and shipping will hurt indigenous people; sever reindeer migration routes; import invasive species to an environment ill-equipped to deal with them; and introduce the very remote, but potentially cataclysmic, danger of an LNG explosion.

Finally, the gas pumped there will contribute to global climate change. In some parts of the world, especially China, LNG may provide climate benefits by displacing dirtier coal. If LNG displaces gas carried by

pipeline, however, the math works out differently: Liquefied natural gas generally creates more emissions, since the process of cooling it to minus 260 degrees Fahrenheit and then shipping and regasifying it requires more energy than pumping natural gas through all but the longest and leakiest pipelines.

“The bottom line is that because of the nature of the liquefaction process, LNG is fairly carbon intensive,” said Gavin Law, the head of gas, LNG, and carbon consulting for the energy consulting firm Wood Mackenzie. The exact difference depends on factors like how much pipelines leak, carbon impurities in the gas, age of equipment, and distance shipped, but generally LNG produces 5 to 10 percent more emissions over its whole life cycle from start to finish, he said.

From a planetary perspective, it doesn’t matter where those emissions occur: Whether from the plant in Yamal, or the power plant in Everett, they have the same impact. The science should make the state’s decisions straightforward.

“Natural gas has shown itself to be an important bridge to a clean energy future,” said Ernest J. Moniz, the former secretary of energy in the Obama administration. “For New England, expanding the pipeline capacity from the Marcellus”—the area of shale gas production in Pennsylvania—“makes the most sense.”

“Life cycle emissions for LNG imports to Boston certainly are higher than they would be for more Marcellus gas,” he said.

But the upstream emissions typically don’t show up on the books of states like Massachusetts, which judge the success of their climate efforts based only on how much greenhouse gas they emit within their own borders.

That’s an accounting fiction. But it’s a convenient one for lawmakers who’ve bowed to pressure to legislate based on what’s visible inside the Commonwealth’s own borders.

FROM MASHPEE TO SPRINGFIELD, Taunton to Sudbury, the message was clear: To fight climate change, the state shouldn’t allow more fossil fuel pipelines or other infrastructure in Massachusetts.

That’s what state senators Marc Pacheco and Jamie Eldridge, the heads of the state Senate’s Committee on Global Warming and Climate Change, heard when they conducted a listening tour of the state—whose results they released on the same day the Russian gas was unloading in Everett—to help prepare a new energy bill.

The resulting legislation was introduced this Monday. It contained many fine ideas, including boosting the state’s renewable energy requirements. But it also would raise obstacles to pipelines that would lock in the state’s reliance on foreign gas, with its higher carbon footprint.

In an interview, Pacheco said “Obviously any fossil fuel investments are problematic,” no matter where they occur, but that “we have no control over what happens in Russia or anywhere else in the world.” Eldridge said, “I think this bill takes a big step to preventing pipelines,” and also expressed concern about the LNG the state imports instead. “I think activists need to think about where a large amount of this gas is coming from, and that could be something the Legislature could take a look at” in the future, he said.

Theirs isn’t the first analysis to miss the larger picture.

In 2015, the Conservation Law Foundation, a prominent environmental advocacy group in Boston, released a report dismissing the need for new pipeline capacity in New England, and called on the region to rely on a “winter-only LNG ‘pipeline,’” “including imported gas, to meet its winter energy needs instead.

After the first shipload of Russian gas arrived, David Ismay, a lawyer with the group, stood by the recommendation and shrugged off the purchase of Russian gas from the Arctic as simply the nature of buying on the worldwide market. "I think it's important to understand that LNG is a globally traded commodity," he said in an interview with the *Globe*.

The foundation, he said, hadn't compared the overall greenhouse gas emissions from LNG to pipeline gas from the Marcellus to determine which was worse for the climate, nor had it factored the impact on the Arctic of gas production into its policy recommendations.

But a state policy that doesn't ask any questions about its fuel until the day the tanker floats into the Harbor abdicates the state's responsibility to own up to all consequences of its energy use—and mitigate the ones that it can.

WHEN AN ICEBREAKER BEARS DOWN on a mother seal during the springtime breeding season, the terrified animal tries to scurry away with her pup. The two may leave a trail of urine and feces on the ice, telltale signs of their distress. Even if the animals survive the collision, the disruption may separate the mother and pup, leading to the pup's death.

Conscientious companies can minimize the cruel realities of global shipping—or conscientious governments can force them to. American law, for instance, requires ships to maintain a safe distance from seals and walrus in ice habitats. Wilson, the seal researcher, also suggested that icebreakers can change routes to avoid known seal habitats, especially during the breeding season, and carry trained observers onboard to advise vessel captains and record any adverse impact, particularly on mothers and young.

The *Globe* attempted to contact Sovcomflot, the Russian state-owned shipper in St. Petersburg that handled the first leg of the first shipment from Siberia to Everett, about what policies, if any, it employs to avoid killing seals and other wildlife, and whether it would halt LNG shipments during the spring as mother seals nurse their pups in the Arctic.

As of Monday night, it had not responded to e-mails.

The policy of Massachusetts, apparently, is to hope that the Russians are on top of it—and that the world beyond the state's borders manages the impacts of fossil fuel production and transportation that the Commonwealth buys and uses, but considers itself too pure to handle itself.

As of Monday night, the next shipment of Russian gas was anchored about 70 miles off Gloucester.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Again, these are far-left policies that are having a negative impact on actual environment and climate issues. This is the Boston *Globe* editorial page, not some rightwing editorial page, and they are writing about how the Massachusetts State legislature said: We are not going to have any pipelines coming across Massachusetts to be able to take gas from Pennsylvania and let people in Boston use it.

Here is the editorial page on Massachusetts' reliance on imported gas. So what happens? They are importing all of their gas from Russia in the Arctic. How does that help America? You have American gas from American pipelines that is produced by Americans, with the highest environmental standards, coming across Massachusetts to Boston.

No. The Massachusetts State legislature says: We are too good for that. We are not going to build pipelines.

So what do they do? They import all of their gas from Russia.

This is an editorial that says: This policy is insane, and that is, in essence, the definition of what we are seeing by the Biden administration, by John Kerry, and by the Massachusetts State legislature—all of these woke pronouncements that actually have the impact of degrading our environment, empowering dictators, laying off Americans, and raising the price of energy on our economy, small businesses, and working families.

So I am hopeful that today, in Boston, the President starts to get serious about American energy policy and that he starts to reverse his administration's focus on shutting down the production of American energy, on permitting pipelines and infrastructure, and on helping to finance energy projects and production. That is the reversal he could make and announce today. That would help the American people. It would help my constituents.

Unfortunately, I think that it is unlikely to happen. The people of our great Nation are going to continue to suffer, and the environment is going to continue to suffer because of these policies on energy that undermine American interests everywhere you look.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, thank you for the opportunity to address you and my colleagues here on the Senate floor this afternoon.

While Kansans are dealing, Americans are dealing every day with skyrocketing gas prices, record-high inflation, and supply chain shortages. President Biden traveled to Saudi Arabia to make a plea for greater oil production availability. What he should be doing is asking Americans and giving them the opportunity to unleash the potential of our own ability to supply oil. We have seen days and we enjoyed the days in which America was generally energy independent, and it would be a wonderful day to return to.

My State of Kansas is an energy-producing State, and we could help increase supply and cut costs at the pump, but instead President Biden chooses our foreign adversaries for assistance. Kansas ranks 11th in oil production and 14th in the production of natural gas. Kansas is also the ninth largest ethanol-producing State. That industry supports over 115,000 oil and gas jobs in Kansas.

Our producers and our refiners stand ready to meet the growing demand for American energy. But since the first day in office and really before assuming office, the President has sought to constrain the oil and gas sectors' access to capital. I don't know how many times in the Banking Committee we were dealing with this issue of whether

or not a regulator could regulate financial institutions, with the goal of eliminating their ability to finance oil and gas production.

In addition to trying to limit access to capital, he blocked construction of pipelines and has proposed burdensome new regulations on oil and gas producers.

My guess is that this is done for the purposes of reducing the use of fossil fuels, the environment-climate agenda. But it is so hypocritical for us, as Americans, for President Biden to be asking others who produce oil to increase their production. If it is about the environment and about climate, you wouldn't ask anybody to increase their production. And I have no doubt that here in the United States, we do it right as far as refining oil and gas into other products in a way that is the most environmentally sound way of doing it compared to places like Venezuela, Libya, where the President also asked that they increase their production for the benefit of American consumers.

The thing to do for us to increase our energy production and reduce the price at the pump—and we talk about prices at the pump so easily. The cost of oil and natural gas has a consequence on things way beyond the price at the pump. It is not just about gasoline. Natural gas, for example, is used in the production of fertilizer for our farmers who struggle today, with the cost of production being astronomically higher than it was before, but almost every product that we buy that is more expensive today than it was previously has an oil and gas component to it.

The request by President Biden to reach out to our adversaries for oil on the world stage, appealing to our adversaries for increased production, not only singles out our weakness but is also unnecessary. The United States has the resources, the expertise, and the domestic demand to be an energy-independent nation, and Kansas has the opportunity to be a participant in that, with additional jobs and a better America.

We should see the impending energy crisis in Europe as a case study for why domestic energy production ought to be supported to the fullest extent in the United States. Additionally, our dependence upon energy from someplace else has huge consequences in our foreign relations, our military preparedness, and our national security.

A far more enduring solution than wandering around the world with a tin cup out—far more stable and affordable energy prices to fill our vehicles, power our homes, or to operate our farms—is for the President to support an all-out, "all of the above" domestic energy strategy. This includes investments in new and existing energy infrastructure like refineries; expanding oil, biofuels, and ethanol production; and new EV manufacturing—incidentally, although certainly not an incidental thing, like the \$4 billion Panasonic EV manufacturing plant we announced last week

for Kansas. We ought to be interested, again, in solar and wind energy. Kansas is the third highest producer of wind energy, wind power, in the United States.

The Biden administration must—I asked them to shift course and promote an “all of the above” strategy that produces more U.S. energy from all sources. It benefits America; it benefits the world; and it especially benefits the consumers who are hurting so much at the grocery store and the gas pump and utility bills.

We need to weaken our reliance on foreign adversaries, and we need to increase the production of energy in the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes and Senator DURBIN for up to 15 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am happy to come to the floor today to join my colleague the Senator from Alaska, Mr. SULLIVAN, as well as my colleague from Kansas, to talk about where we are with this administration or where, unfortunately, we aren't when it comes to prioritizing American-made energy.

As has been noted here on the floor by my colleagues, the President has just returned from the Middle East. It wasn't for a sightseeing trip; it was really all about oil. He was talking about oil. Above all, the President made that trip to ask the leaders of several foreign nations, members of OPEC, to increase their production levels.

OK, we get it. Gasoline prices are way too high. We know that. We have hit national records in recent weeks. They are averaging right now about \$5.32 a gallon in my State. That is actually down a little bit from where we were last month, but it is up over 50 percent from where we were last year.

As has been said repeatedly, and we don't need to say it here on the floor of the Senate, people are feeling it in their homes. They are feeling it in their pocketbooks. Families are. Businesses are. Whether you are in places like Anchorage or Fairbanks, your budgets are stretched thinner and thinner and thinner.

It is increasingly difficult for small tourist operations, whether you are trying to take people out on sightseeing trips in the air or on the water. Our fishing fleets have to fill up their fishing vessels. But especially, particularly, our outlying villages—these villages that are off the road system—that already faced high prices, now the prices are astronomical.

I met with some leaders from the Northwest Arctic Borough just a few days ago, and they shared with me that

in many of their communities, the communities were paying about \$5.25 on average. But these were prices that were locked in from last fall when the last fuel barge came into those northern waters and was able to make its way up the river systems. Now, with the first spring barge comes literally—literally—in 1 day going from \$5.25 to over \$8 a gallon. That is a lock-in price that they are going to be living with until that next barge.

Think about what that means when you are a community that is locked into these extraordinarily high prices. When that last fuel barge comes, you are going to have small villages that are going to be looking to see how much—not how much do we need to get through the winter but how much can we afford? They don't have much of a tax base. How much can we afford?

My theory is that they are only going to be able to buy as much as they can, and it is not going to be enough to get them through the winter. So halfway through the winter, in the darkest and coldest, when everything is locked in the ice, they are going to run out of fuel. And you have to be able to keep the heat on or everything breaks. So how do you get the fuel? You fly it in. Think about what those costs then become. So for us in Alaska, this is not only frightening, but it has the potential to just be catastrophic as we look at no end in sight for these prices.

I don't begrudge the President for meeting with world leaders. We expect him to do this. And I think it is a great idea to do what we can to increase supply to reduce prices. This is kind of the basics of supply and demand. I have championed this for years. Let's increase our supply. But the question is where that energy is going to come from. Where should we focus our time? Where should we focus our efforts? I think it just has to begin at home. It has to be here.

But apparently this administration has decided they are going to go elsewhere. They are going to seek oil from the Middle East. They are sending envoys to Venezuela. They are pushing for a weakened Iran deal, signaling that oil from the two worst regimes in the world could somehow come back online? This makes zero sense to me. It just makes no sense. Why would we do this? Why would we go abroad when we have the resources here? Why choose oil produced at low environmental standards, like my friend from Kansas just said? You are going to countries that have lower environmental standards and track records when it comes to human rights abuses, and we are just going to turn our eye to it? We are just going to close our eyes and say that is OK now? No, it is not OK.

Why? Why do we give fist bumps to leaders while sucker-punching the producers, the refiners, and the gas station owners in our own domestic industry? Unfortunately, that is what we are seeing. We are seeing that happen in my State. We have billions of barrels of

oil in our Federal areas. We have a world-class pipeline that is one-quarter full and a general refusal from the administration to help us do much of anything about it.

We can talk about the 1002 area, the largest untapped conventional oilfield in North America, is what is projected, but you are not seeing this administration pushing forward with that even though we mandated—even though Congress mandated this in 2017. Not a chance. They are not moving forward with that. They have halted all development—illegally, I might add.

But also take the 5-year plan, the proposed 5-year plan. It is long overdue. Now we are learning that the administration may not hold a single offshore lease through 2028. They are proposing a single sale in Cook Inlet in Alaska after canceling the one that was just supposed to have been held, suggesting that they are OK, they are somehow OK with crimping the only source of natural gas for hundreds of thousands of Alaskans.

Again, this direction just makes no sense to me. We need a course correction from the Biden administration. Even as we are moving forward in so many other initiatives, we need to have a strategic plan that assures that our own energy security—our own energy security—is addressed and also helping to improve the energy security of our allies.

I believe that we can do this without taking our eye off the ball of what we need to do to reduce emissions to address the challenges that face us when it comes to climate. But we have to acknowledge that the world has changed. There is still, though, no substitute or equal for American energy. So what we need is for common sense to prevail over wishful thinking. We need resource development here at home in places like Alaska and Kansas. They need to be our first and our highest priority. The longer it takes for that to happen, the greater the price that Alaskans will be paying and all Americans will be paying.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I was on the floor 2 days ago when the Republican Senate leader came to the floor and said something which I still don't quite understand, and I would like to refer to it in a statement.

#### CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion with respect to the Merle nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Not hearing an objection, it is withdrawn.

The cloture motion, on the nomination of Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, was withdrawn.