freedom to join a union is the most fundamental right afforded to all workers in this country.

Unfortunately, that right is constantly under attack by big companies that spend millions and millions of dollars engaging in intimidation and retaliation against those seeking to exercise their right to unionize.

What is worse is that companies are often allowed to write off the expenses for union busting from their taxes. You heard that right. All of us, the taxpayers of America, are paying for companies to intimidate workers out of joining unions.

This has to stop. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the No Tax Breaks for Union Busting Act, led by Representative NORCROSS because enough is enough. We need to make it easier in this country for workers to join a union if they choose to do so, and we certainly should not be giving tax breaks to companies to intimidate workers out of exercising that right.

LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY). Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) kindly take the chair.

□ 1220

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, with Mr. CLOUD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 28, 2023, 3 hours remained in general debate.

Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) will each control 90 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

My goal as the chair of Energy and Commerce Committee is to make sure Americans have access to affordable, reliable energy. This was a key promise in the House Republicans' ''Commitment to America,'' and we are hitting the ground running to deliver on that promise. This is just the beginning.

Energy is foundational to everything. For centuries it has driven human progress and development. It is why America has done more to lift people out of poverty and raise the standard of living than anywhere else in the world.

Today, over 3.7 billion people are living in energy poverty. That is half the world. They have a 10-year lower life expectancy, 35 percent fewer years of education, and many don't have electricity at all.

Here in the United States of America, we are blessed with the ability and the resources to continue to raise the standard of living globally and even lift people out of poverty.

Our goal today is to celebrate how our abundant energy resources have unleashed prosperity and invited people from around the world to come across the globe to America to achieve their hopes and dreams.

We have accomplished this as a leader in reducing emissions and with the highest environmental and labor standards in the world. We cannot afford to move backward with a reckless command-and-control so-called climate agenda that forces people to pay more and go without reliable electricity.

H.R. 1 prioritizes the American people over this radical climate agenda.

On his first day in office, President Biden started a war on American energy. Predictably, gas prices skyrocketed to the highest levels in American history. President Biden revoked the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline, imposed a moratorium on oil production on Federal lands, and directed agencies across the Federal Government to impose punitive and burdensome regulations.

As the American people suffered, President Biden turned to OPEC and Russia to boost supplies. In the face of Russia's aggression, President Biden looked the other way and green-lit the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, emboldening Russia to attack Ukraine. The CCP now is deepening ties with Russia and consolidating its control over more than 90 percent of the world's critical mineral supplies.

To win the future, we cannot allow our energy security to be surrendered to our adversaries. H.R. 1 sends the strong and unmistakable signal to restore American energy dominance and bolster our national security. H.R. 1 will unleash American energy, lower costs, and secure our supply chains. This package helps lift barriers to expanding our energy supplies, remove red tape for exporting and importing LNG, and build more pipelines with our North American allies and across the States.

It would repeal President Biden's burdensome natural gas tax, which will harm communities, shut down production, and raise prices across the entire economy.

H.R. 1 will encourage innovation and production of critical materials here at home to cut China out of our energy supply chains and ensure America is leading the world in innovation and next-generation energy technologies.

We have heard a lot of talk, and Democrats are forcing a so-called transition that requires the American people to suffer through supply chains and price hikes. What Republicans are offering through H.R. 1 is a commitment to energy expansion that will deliver on lower costs and reliable and affordable energy.

The fact is, higher costs are making life unaffordable for hardworking people in this country while forcing us to be dangerously reliant on Chinese supply chains that are dirtier and use slave labor.

I think about the farmer who told us that this so-called climate agenda is raising the cost of food and making it harder for farmers to feed our families; an advocate who shared with our committee that record-high energy costs hurt low-income and minority families the most; and the mayor of Midland who told us her community is thriving because of the investment in jobs the oil and gas industry brings.

We must embrace and expand America's position as the number one energy producer in the world while continuing our leadership to reduce emissions.

People all over this Nation are counting on us for a better quality of life. With H.R. 1, we will boost energy production, lift regulatory burdens for the construction of more energy infrastructure, cut China out of our critical material supply chains, and lower costs across the board. This is how we build a more secure future for Americans.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of H.R. 1, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1. The Republicans call it the Lower Energy Costs Act. In fact, it does the opposite, and it puts polluters over people, so we call it the polluters over people act. That is justified because that is exactly what it does.

This bill is nothing more than a grab bag of Big Oil giveaways and loopholes that endanger the health, safety, and security of Americans. It does absolutely nothing to lower energy costs for American families. In fact, it will actually drive up costs while doubling down on costly fossil fuels.

Now, does the GOP really believe that Big Oil cares about Americans?

During the COVID crisis in the last 3 years, we had a hearing where we brought in some of the large oil companies. It was quite clear that they wanted to keep prices high. It was quite clear that they were benefiting from OPEC and the fact that Russia had invaded Ukraine and that oil supplies had become more limited because of that invasion of Ukraine and that as a result, prices for oil and gasoline were going up. They didn't care. They liked it.

We actually asked them at the hearing whether or not they would increase

production because they have so many leases on Federal lands that they don't use, and they said no. They said maybe eventually they would do that, but they haven't gotten around to it yet. I don't think they have gotten around to it still.

So this notion that somehow by benefiting Big Oil, the major American so-called oil companies, that this is going to help the American people, that is not their goal.

Last year, Big Oil's profits in 2022 were $451 billion, a record high. The dividends they gave out and the stock buyouts amounted to $163 billion. They only care about the stockholders. They don't care about the price of gasoline. They want it to stay high. They don't care whether Americans can afford gasoline.

□ 1230

Chairwoman RODGERS, who I really respect a lot, talked about LNG. One of the things in the bill is it removes the requirement—and I am going to talk about other things it does—but it removes the requirement that liquified natural gas exports be determined to be in the public interest before being sent overseas.

That is going to lead to more American LNG being sent to our adversaries, including China. This helps China. This doesn't hurt China. This helps China. We know that there was a time a few years ago when LNG exports were limited because of—I forget what caused it—and during that period of time, the evidence shows the price for American gasoline or American crude was actually going down.

When you send LNG overseas, it is not available here in the United States. That actually lowers gas prices when you have more gasoline available or more refineries available to process gasoline here in the United States.

I debunk this idea that somehow this bill is going to lower prices here, that somehow benefiting Big Oil benefits Americans, that somehow exporting more LNG hurts China. These things simply are not the case. The evidence proves very much to the contrary.

This bill, H.R. 1, I will call it the polluters over people act, rescinds several transformational climate programs that the Democrats enacted as part of the Inflation Reduction Act last year. What I am trying to get across today is that at the same time that they are helping Big Oil, not driving down prices, and helping China, the Republicans are also tearing down all of the environmental laws that we have had for the last 50 years and putting all the emphasis on fossil fuels rather than clean energy.

The bottom line is, the only way that we are going to lower costs is by encouraging clean energy. Yes, I agree with Chairwoman RODGERS that the United States has to be a bigger energy producer, but the future for that is with clean energy, not with pumping more oil and gas. It is by encouraging clean energy because that is where we can be the big producer. That is where the future is. That is where we can outcompete the rest of the world.

What does this bill do?

It foolishly repeals the $27 billion Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, which invests in high-impact projects that reduce pollution, creates good-paying clean energy jobs, and improves public health. They obviously do not want to do anything for clean energy.

It also repeals the methane emissions reduction program, which protects the health of our communities and ensures that polluters, not taxpayers or customers, pay for wasted methane. Let me use that as an example. I want everyone to understand that when we passed the Inflation Reduction Act and we were trying to cut back on greenhouse gases which lead to global climate problems and the increase in global warming, we worked hard to deal with those industries here that could be affected. The Methane Emissions Reduction Act is a perfect example that we worked with the independent oil producers because they said, well, if you cause the methane that is wasted now and goes into the atmosphere and causes this increased number of greenhouse gases, if you work with us, we can accomplish capturing this methane and then it can be recycled, but we need some money to accomplish that.

We provided them with a fund so they could make that transition. We also said that if it took them time to get a permit to capture the gas and provide a recycling program for the methane, that they would not be penalized by doing that.

This has been characterized by the GOP as some sort of tax or fee on the industry. It is really a penalty if they don't do what is necessary to capture methane and avoid it going into the atmosphere. The same is true for almost every provision that they seek to repeal here.

These are provisions that try to protect the public health, reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, but at the same time don't have a negative impact on those industries that are hiring people and that create jobs. At the same time, try to move toward new clean energy things like wind, solar, and more hydropower, and other things that actually do create more jobs, as we have proven that they have.

There are so many other things that repeal—I won't go through all of them because I know that we have other speakers. The bill also repeals the popular home electrification rebates that are specifically designed to lower energy bills for American families. These are popular incentives that will save families money and are urgently needed to help us fight the climate crisis.

Republicans are rejecting all these things that help people save money, help reduce greenhouse gases so they can double-down on the old pro-polluter policies that they have had for years. This bill also does nothing to meaningfully address permitting reform.

Its vision of permitting consists of letting polluters do whatever they want, and instead, the bill becomes a sweetheart deal. The bill, for example, doesn't include any changes to the transmission policy necessary to ensure that clean energy can reach all corners of the country.

Let me also give you a couple of other examples. The biggest thing that they do to basically endanger all of our environmental protections is they exempt so-called critical energy resources from the Clean Air Act and hazardous waste permitting requirements.

They say if we label a refinery or if we label a utility as a critical energy resource, then they don't have to follow the Clean Air Act, they don't have to follow the Clean Water Act, and they don't have to follow the Hazardous Waste Act. It is a roundabout way of saying that we are just going to let all these industries do whatever they want, even though it undercuts public health protections.

They do the same thing with toxic chemicals. We had a major toxic chemical bill to try to cut back on toxic chemicals that needlessly expose families and children to health risks. They basically get rid of that by saying, oh, those facilities don't have to worry about releasing toxic chemicals.

Mr. Chair, I end by saying this. Democrats understand that the transition to clean energy is important. In fact, projects already underway are valued at tens of billions of dollars and have already created more than 100,000 good-paying jobs.

Our Inflation Reduction Act is estimated to create 9 million new jobs over the coming decade and reduce energy costs by an average of $1,800 per year.

What we have done in the last few years as Democrats is to try to move toward clean energy, understanding that you still have to have fossil fuels and nuclear and other things, but understanding that the future in terms of the U.S. being a major energy producer is in clean energy, not in fossil fuels.

To just wreck and put a bulldozer through all our environmental protections in order to encourage fossil fuels is just a huge mistake. It is not going to lower energy costs. It is going to make it much more difficult for us to reduce greenhouse gases and all the negative impacts of climate change.

There is nothing in here. In my opinion, this bill is also going to hurt us from a national security point of view because it does actually help China and help our adversaries rather than making it more difficult for them to compete with us.

Mr. Chair, I would urge opposition to the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), a

leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support H.R. 1, the most important bill and the priority for this Congress.

When I came to Congress, I made it my mission to spread the word about the Permian Basin, the heartbeat of American energy and the largest secure supply of oil and gas.

I am incredibly proud to represent the men and women of the Permian Basin, who have revolutionized the way we produce energy in order to provide us with an incredible national security and economic asset.

Unfortunately, President Biden has demonized the very people that I represent. He has demonized the people of West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

From his policies, like killing the Keystone XL pipeline and shutting down drilling permitting, but however, begging foreign dictators to produce more oil, his rhetoric, literally promising to end fossil fuels, he has used every tool in the toolkit to build a bureaucracy that is completely obsessed and opposed to killing American energy. His policies have driven energy costs and inflation through the roof.

Today, I say to the American public: You are going to hear a lot of misinformation about the Inflation Reduction Act, which did nothing to curb inflation.

Energy policies by this administration have increased costs for American families. Americans are being forced to pay 40 percent more on gasoline since the President took office, 20 to 30 percent more on their electricity bills. It is all in the name of a climate crusade, which can't even come close to what the Permian Basin and other producing areas in this country have done to reduce harmful emissions and provide affordable and clean reliable energy.

In fact, I spoke to the president of IPAA yesterday. What we just heard was that the Independent Producers of America support the Democrats' policies. That couldn't be further from the truth. I asked them that. They said no, industry was not consulted.

Over the past 10 years we have brought down methane emissions by almost 15 percent. No government mandate could come close to that. We are only beginning to tap into the incredible asset that is liquified natural gas. Not only is it good for our environment, but it is good for the economy.

We heard this when we took the Energy and Commerce Committee on the road and we talked to Mayor Blong in Midland, Texas, and we heard this from the producers. Today, we will likely continue to hear about Big Oil. The Big Oil boogeyman that doesn't actually exist.

The truth is, and I would face the Democrats, my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and tell you what the IPAA told us, and what they continue to tell us: 90 percent of our energy is produced by small, independent producers, companies that have 10, 20, 30 employees. Big Oil?

You are talking to the people of West Virginia when you say that. When Democrats and this administration blame Big Oil, they are talking about my district.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act is a complete rejection of the Biden administration's anti-energy policies that have been aimed at workers throughout this country for 2 years. We are fighting back. We want to produce American-made oil. We want to boost American products in order to reduce inflation.

I am extremely proud to have worked on this legislation that includes my bill to reduce taxes on natural gas. This is just the beginning. House Republicans are going to follow through on our commitment to the American public and on our commitment to American families.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, passing H.R. 1 is just the beginning. The American public put their trust in Republicans under Speaker MCCARTHY and Chair MCMORRIS RODGERS to lower costs, and that is exactly what we are going to do by boosting American production instead of siding with Russia, Iran, and China.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand with America to pass H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in deep opposition to H.R. 1, or as we have heard, the polluters over people act.

When House Democrats had an opportunity to bring an H.R. 1 to the floor, it was to protect Americans' sacred right to vote and curb the influence of dark money and politics.

Compare that to this H.R. 1, which is nothing short of a bonanza for corporate polluters.

It creates loopholes in our Nation's most important environmental laws, laws that exist to ensure Americans have clean air, that they have clean water, and do not need to live in fear of industrial accidents in their backyards.

It does this so that the richest oil and gas companies in the world can indeed continue to achieve a record-breaking bit of profits at the expense of everyday Americans. We know the best way for us to avoid volatile fossil fuel price shocks is to become less reliant on fossil energy by transitioning to a strong, clean energy future, one that will also protect our air and our water and create millions of well-paying American jobs.

This is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act is doing. New clean energy projects are underway across our country. There have been tens of billions of dollars in domestic manufacturing announcements, which will ensure that solar panels, wind turbines, batteries, EVs, and the other technologies we will need will be made here in America.

This bill seeks to stop that progress. It would repeal critical sections of the IRA. The greenhouse gas reduction fund will leverage private funding to make clean energy investments across the country, including in disadvantaged communities.

The methane emissions reduction program is going to drive down highly potent climate pollution from the oil and gas sector. New rebates will enable low- and moderate-income Americans to save significant money by upgrading their appliances. These programs will be wiped out by this bill.

□ 1245

Mr. Chair, I am not opposed to examining how we can improve permitting processes, but it must be done with the intention of accelerating the clean energy transition—building out our transmission infrastructure to enable our electricity system to be cleaner, more reliable, and, yes, more affordable.

Unfortunately, this bill is only interested in giveaways to outdated, outmoded, and polluting industries, not in bringing our energy system into this 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment I introduced in concurrence with Representative LESKO to defend America's ability to purchase and use natural gas stoves, a common household appliance found in over one-third of American households.

Federal bureaucrats at the Department of Energy are threatening access to natural gas stoves for millions of Americans through the rulemaking process. This amendment would stop the DOE from denying Americans the freedom to cook on the range of their choosing.

According to the Department of Energy's own analysis, in 2020, 38 percent of Americans used natural gas to cook in their homes. The Energy Information Administration says cooking with gas is three times cheaper than cooking with electricity.

Americans should have access to the cooking appliances that they deem fit. They do not want or need the Federal Government to dictate what is in their kitchens. The Department of Energy's own research estimates that 50 percent of gas stoves on the market today don't meet the proposed standards, which means these households would have to remove them.

This is a direct attack on natural gas consumption in this country and an example of the Biden administration's

desire to control every decision we make. Americans should have the freedom to choose their appliances, and Federal Government intrusion is unwarranted and unwanted.

Furthermore, this rule is essentially a tax on consumers, who are already being squeezed by inflation. My Democratic colleagues may argue that these rules were crafted with the purpose of saving consumers money. The DOE estimates the regulation would reduce energy use by 3.4 percent, resulting in a whopping $21.89 saved over a gas range's lifetime. This would save consumers $1.45 per year of the 15-year lifespan of a gas range.

This minuscule savings indicates this regulation isn't actually about consumers' pocketbooks. It is about Federal control at the behest of the radical green policy groups.

People should be free to choose their cooking appliances based on what they need rather than on what the government requires. If a consumer wants a gas stove that cooks faster, then they should be free to choose it, and if a consumer wants a gas stove that cooks slowly but more efficiently, then they should be free to choose that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, no one should have their choices limited by Federal bureaucrats. In fact, these bureaucrats should not have the ability to implement rules like this at all without congressional approval.

This amendment shows the clear difference in vision between House Republicans and the Biden administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support consumers and their freedom to choose what they prefer in their kitchens by supporting this amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is the ranking member of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1. This bill puts the needs of the oil industry over the health and well-being of the American people. Instead of protecting the communities we are here to represent, the bill will cause real harm to people's health and further degrade our environment.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim the bill will help lower Americans' energy costs and make us energy independent, in fact, the bill does just the opposite.

Here is why. By opening LNG exports and doubling down on fossil fuels, this legislation will further increase our reliance on the global oil and gas markets. It will further subject us to the volatility of the global marketplace. Frankly, it will do nothing to increase our security here at home because we simply can't drill our way toward lower energy costs.

The only way to bring energy costs down here in America, and to make our Nation truly energy independent, is to expedite the transition to more renewable forms of energy.

In addition, any claim that this legislation does not touch some part of our Nation's most important environmental laws is just untrue. The bill decimates the laws that were put in place to protect our air, water, and, most of all, our health. It repeals key provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, provisions that actually bring down the costs for Americans and reduce emissions.

So now, instead of working with us to find real bipartisan solutions to the crises we face, the majority severely limited amendments to this bill in violation of the promises they made at the beginning.

I offered some commonsense amendments to the legislation that, unfortunately, were not made in order. One would have restricted the use of eminent domain for natural gas pipelines to ensure communities have a voice in our energy decisions. The other would have required a simple analysis to eliminate methane emissions from projects under NEPA review.

However, we don't have the ability to have those conversations because the majority doesn't want to hear it. I want to say what I said in the committee markup: Mr. Chair, once my colleagues on the other side of the aisle get this out of their system, I stand willing, ready, and able to work on a bipartisan solution that will both help increase our energy security in the United States and will make us independent from a volatile foreign oil market.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1. This bill will unleash American energy and reduce gasoline and energy prices for all Americans.

Look at this chart. Since Biden has taken office, gasoline prices have gone up 51 percent, utility gas prices have gone up 44 percent, and electricity prices have gone up for Americans 24 percent.

H.R. 1 is here to help Americans with these outrageous cost-of-living increases.

I am honored that my legislation to disapprove of President Biden's decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline was included in this package. President Biden's decision to cancel the pipeline was a terrible decision that led to increased gasoline prices and the loss of thousands and thousands of jobs.

Now is the time to stand up for the American people. Now is the time to help reduce the cost of gasoline, utility gas, and electricity. Now is the time to support H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, by its position, H.R. 1 reflects a top priority of the House majority. There is much that my constituents in Houston agree we should be prioritizing in this Congress when it comes to energy—not only lowering energy costs, which is the bill's title—but strengthening our energy security, ensuring and enabling domestic energy production of all kinds, and ensuring our energy future.

That comes from serious legislating. That comes from listening. That comes from stakeholders of all kinds coming to the table to grapple with the competing interests here and come up with workable, durable policy.

That is, unfortunately, not what we have in this massive bill and not what we are seeing in this Chamber in our debates on energy policy here or across the country. That is a problem.

I have warned and will continue to warn that the politicization of energy policy and energy production is one of the most dangerous things that is happening in this country right now, and I am sorry to see that this debate is no different.

We simply cannot repeat cursory talking points and epithets that do not get to the complex and urgent challenges in front of us. There are real and dire consequences for our people who produce the energy that we need and use every day and for our environment if we cannot get it together enough to take this work seriously here.

We must move from politics to policy. I can't go through all the policy in this bill in the time that I have here. However, I do agree that we must reform the permitting process, that we should continue exports of oil and natural gas, that we need an offshore leasing plan, that we should increase offshore revenue to coastal States, that we need to secure critical minerals, and other ideas contained in this bill.

However, H.R. 1 contains so many unworkable provisions that create unrealistic deadlines, threaten our national security, and repeal key environmental and public health protections and programs—including the historic work that we did just in the last Congress in the Inflation Reduction Act to reduce methane emissions, incentivize clean energy investment, and protect communities—that I cannot vote for the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the work we did in the Inflation Reduction Act was to reduce methane emissions, incentivize clean energy investment, and protect communities. Because of

that and because this bill repeals that important work, I cannot vote for it.

People here in Washington understand that this bill is a messaging bill that will not be taken up in the Senate. With this vote, this is my message: When it comes to energy, it is time to put aside politics and get to the policy.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW), who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, energy is the most important element of a prosperous society. Nothing else functions without it.

Reliable electricity allows us to work at night, keep our sick and injured on life support, heat our homes in freezing weather, manufacture the materials that we use to build our homes, and powers the systems that allow the public to watch these remarks right here on this House floor.

Energy is connected to everything. The price of energy affects the price of everything else, and the world devolves into the Dark Ages without it.

This might explain why Republicans think an energy bill should be labeled H.R. 1—because it is our number one priority, as it should be.

We have to introduce this bill because, bewilderingly, energy security has been under relentless attack by radical leftists and the Biden administration. They don't believe in energy security. They don't believe in reliable, affordable energy. They seem to think that the only energy worth pursuing is so-called renewables, solar and wind.

This is not sound policy or science. This has become a religion, and it has become an irrational pursuit of intermittent, weather-dependent energy sources that take up vast amounts of land, vast amounts of resources to make, and vast amounts of critical minerals to be mined. Still, it doesn't deliver the energy security the American people need.

I am not against these things. It would be fine to pursue these technologies if it didn't also come with a simultaneous attack on the sources of energy that actually work—namely, oil and gas.

Every good thing you have in this world, Mr. Chairman, is because of petroleum products—every single thing. Your shoes, your cars, your iPhones, your Netflix, your Patagonia jackets, medical devices that save your life, your heating, your cooling—literally everything comes from petroleum products.

The attack on oil and gas has been relentless, and it has been deeply foolish. It started with day one of the Biden administration and the Keystone pipeline, then executive orders banning new leases on Federal lands, and then refusal to permit pipelines. Then they turn around and attack the suppliers and producers for higher prices. It is pure gaslighting.

They have drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, all while prioritizing the same crazy climate policies that have caused Europe to enter an energy crisis and that are now causing developing nations to be priced out of gas markets and turn to coal production.

This gets me to quite the irony here. The administration's policies are more likely to increase global carbon emissions as a result, and for one simple reason. I really want everyone to understand this. By refusing to push for increased natural gas exports, we are shelving the best tool for displacing coal power around the world.

Coal burned in foreign countries accounts for about 50 percent of global power emissions. Natural gas is an easy substitute with half the emissions. American natural gas could easily be leveraged to increase prosperity for all and reduce emissions.

This is not rocket science. It is common sense. It is just math. Promoting American natural gas is better for energy security, better for our own affordability, and better for reducing global emissions. There is no logical counterargument to what I just said. There is not one.

Maybe—I believe this—the Biden administration actually knows this. That is why they prefer oil production in foreign countries and beg them to drill so that we can pretend we care about the climate while allowing other countries to do the dirty work for us.

□ 1300

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this dangerous and irresponsible bill.

With extreme weather events becoming more and more frequent, and climate change impacting our communities, agriculture, homes, and even our national security, we need to work together to advance climate rescue measures that move the U.S. away from fossil fuel dependence, protect workers and communities, and strengthen environmental protections, all while reducing costs to the American people.

This can't happen overnight, but instead of building upon the historic, deficit-reducing provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, Republicans are trying to roll back that historic bill, and in the process they are putting polluters over people and the planet.

H.R. 1 restricts community input by gutting NEPA. It forces the sell-off of public lands and undermines the health of all Americans by compromising air and water quality, all while adding billions to our national debt.

Of particular interest in my district is that this bill would block the EPA from requiring refineries to study alternatives to the use of hydrofluoric acid—or HF—in fossil fuel processing. HF has the potential to form a poisonous, killing aerosol cloud which can travel for miles if it is released.

There have been dozens of accidents involving HF in recent years, including a devastating 2019 explosion and fire at a refinery in my district. That explosion put U.S. steelworkers and tens of thousands of nearby residents at serious risk of death and serious harm. An inspection found that the refinery lacked adequate inspection and safety protocols to prevent a catastrophe. Essentially, it was a miracle that no one died that night.

To safeguard against future accidents, I offered a commonsense amendment to this bill that would require refineries with a history of accidents or Clean Air Act violations to study alternatives to HF, but my Republican colleagues refused to allow the amendment.

This refusal to consider past disasters to create necessary safety standards tells us exactly what this bill is about: empowering the fossil fuel industry at the expense of worker and community safety.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote against this reckless bill.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership on this bill. The Lower Energy Costs Act is a product of countless hours of discussion between leadership, stakeholders, and our constituents, who are tired of higher costs for less reliable energy.

The United States has an incredible energy potential. We have vast resources of oil, natural gas, and other critical minerals essential for energy dominance.

Only a few years ago, we were a global leader in both oil and gas production. This was achieved through American innovation, domestic energy production, and investment from the private sector in developing our critical energy infrastructure.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration vowed to wage war on American energy. Starting on his very first day in office with the help of the Democrats here in Congress, the Biden administration has pursued radical rush-to-green energy policies that made energy less secure, less reliable, and more expensive for our constituents.

This has led to increased costs of energy and goods, hitting the most vulnerable the hardest. We should be about increasing the standard of living for Americans versus diminishing the standard of living that these anti-American energy policies actually do.

Energy is the foundation of everything in American life. When the cost of energy goes up, everything else does, as well. H.R. 1 should help America and will help America produce more, deliver more to our communities, and give us the ability to export and help our allies around the world.

The American people recognize this, and they are sick of choosing between paying their energy bills and putting food on the table, which is why they gave us the majority, to stop this radical energy agenda.

I am proud that my bill, Protecting American Energy Production Act, was included in this package. This provision will protect energy security and affordability by prohibiting the President from imposing a ban on hydraulic fracturing.

The discovery of natural gas through the shale revolution has made the United States a leader in energy production as well as emissions reduction and has allowed the United States of America, not our adversaries, to set the price of energy.

We are approaching the breaking point in our energy infrastructure. The so-called rush-to-green agenda has prevented the buildout of natural gas and other essential energy infrastructure, which is now reaching capacity. Many States, like my own State of South Carolina, are now at risk of approaching an energy deficit in the next few years if we don't immediately change our current regulatory framework.

Fortunately, H.R. 1 addresses these concerns by requiring States to raise legitimate water quality concerns for interstate pipelines and LNG export facilities through FERC's NEPA process instead of weaponizing section 401 of the Clean Water Act to block pipelines.

This change is critical to prevent the political agenda of States abusing section 401 to veto projects of national significance while preserving the ability of States to raise legitimate water quality concerns. New England States could finally get gas from the Marcellus shale instead of importing natural gas from Russia, Iran, Venezuela, and a lot of our other adversaries around the globe.

We have the resources here not only to meet our domestic demand but also to be a leading exporter globally.

Representative DEGETTE mentioned earlier about capacity and U.S. production and how that would limit available gas for American domestic energy production. The Progressive Policy Institute, which is far from a conservative think tank, put out an article, ''The Climate Case for Expanding U.S. Natural Gas Exports,'' which talks about using that domestically. I would ask you to read it.

This package also sets a framework to export our domestic resources so our allies will no longer have to rely on Vladimir Putin's energy oligarchy. The Democrats keep calling this the polluters over people act. That couldn't be further from the truth.

The reality is that their energy policies put Russia, China, OPEC+, and radical Green New Deal interests over the interests of the American people. The greatest beneficiaries of their policies are the CCP and Vladimir Putin.

Green New Deal policies leave us totally dependent on China for critical minerals that make all of our devices work. Even the green energy devices, wind and solar, need those critical minerals.

We have them here. We harvest them cleaner, more environmentally friendly than anywhere in the world. Let's produce them here. That is what H.R. 1 allows us to do.

H.R. 1 puts the American people first by unleashing American energy and securing our supply chains. It will increase American energy production and restore American energy leadership in the world. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership and yielding the time.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the polluters over people act, and I rushed here to the floor with some good news: This bill is not going anywhere.

President Biden has already said that he intends to veto it, but it is not even going to make it out of the U.S. Senate. I thought President Biden spoke very well in his statement on his veto message.

He said, we are ''making unprecedented progress in protecting America's energy security and reducing energy costs for Americans—in their homes and at the pump. H.R. 1 would do just the opposite, replacing pro-consumer policies with a thinly veiled license to pollute. It would raise costs for American families by repealing household energy rebates and rolling back historic investments to increase access to cost-lowering clean energy technologies. Instead of protecting American consumers, it would pad oil and gas company profits—already at record levels—and undercut our public health and environment.'' It will take us backwards.

In fact, a number of America's leading health organizations, like the American Lung Association, the Children's Environmental Health Network, and others wrote to Congress to say they oppose H.R. 1 and its attempt to weaken the Clean Air Act to allow additional polluting energy sources. They say, ''Years of scientific research has clearly established that pollution is a threat to human health at every stage of life—from inside the womb to adulthood.''

Burning fossil fuels not only contributes to a warming climate, but higher levels of dangerous—and deadly—pollution.

The good news is, this bill is not going anywhere.

There is more good news for American families and all of us who care about the moral obligation we have to our kids to provide a livable planet.

Earlier this month, the International Energy Agency said it has been the jump in renewables, not frack gas—it has been the jump in renewables that has helped blunt a feared runaway in carbon emissions. In the end, they say, global energy-related emissions are still on an unsustainable growth trajectory, but—and this is thanks to the outstanding wealth of renewable energy, electric vehicles, heat pumps, energy efficient technologies—that we still have a fighting chance.

This was followed by more good news yesterday out of the U.S. Energy Information Administration. For the first time in 2022 renewable energy in America surpassed coal burning in America, and it is now outpacing nuclear energy, as well.

Who is driving this?

I thought this was very interesting.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. The States that are producing the most renewable energy resources: In solar, California, Texas, North Carolina; in wind, again it is Texas, Iowa, and Oklahoma.

Why is this happening?

Because renewable energy is the cheapest energy.

With the Inflation Reduction Act, the bipartisan infrastructure law, the CHIPS and Science Act, we are about to lower energy bills substantially for our neighbors back home.

Since we have adopted the IRA, the infrastructure law, we have also seen $200 billion of private sector investments in the manufacturing sector in America, in clean energy, electric vehicles, batteries, and other manufacturing processes.

There is good news here. As we debate this bill, and the polluters over people act goes nowhere, we continue to lower energy costs for our families back home, lift American workers, and provide for healthier, safer communities. We have an opportunity here to go farther and faster. That is what is inspirational today, not the backwards policies of the past.

Vote ''no'' on the polluters over people act.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Chair, polluters over people act. They would rather put people stopping traffic to prevent you from getting to work and people throwing mashed potatoes at art than they would the American people.

I could not disagree with my colleagues more. Oil is a global commodity. Prices went up when the President constrained supply.

How do we know that? His own actions.

What did the President do?

He went to Saudi Arabia and Venezuela to ask them to produce more oil,

and then released oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve so prices could go down just in time for the elections.

Among the 20 bills that make up this package, I draw attention to a suite of bills focused on refining and processing critical minerals as well as development of new mines for critical minerals on Federal land.

The critical minerals provisions in the E&C and Natural Resources titles are helpful for Iowa wind, which produces 58 percent of the electricity in the State. This allows Iowa to be a net exporter of electricity and supports 230 blade manufacturing jobs in Fort Madison. Ensuring we mine critical minerals in the U.S. and process those minerals domestically is critical to securing our Nation's global competitiveness and supporting many clean energy technologies as well as supporting a cleaner environment from China.

Madam Chair, I also commend the significant strides we have made on NEPA reform with the package combining measures to streamline permitting reviews for energy products and mines. Importantly, H.R. 1 places clear timelines on environmental reviews, clarifies the scope of environmental reviews, and puts sidebars on judicial reviews under NEPA.

According to a recent poll from Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions Forum, 80 percent of people support policies that expedite government review of infrastructure projects, which is why these issues are at the heart of H.R. 1. As fiscal conservatives, we also take pride in the fact that responsible permitting reform has the opportunity to lower emissions while also costing zero taxpayer dollars and lowering the costs of energy for consumers.

I am proud of the legislative wins in H.R. 1 to reduce energy costs. We all want a cleaner, healthier planet for our children and grandchildren and also affordable, abundant energy. H.R. 1 is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

□ 1315

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Chair, I rise today to share my disappointment and to oppose H.R. 1.

As a Representative of California, I work to find solutions that deal with price spikes at the pump, bring down high heating bills, and deliver lower costs overall to my constituents.

You can imagine my optimism when I first saw on our agenda a bill that supposedly aims at lowering energy costs.

When I read it, I was shocked to see that the only lower thing that it does is lower standards for our Nation's polluters.

This bill doesn't deliver less cost to families. It only forces more giveaways of our public lands to Big Oil, the same oil companies that already have thousands of unused drilling permits.

This bill doesn't decrease energy prices. It increases the number of loopholes in our public health laws.

This bill just doesn't fail to help families bring their utility bills down. It actually repeals solutions that we put in place last year to bring down heating costs and to help folks upgrade to more efficient home energy appliances.

Higher levels of pollution, higher costs for families, and, let's not forget, higher budget deficits to the tune of $2.4 billion over the next decade—is that being fiscally responsible?

Madam Chair, putting polluters ahead of people is bad enough, but actually raising energy costs and our Federal deficit while proclaiming to care about this is even worse.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' so we can actually work together to build on the laws we have passed that promote clean energy, cut energy costs for families across the country, and reduce the deficit.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, legislation offered by our majority leader that will fulfill House Republicans' commitment to America and focuses on one of the most pressing issues facing communities in Ohio and across the country.

Over the past 2 years, I have heard from countless people in Ohio's Fifth District that the soaring cost of energy has negatively impacted family budgeting, business operations, and agricultural output.

One retired individual told me that his gas budget plan went from $100 a month to $160.

Farmers in my district were hit hard because of the need to fuel their farm equipment and purchase fertilizer and other materials made from petroleum products. In 2022, operating costs for ag producers went up a whopping 30 percent. This resulted in higher food and grocery costs for consumers, eating up a larger share of the family budget.

There is no way around it: Energy plays a huge role in America's economy. Plants in northern Ohio, such as glass, steel, and food processing, depend on reliable and affordable energy.

When I asked stakeholders at a recent Energy and Commerce roundtable whether we need more or less power in the future to meet demand, it was unanimous. Our economic future depends on the generation of more power, not less.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration's policy of restricting access to and production of energy resulted in higher costs.

After promising throughout 2020 that he was going to shut down American energy production, President Biden came into office and immediately canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, which would have carried 830,000 barrels per day from Canada. This ill-conceived order also eliminated good-paying American jobs.

He then halted new oil and gas leases on Federal lands, slowed or halted the permitting process for new oil and gas projects, and authorized financial regulators to issue new rules to make it harder to invest in the oil and gas industry.

Instead of recognizing that his failed policies were causing prices to increase, the administration called on countries like Russia, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and other OPEC nations for relief and authorized historic releases from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to manipulate the markets.

To the surprise of no one, all of these gimmicks failed, and the American people have paid the price. That ends today.

H.R. 1 represents the culmination of our early efforts to solve the problem of lowering energy costs. It will increase domestic energy production, reform restrictive and costly permitting processes, reverse the Biden administration's anti-American energy policies, and boost the processing and production of critical minerals.

This legislation also includes my bill, the REFINER Act, to boost refining capacity in the United States. In order to meet the energy demands of the American people, we need more refining infrastructure to transform products into fuel and other petroleum products.

We also need increased capacity to keep the prices of everyday goods down, like medicine, hygiene products, clothing, home improvement products, and more.

The REFINERY Act will provide us with the much-needed blueprint to do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Chair, like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here today, I believe we need an all-of-the-above energy approach in this country.

As a Member of Congress representing a district that is 65 percent covered in corn and soybeans every single summer, that all-of-the-above approach includes strong support for biofuels.

When prices at the gas pump were rising last year, I worked across the aisle to pass legislation allowing for the year-round sales of E15 through this House. This was the first time a bill like this passed this body.

Renewable fuels like E15 are made with a higher ethanol blend than regular gasoline and can sell for up to 40 cents less per gallon in Minnesota.

Investments in E15 and biofuels mean new markets for our family farmers growing corn and soybeans in my district, and it means giving our domestic energy supply security and reinforcement as we work to increase U.S. energy independence.

I am proud to have worked last summer to pass the largest investment in biofuels in our Nation's history through the Inflation Reduction Act.

This is a game changer for corn growers and soybean farmers in my district, and it is a commonsense way to help protect our environment, strengthen our energy independence, and lower costs for Americans.

The Inflation Reduction Act included many more investments in renewable energy and important reforms to our oil and gas leasing practices.

Today, House Republicans are putting forth hyperpartisan legislation to roll back the climate progress we made in the last Congress, gutting clean air and drinking water protections and giving handouts to polluters.

Their so-called all-of-the-above energy bill does not contain even a discussion of biofuels. There were amendments offered by my colleague in Iowa to include biofuels in this legislation. Republicans blocked them.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Chair, it is one thing to say you support an all-of-the-above energy approach. It is entirely another thing to actually do it.

I will work with anyone to lower costs for my constituents and to support Minnesota farmers, but this bill is a handout to Big Oil and a slap in the face to family farmers.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, let me just say it is great to see the American people in the gallery for once listening to a debate on energy. It is so important to them.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded not to reference occupants of the gallery.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, which will reinsert America back to its proper place as the world's leader in energy and critical mineral production.

My home State of Idaho is blessed to be rich in natural resources, especially when it comes to critical minerals. Right now, there are revolutionary innovations in technology industries, transportation, and healthcare, and they all have one thing in common: an increasing need for certain critical minerals.

Idaho contains an abundance of these minerals, including cobalt, lithium, and antimony. These resources not only can help the United States meet domestic demand, but they can also help fulfill global demand and bring prosperity to communities lacking high-paying jobs.

As part of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I voted for many of these provisions in H.R. 1 that support access to critical minerals in American soil and require the Department of Energy to identify resources vulnerable to supply chain disruptions.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has proliferated policies that have ceded America's place as a responsible, productive source of critical minerals to foreign nations, many of which are hostile to Americans.

For example, instead of Idaho and America producing the world's antimony, China and Russia account for more than 75 percent of the world's supply. Instead of Idaho and America fulfilling the global demand for cobalt, it comes from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a country with a horrifically bad human rights record. That has to change.

Madam Chair, today, we offer Americans an all-of-the-above energy strategy that will reverse the America last policies currently in place. H.R. 1 will secure domestic energy supply and allow America to control its own destiny by restoring its position as a global leader in production.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a member of our committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

I am upset that the Republicans have brought forth this bill, which sells out the health and well-being of the American people.

For decades, scientists have warned of the devastating impacts that human-caused climate change will have and do have on our planet. Consider even the first 3 months of this year.

In January, Alabama and Georgia were hit by severe storms, straight-line winds, and tornadoes that caused at least nine storm-related deaths.

In January and March, my home State of California experienced severe winter storms, flooding, and mudslides that ended in at least 27 storm-related deaths across the State combined.

Just last week in Mississippi, there was devastation by severe storms and tornadoes that resulted in 26 people dying.

H.R. 1 fast-tracks offshore oil and gas developments, guts bedrock environmental and public health laws, silences communities, and reverses the significant progress that we made through the Inflation Reduction Act.

These are your Republican Representatives bringing forth this bill. They are selling out the American people for oil profits.

Last Congress, Republicans had the choice to join Democrats as we worked to deliver a historic $369 billion in climate action and clean energy investments through the Inflation Reduction Act. Instead, they have chosen to advance bills like this that, if implemented, will worsen the climate crisis and put our children and grandchildren on a path to an unlivable future.

Madam Chair, this bill chooses to put polluters over people, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I am glad the people at home are watching this on TV or here in person because they are learning that H.R. 1 is going to lower their energy costs.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and whose State is a huge energy producer for our Nation.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this bill is absolutely critical to our Nation, critical for hardworking Americans, not to mention critical for national security.

We produce energy cleaner, more efficiently, and cheaper than any other country. We need to start acting like it.

The best way to reverse the damage of Biden's energy crisis and drive down energy prices is by flipping the switch and unleashing American energy at home.

We have real solutions in H.R. 1 to do just that very thing.

Bills like Representative CRENSHAW's Keeping America's Refineries Act will help ensure that our Nation's refineries can continue to operate and keep the lights on in our country.

My energy-heavy district, as the chairman referred to, houses about 50 percent of Texas' daily refining output. Our district is home to America's largest petroleum refineries, which process 2.6 million barrels of oil a day. This bill will ensure our refineries stay online.

This bill fights back on overburdensome regulations imposed by the Biden administration that target the use of hydrofluoric acid that goes into everything from aluminum cans to vehicle fuel cells.

Our country simply cannot run without energy, and let me tell you: We can't afford to live in the greenies' dystopia that the folks on the other side of the aisle dream about, either.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this vital piece of legislation that will unleash American energy, lower energy costs for hardworking Americans, increase production, reform the drawn-out permitting processes, streamline energy infrastructure, and boost the production and processing of critical minerals. Our country depends on it.

□ 1330

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), who is the ranking member of our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, I rise today to reaffirm my commitment and that of my Democratic colleagues to reducing energy costs for the American people.

Last Congress, we delivered a historic bill, the Inflation Reduction Act, that will save Americans money and make transformative investments to fight climate change.

The High-Efficiency Electric Home Rebate Program, in particular, gives Americans up to $14,000 to electrify their homes and improve energy efficiency. It covers up to 100 percent of electrification project costs for low-income households, who often bear the brunt of both high-energy costs and extreme weather.

I know this program will save lives and money because the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, or as we call it SMUD, is doing this in my district. Last November, I visited a constituent, a retired nurse whose home had been fully electrified and weatherized by SMUD. This includes a heat pump, water heater, induction stove, ceiling fans, energy-efficient refrigerator, and insulation.

The Inflation Reduction Act would allow SMUD to significantly expand this program, which would positively impact my constituents.

H.R. 1 would repeal the home rebate program. This legislation would repeal a program that could save Americans up to $14,000. This is nothing more than a shameless giveaway to Big Oil when we need to be accelerating the clean energy transition.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), a new member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. DUNN of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 1.

With this bill, the days of America's dependence on imported energy are beginning to come to a close.

Under President Biden, gas prices have skyrocketed, leases for oil and gas have been canceled, and electricity prices have soared.

Thankfully, multiple committees have come together to provide a multilateral solution to these problems.

When H.R. 1 becomes law, it will lower energy costs and unleash American energy, providing clarity for critical infrastructure investors.

It will streamline energy permitting and exports and repeal the new natural gas tax imposed by the Biden administration.

House Republicans are delivering on our promise to reestablish the days of American energy independence.

Importantly, H.R. 1 slashes burdensome regulations that make it difficult and unappealing to build in America.

Eliminating these barriers in conjunction with comprehensive permitting reform will reverse the Biden administration's radical energy policies that destroyed American dominance in the energy space and compromised our national security.

Simply put, H.R. 1 will unleash American innovation and unlock American resources for future generations.

I look forward to voting ''yea'' on H.R. 1, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1. My community of Buffalo and Niagara Falls are all too familiar with the devastating consequences of decisions that put polluters over people.

Toxic waste dumped by Hooker Chemical in the 1940s contaminated the Love Canal neighborhood of Niagara Falls. President Jimmy Carter declared a Federal health emergency, and Congress passed the Superfund Act with Love Canal becoming the first cleanup site.

In 1968, the Buffalo River caught fire due to industrial contamination and was considered biologically dead.

Atrocities like this led to the approval of the Clean Water Act in 1972 and have required hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

After residents sounded the alarm for years, in 2013, Tonawanda Coke was found guilty of deliberately releasing cancer-causing benzene into surrounding neighborhoods, a violation of the Clean Air Act.

The Superfund Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act were each put in place after historically unchecked pollution impacted the health of our waterways, communities, and families.

H.R. 1 removes safety protections, lessens accountability for violators, and diminishes public input.

If this bill were in place 10 years ago, western New York neighbors would have had no recourse to address the carcinogens and toxic substances released into the air by Tonawanda Coke.

We can't let polluting history repeat itself.

I am voting ''no'' on H.R. 1 and encourage my colleagues who care about the health and future of our communities to do the same.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I am glad we have got so many members of the Energy and Commerce Committee to come down and show the American people how we are going to lower their energy costs.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a real leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, here is the deal: It is January 19, 2021. Gas is $2.38 per gallon. We had just replenished our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. American energy dominance provided stability across the geopolitical landscape.

The following day, the war on domestic energy began with the cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline and executive action restricting domestic production.

In a matter of mere months, gas prices would reach record highs. Our emergency reserves would be tapped for political purposes, and we would be begging adversaries to increase their production while an empowered Russia and an empowered China both eyed territorial expansion.

This is what the radical Green New Deal looks like in implementation.

My constituents have told me about the energy bills that they can't budget for, the unaffordable rate spikes in peak hours, and even stories of gas tanks being drilled into.

Everything costs more when energy costs more.

With H.R. 1, energy will cost less.

The Lower Energy Costs Act will unleash domestic production. H.R. 1 includes permitting reforms, increased production and processing of critical minerals, and an undoing of the Biden administration's regulatory stranglehold on the energy sector.

In Michigan, activists have long eyed shutting down Line 5, an essential international pipeline sustaining 34,000 jobs across the Midwest and billions in economic activity.

Language I authored, included in H.R. 1, would protect these pipelines from being unilaterally shut down by an overzealous executive branch.

Prosperity, opportunity, and security are on the line.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. SALINAS).

Ms. SALINAS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Vladimir Putin's war on Ukraine demonstrated that the clean energy transition isn't just important for our planet, it is important for our national security.

It revealed the dangerous pitfalls of our overreliance on global oil and gas markets. The solution is not to deepen our reliance on fossil fuels, it is to go all in on clean, American energy. We need to ramp up solar, wind, hydrogen, and other similar projects across the country. Oregon is poised for this type of investment in development.

However, H.R. 1 doesn't do that. Instead, it repeals major clean energy programs, even going so far as to target the home electrification rebate designed to help American families make their homes energy efficient, yet another petty, retributive action by House Republicans.

This bill worsens the climate crisis and hampers our ability to produce clean energy here at home. It is a disaster in the making.

I also want to talk more specifically about my community back home. Oregon's Sixth District is home to hundreds of specialty crop farmers who grow everything from blueberries to wine grapes and hazelnuts. The farming tradition in the Willamette Valley dates back centuries. It was even publicized in the 1820s as a ''promised land of flowing milk and honey.''

Today, this land faces a serious threat. Specialty crop growers in my district recognize the imminent danger the climate crisis poses to their farming tradition. Many are already feeling

the impacts of our warming planet as extreme drought, heat waves, and wildfires diminish crop yields and endanger farmers' livelihoods.

H.R. 1 would exacerbate the climate crisis, and further threaten Oregon's future. This bill would repeal key clean energy programs in favor of unmitigated fossil fuel production, leading to more emissions and harmful climate impacts.

For all these reasons and more, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, the rush to disaster is this rush to green energy policies without thinking about the replacement source of power generation that can be provided by American-produced natural gas, delivered to where it needs to be to produce the power and help lower carbon emissions for America.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act because lowering energy costs is a top priority of Tennesseans.

Since President Biden took office, energy costs have skyrocketed. To make matters worse, congressional Democrats poured gasoline on the fire by passing a $370 billion Green New Deal giveaway that has done nothing to address the root cause of record-high energy costs and inflation.

My neighbors often ask, Why have energy costs gone up so much, so quickly? Why is the President not doing anything about it? Unfortunately, the Biden administration prioritizes the demands of woke, left-wing activists that would rather hold our economy hostage than promote the cleanest, most affordable energy produced right here in the United States.

Madam Chair, because of the reckless policies of the Biden administration, Republicans have many priorities this Congress, but our number one priority is to lower energy costs on behalf of the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I rise today to oppose the polluters over people act and the mining provisions that will make it easier for foreign-owned companies to pollute our lands and waters and destroy our Tribal cultural resources.

America's 150-year-old mining law already fails to protect our communities from irresponsible mining. We see that in the thousands of abandoned mines that dot New Mexico and the West.

H.R. 1 would only make it worse, threatening our water and, as we know, ''agua es vida,'' ''water is life.''

I am disappointed that the Republicans blocked my amendment to stop mining exploration on public lands if it harms our water, farmers, and Tribal communities. Do they not care about our most essential resource, our water?

Indeed, some proposed mining projects are from subsidiaries of foreign companies like Resolution Copper in Arizona, which has ties to the Chinese Communist Party. Why are they protecting the Chinese Communist Party's subsidiary mining our precious resources?

That mine would devastate Tribal cultural resources and threaten our precious water resources.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this polluter over people act.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Chair, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1. This administration, the Biden administration, has stonewalled American energy production, quite literally, from day one.

The permit for the Keystone XL pipeline was revoked just hours after Biden's inauguration, and permitting for new oil and gas leases were halted soon thereafter.

The results were predictable. Americans endured historically high gas prices, with Floridians paying, on average, $4.80 per gallon last summer. Government restriction and regulation fanned the flames of inflation already burdening Floridians and Americans at gas pumps and grocery stores.

□ 1345

We, as Republicans, have a responsibility to uphold our Commitment to America. H.R. 1 will be the cornerstone of fulfilling that commitment to our friends and neighbors in Florida's Third District.

We will start by overhauling our permitting regulations. This administration has effectively frozen all new oil and gas exploration permits, severely handicapping our ability to fulfill the energy demands of Americans.

We can choose to rely on energy imports from hostile nations and fair-weather friends, or we can utilize the vast potential of our energy sector to meet our needs more efficiently and cleanly.

Our energy requirements extend to nearly all of our most vital industries, arguably none more important than our agricultural sector, because a nation that cannot feed itself cannot be safe. Essential inputs, from fertilizer to gasoline for tractors, are directly reliant on the price of energy. Unleashing the power of our energy will keep the costs of businesses low for our producers and prices low at the grocery store, benefiting all Americans.

Repealing export restrictions on LNG, liquefied natural gas, will exponentially grow our share of global gas markets. The largest LNG bunker barge, the Clean Canaveral, just completed its inaugural bunkering in Jacksonville, Florida, making the Sunshine State a new hub for natural gas. Floridians stand to benefit greatly in jobs and economic growth from the reduction of regulations and LNG exports.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Environmental protection and smart regulation, alongside responsible businesses and every single one of us, will save our planet for the next generation, for my four grandchildren, and for your grandchildren.

When my granddaughter, Aubrey, was only 5 years old, she attended an issues conference with a national candidate who asked Aubrey what she cared about. Aubrey responded, ''Trash on the playground. How do we fix that?'' a simple yet important question.

One of our most basic jobs is to protect our natural resources, protect this global playground, and regulate companies to ensure that they are not able to abuse and pollute our planet.

The deregulation that H.R. 1 allows will pollute our planet and harm health. This legislation guts critical investments in climate change, balloons the deficit, and rolls back key environmental standards, all while failing to address energy costs for Pennsylvania's families.

They are trying to do this at the same time we are seeing some consequences of deregulation right in Pennsylvania, leading to environmental disasters that could poison American families, like the derailment of the train and environmental disaster in East Palestine, Ohio, affecting, of course, Pennsylvania's Pittsburgh suburbs, and, most recently, the pollution of water in Philadelphia.

It seems we need more regulation, not less.

Madam Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle either forget or simply do not know that it was a Republican President, Richard Nixon, who, in 1970, proposed the Environmental Protection Agency, and it began operation that same year.

In the early 1970s, Pennsylvania passed a brilliant constitutional amendment, article I, section 27, which says Pennsylvanians are guaranteed the right to clean air and clean water and to the protection of our natural aesthetics for generations to come. This beautiful amendment is a reminder to all of us that we should not pass H.R. 1.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, it is funny. I see polluters over people act. We are talking about increasing natural gas production and delivery in this country. According to EIA data, switching to natural gas has accounted for as much as 61 percent of U.S. emissions reductions from 2005 to 2020.

More natural gas—cleaner burning, American-produced natural gas—delivered to where it needs to go will help

us lower carbon emissions and make America more energy secure.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Chair, I stand here before you today because the American people are hurting. Over the past few years, they have been forced to cope with skyrocketing costs, a direct result of President Biden's misguided energy policies.

With every step the President has taken to restrict domestic energy, from canceling the Keystone pipeline to placing a ban on new drilling, it has become much harder for Americans to make ends meet. Fortunately, Republicans have a solution to this problem that will increase domestic energy production.

The United States is home to some of the largest reserves of oil and natural gas anywhere in the world. The Lower Energy Costs Act will allow us to tap into these resources so we can drive down the cost of energy and combat the out-of-control inflation that has devastated the American family.

Our legislation will increase American energy production, reform our broken permitting process, reverse President Biden's anti-energy policies, and improve the construction of energy infrastructure.

H.R. 1 also protects our energy future by boosting production of critical minerals, making us less reliant on our adversaries such as China.

Under the leadership of Chair RODGERS, my colleagues and I on the Energy and Commerce Committee have been working to shape policies that will unleash American energy and lower costs for our families. H.R. 1 represents our commitment to fighting for an economy that is strong and a nation that is safe.

This bill will help reduce our reliance on foreign oil, which would not only benefit our economy but also strengthen our national security and our safety.

The left's dream of a Green New Deal future has turned into a nightmare, and it is time for the President to wake up. With prices nearing record highs, the need to unleash American energy has never been more pressing and important.

This body must take immediate action to lower energy costs, fight inflation, and secure our energy future, and this bill will do it.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

This bill is nothing more than a shameless handout to fossil fuel companies, and it speaks volumes that House Republicans have made it their number one priority for the 118th Congress.

My colleagues across the aisle have once again chosen to side with their Big Oil buddies and stand against the American people, our planet, and our future.

Let me be clear: The last thing that Big Oil needs is another handout. Last year, we all felt pain at the pump while fossil fuel companies raked in record profits. When House Democrats voted to crack down on gas price gouging, Republicans voted ''no.''

With their new majority and this bill, Republicans are letting us know exactly where their loyalties lie and the lows that they will sink to in order to appease those special interests. They are even giving polluters free rein to dump toxic waste on our public lands.

The Republican Party has made it clear that they are happy to poison our planet if it helps their fossil fuel friends make a quick buck.

Under the polluters over people act, working families will pay the price, literally. Through taxpayer-funded subsidies and reckless deregulation, Republicans are rewarding Big Oil for bad behavior, and this time, they are not even hiding it.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to please oppose this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), whose State is at the crossroads of America.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Only a few years ago, our country was comfortably meeting our energy needs with our own production. Under President Biden's reckless energy agenda, however, we have dramatically increased our dependence on foreign oil, sent gas prices sky-high last year, and increased the cost of energy bills for Americans and the people in Indiana who I represent.

House Republicans made a commitment to America that we would end the war on American energy, and we are demonstrating that commitment today by passing H.R. 1.

This bill will flip the switch on domestic energy production, reversing the administration's anti-energy policies and streamlining our energy infrastructure.

Included in this bill is my Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act, which would address the broad set of critical energy resources that we need to properly assess our Nation's energy supply, identify critical resources for our economy, and help locate vulnerabilities in our supply chains.

Under this legislation, the U.S. could produce energy that is cleaner and safer than other parts of the world—which we already are—where production is tied to dangerous working conditions, child labor exploitation, and extremely low pay.

It would also help us shift away from our reliance on energy resources from countries controlled by foreign dictators, better protecting our national security.

As a supporter of an all-of-the-above energy approach, I know how crucial it is that we take steps to safeguard and secure the energy resources necessary to keep the lights on, rates down, and emissions low.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1 so that we can address America's energy crisis created by the administration and meet America's energy needs on our own.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), a member of our committee.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding and recognizing me.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' energy bill.

I have deep concerns about this package overall in terms of its attack on our bedrock environmental laws. As a Marylander, I am particularly alarmed at changes to section 401 certifications under the Clean Water Act, which would endanger the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

To protect our environment and public health, States need to have the authority and tools to regulate pollution in their waters. One section of this bill would narrow States' ability to regulate pollution sources that impact downstream water quality.

This bill would also restrict the conditions and limitations that a State could place on clean water certification, further hampering a State's means of protecting its waters.

That has grave implications for a State's ability to set limits on how much of a particular pollutant a water body can accept while still meeting the State's overall water quality standards. These limits, known as total maximum daily loads, or TMDLs, are required to restore waters impaired by pollution, which is the case for the Chesapeake Bay and most of its tributaries.

That is why I filed an amendment, along with Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, to ensure that this energy bill would not impact a State's authority to establish or implement a State-approved TMDL for an impaired waterway. Unfortunately, Republicans did not allow for this amendment to be offered on the floor today.

As this bill strips away environmental and public health protections across the board, we don't even have the most basic assurances that States will be able to design and execute their own plans to reduce waterway pollution.

For the Chesapeake Bay, this could be disastrous. The TMDLs are the guides by which the seven watershed jurisdictions work with EPA to continue making progress on the larger Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

It is gross negligence, as a matter of legislation, to roll back these key protections for these bodies of water.

Tragically, rolling back these protections is the chief goal of this bill. That is what it is all about. For that reason, I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), whose State includes the Marcellus shale, which has an immeasurable amount of natural gas.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Chair, the increased cost of energy over the last couple of years under the Biden administration has put tremendous strains on small businesses, families, and my neighbors across Pennsylvania and across our country.

My district does encompass a good portion of the Marcellus shale, one of the highest natural gas producing regions, in fact, in the world.

Energy is jobs. Energy is good pay. Natural gas is about education. The schools that are developing throughout my communities in order to enrich young people for the future and have them stay in Pennsylvania is so incredibly meaningful, Madam Chair.

Natural gas, Madam Chair, is one of the cleanest energies known to man. A tripling, it is known, of the use of natural gas will enormously reduce carbon emissions on a worldwide perspective. There is so much good about this. Natural gas is an answer to any transitional carbon-free emissions.

Madam Chair, this administration has been doing everything it can to assault domestic energy and is truly choosing Venezuela over Pennsylvania and OPEC over Texas, and the list can go on.

□ 1400

This is senseless. H.R. 1 corrects a lot of this. H.R. 1 is about energy independence, which improves our national security. It is about less carbon emissions because we do create the cleanest energy in the world. H.R. 1 is about strengthening America, Madam Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SORENSEN).

Mr. SORENSEN. Madam Chair, as Congress' only meteorologist, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, House Republicans' polluters over people act.

This bill does nothing to lower energy costs for working families. This bill does nothing to help our farm families dealing with the effects of extreme weather. This bill does nothing to support the domestic production of biofuels in central and northwestern Illinois.

In fact, instead of lowering costs for working communities across the Nation, the polluters over people act pads the pockets of Big Oil and Gas, guts environmental protections, and adds $2.4 billion to the deficit.

Earlier this week, I offered an amendment that would have prevented big corporations from selling natural gas overseas until we could ensure that it won't raise prices here at home. I am disappointed that Republicans put polluters over people and blocked my amendment from being considered today.

At home in Illinois, sustainability is not a partisan issue. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents all want our communities to be clean and prosperous. I thought this would be a bipartisan goal in Congress, but it seems that my colleagues across the aisle are willing to let the Federal deficit balloon for Big Oil and corporate interests at the expense of our communities' futures.

Not only will this decision impact our daily lives; it impacts the lives of our children, grandchildren, and their grandchildren.

I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on commonsense solutions that meet our Nation's energy needs while lowering energy costs for working families. American families deserve much more.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, exporting U.S.-produced, cleaner-burning natural gas to places like Vietnam and China, which allows them to take their coal-fired power plants offline, actually lowers carbon emissions globally.

Democrats say they care about carbon emissions globally. Exporting clean-burning natural gas will help do that.

Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. I am proud of the work that we are doing here to reduce the burden of high energy costs facing Americans and to strengthen our national security. I am also pleased that my bill to repeal the EPA's $27 billion slush fund is included in H.R. 1. It is an important step to right the numerous wrongs in the misnamed Inflation Reduction Act.

I have said many times that the war in Ukraine didn't create the energy crisis; it exposed it. If we learn nothing else from the energy crisis in Europe, it is that we should never make our Nation or our allies dependent on an adversarial nation to meet our energy needs. Sadly, the Biden administration's attacks on American hydrocarbon energy make us more dependent on China, who is an adversary, making this not only an economic security issue but a national security issue, as well. Thankfully, the Lower Energy Costs Act puts us on a path to energy security, improves our economy, and strengthens our national security.

Additionally, Americans have been facing record levels of inflation due to the policies of the Biden administration. Energy costs are one of the biggest drivers of inflation. Everything we use or consume has an energy cost. On day one, President Biden set the course for higher energy costs and higher inflation. When he came into office, inflation was 1.87 percent. Today, it is over 6.5 percent because of reckless spending, increases in massive regulatory costs, and higher energy costs.

The misnamed Inflation Reduction Act contributed to these problems by establishing the so-called Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, which is nothing more than a $27 billion slush fund for green advocacy groups.

The reality is energy prices have risen so much during Joe Biden's Presidency that nearly 20 million households are now behind on their household utility bills. If my colleagues really wanted to help the American people, they would do everything they could to help reduce energy costs.

This might be interesting to my colleagues. Polling indicates that a majority of voters support the Lower Energy Costs Act, including 56 percent of self-identified liberals and 69 percent of moderates.

For these reasons, I encourage all of my colleagues to support unleashing our domestic energy production to reduce the cost of living for all Americans, strengthens our national security, and makes energy independent again. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today because the Republicans' so-called energy legislation is a farce. This bill does nothing to lower energy costs. It instead increases our deficit by $2.4 billion in handouts to Big Oil.

In Ways and Means, the Oversight Committee clearly presented a report last year that clearly showed the oil companies themselves lied. Not Biden but the oil companies raised the price beyond belief.

I tried to offer a simple amendment to this bill that expressed support for offshore wind development, a clean energy source. That is it. It was blocked. At the same time, an amendment on their side was added, which gives hot air to fictions about offshore wind. So much for regular order.

Let me be clear, the experts agree. NOAA agrees, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the experts agree that offshore wind is not harmful to marine life. They would support it.

The author of one of these amendments was once a big supporter of wind energy. Now, he is leading the misinformation campaign against offshore wind.

How do you like that?

Republicans don't listen to experts or science. We know that. Their attacks on clean energy are rooted in pure bad faith.

Wind power is clean energy. It supports good-paying, union manufacturing and construction jobs.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I applaud leadership for allowing this bill to go through regular order. It went through three committees, 21 bills, hearings, markups, amendments offered, and here we are today.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), who is from a huge area of Marcellus shale, producing so much natural gas for our Nation.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, for the past 2 years, President Biden has made it his top priority to wage war on American energy.

On his first day in office, President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline and sent a message for those who wished to produce energy here in the United States that they would not be welcomed during his tenure.

When gas prices soared to over $5 a gallon in Pennsylvania last summer, his administration continued to tout the benefits of the Green New Deal, instead of working to lower prices for American families.

Now, House Republicans are finally putting an end to Biden's failed policies. H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, would create the permitting reform that is required in order to allow American companies to produce the oil, natural gas, and critical minerals that we so desperately need.

Included in this bill is legislation that I crafted to provide critical energy resource facilities the ability to participate in the EPA's flexible air permitting program and providing them with the ability to anticipate operational changes.

This isn't about cutting regulations. It is about giving certainty to American energy producers. This legislation allows us to provide the flexibility that American businesses need to mine and produce critical materials safely while at the same time spurring investments into our own communities.

It was President Reagan who said: We maintain peace through our strength.

Today, that means returning to American energy dominance and ending our reliance on foreign oil. It is time to streamline the permitting process, it is time to lower energy prices, and it is time to create American jobs.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

You know what? We hoped, coming from an energy State, that we could do this bipartisan. H.R. 1 goes off on a tangent that even union members are questioning.

If you want to know what the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers would like, they would like us to be bipartisan and to get a framework to strengthen and to get reliable Federal permitting so that we can continue to have jobs.

Even those who believe in parks, like I do, would like a permitting process that works and protects our parks. But if we look at this, what we will be doing is just giving people a blank slip, and they can do whatever they want to do in America's precious parks. That is not where we want to be.

I am grateful for the idea that we want to build our economy, but we cannot build our economy on environmental disasters which are happening around the Nation: the 2008 coal ash spill in Tennessee, the 2014 water crisis in Flint, the concealed 2022 radioactive spill in Minnesota, the tragedy with the tornado in Mississippi, and the train chemical spill and fire in Ohio.

It is clear that we need to do something together, but this is not it. H.R. 1 will, in fact, impact our environment by taking away the requirements for waste produced by certain energy facilities. It will undermine the Toxic Substances Control Act by short-circuiting the review and approval process for new chemicals. It will also allow the EPA administrator to circumvent the scientific process of approving or denying flexible permitting. That is not what our workers want us to do.

In addition, we find that the Federal Government recognizes that this is not working. In his statement to veto, the President acknowledges that this would raise costs for American families by repealing household energy rebates, roll back historic investments to increase access to low-cost energy. Instead of protecting American consumers, it would pad and increase profits by those who already have profits.

What about our health?

What about our children?

H.R. 1 is not bipartisan. It needs to be a compromise, working with all of us to create jobs.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEUSER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired, and the gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), a new member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, the problem of increasing energy costs is a critically important issue for my constituents. Many of the members of my community are paying natural gas prices over twice as high as they were a year ago, and they count themselves lucky, because some of the people in my district have natural gas bills three times higher to heat their homes than they were a year ago. Also, gasoline prices in my district are almost twice as high as they were just a few years ago.

Mr. Chair, I represent over 100,000 people who commute over an hour, each way, back and forth to Los Angeles every day. They are not doing this because they want to. They are doing this because that is what is required to put food on the table for their families. They can't afford to buy a new car, much less an electric car. Every time the price of energy goes up, these people feel the effects the most acutely.

This is not unique to my district. In fact, a survey released several weeks ago showed that over 30 percent of Americans had to make the incredibly difficult decision between paying a higher energy bill or buying basic necessities for their family in the last 12 months.

This bill is a meaningful step toward improving that situation. It would streamline the production of energy here in America.

□ 1415

Mr. Chair, the problem we have here is a classic one of supply and demand. Unfortunately, at both the Federal and State levels, we have actively sought to constrain the supply of domestic energy here in America over the last several years.

Economists will tell you that when you do that, when you have a fixed demand and you constrain the supply, prices have to go up. That is exactly what has been happening, and it is disproportionately impacting the segment of our population who can least afford to pay it.

Mr. Chair, we produce energy more cleanly in America than anywhere else on the planet. When we force our constituents to import a barrel of oil from Venezuela, it has a 50 percent higher life cycle greenhouse gas emission than a barrel of oil produced here. This bill will meaningfully improve that situation.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES).

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Besides increasing the deficit by $2.4 billion, this bill eviscerates bedrock environmental protections.

These protections are in place for a reason. My community has been stifled by decades of environmental abuses, and as a result, economic growth in many areas is a challenge and the health and safety of my constituents are at risk.

My district was once a thriving manufacturing community, but factories dumped waste in rivers, buried toxic materials, and disposed of materials with no oversight. Now my district is littered with abandoned factories, fragile ecosystems, and unusable land.

Sites once used for industrial, manufacturing, or commercial uses have been abandoned or underutilized due to known or suspected contamination of the past.

Environmental liabilities have been preventing developers and investors from restoring these properties to productive use and revitalizing impacted communities.

During my time in Congress, I have fought to bring back millions of dollars to my district for brownfield remediation in places like Waterbury, New Britain, and Torrington. Places where asthma-related illnesses are on the rise

as a direct result of environmental factors.

We are working to clean decades of pollution in the rivers of the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Farmington valleys. These once-blighted properties have been transformed into fisheries, art spaces, and even affordable housing.

After years of hard work, we were able to secure wild and scenic designations for miles of rivers in Connecticut. My State is literally beginning to breathe again.

This legislation rolls back environmental protections and regulations and gives billions in handouts to Big Oil and Gas.

In Connecticut's Fifth, we are learning hard lessons about cleaning up environmental messes of the past.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote on this dangerous and harmful legislation, and for us to listen to the science and follow what we already know to be true.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), who is a new member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and whose State has the Marcellus shale. They are a big producer in oil, coal, hydro, nuclear, and a lot of other things.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The American people deserve reliable, secure, and affordable energy to power our homes and businesses, fuel our vehicles, and sustain our way of life.

In this country we are blessed with an abundance of clean and affordable energy resources capable of meeting our energy needs for many generations to come.

Today, we have an opportunity to end our reliance on bad actors, lower prices for families hurting under sky-high inflation, and finally unleashing American energy dominance.

H.R. 1 is about ensuring a secure energy future for America.

Just recently, PJM Interconnection, one of the Nation's largest grid operators, released an alarming report about the long-term reliability of America's power grid.

The report shows that America's growing power demand, coupled with the retirement of existing power generation, far outweighs renewable sources' capacity to keep up.

Simply put, the Biden administration's rush to green is putting us on a dangerous collision course toward power outages and energy insecurity.

To see the consequences of the rush to green, just take a look at the energy crisis that unfolded when much of Europe shut off nuclear and fossil fuel power generation without a means to meet their power needs.

We cannot allow ourselves to fall victim to the same fate.

H.R. 1 embraces the abundant resources at our disposal and rejects the false notion that a cleaner environment can only be achieved at the peril of the United States' energy security and independence.

This commonsense bill reforms the outdated permitting process, increases domestic energy production, and repeals President Biden's disastrous natural gas tax.

Mr. Chair, when the American people flip on the light switch, they should have confidence that the lights will actually come on.

I am proud to join my colleagues in delivering on our commitment to America by restoring American energy dominance.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting America's energy future with the passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chair, this week my Republican colleagues are fast-tracking a bill that puts polluters over people, H.R. 1.

Let's be clear: This bill won't do anything, not one thing to help American consumers and families to lower their energy costs. Yes, we do want that light on, but this bill is not going to help us get there.

Instead, it would simply repeal household energy rebates passed by House Democrats, like those from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

We shouldn't have to choose between dirty air and polluted water just to meet the energy needs of the future. We simply don't have to. We could work together in a bipartisan way to address energy costs, but extreme MAGA Republicans refuse to do that.

We could work together on issues like the electrical grid liability and security, an issue that is all too important to us in my home State of Texas.

Instead, Republican-backed H.R. 1 picks winners and losers. The wealthy and well-connected win and workers lose. I stand with workers. Workers in my district know that new energy jobs and clean energy jobs are the jobs of the future. We depend on them.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this bill because this bill does not protect those workers. I urge my colleagues to do the same. Oppose this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I am glad to have the author of the bill on the floor, Mr. SCALISE.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my guardian angel.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, President Biden's threat to veto H.R. 1 tells everything we need to know about the bill. It will unleash American energy and bring down energy costs.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, is about increasing domestic production, permitting reform, streamlining energy exports, and reversing President Biden's anti-energy agenda.

In the first week of Joe Biden's Presidency, he stopped American energy production by halting needed permits for energy production and shutting down the Keystone pipeline, also sending home 300 West Virginians who were out there working. He drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserves while failing to fix the problems that he had created.

Americans are sick of these policies, which is why they elected a Republican majority to be a needed check on the Biden administration's war on American energy.

H.R. 1 is necessary to jump-start American energy production, and is one of many crucial energy policies that I am looking forward to supporting.

Mr. Chair, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), my good friend, the majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chair, I thank my dear friend from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for her leadership and for yielding. I truly appreciate her leadership on energy policy, as we are seeing here today, and also for her working with us on getting this Lower Energy Costs Act to the floor, and, hopefully, passed over to the Senate shortly. She has been a champion on energy issues of all kinds, but especially on the pipeline issue specific to West Virginia.

Pipelines are so critical to America's energy independence. In fact, we deal with making it easier to move pipelines and build pipelines in America. A lot of the infrastructure that we need to make this country grow is being held up right now from a lot of radical regulations on the left and outside groups that don't want American energy. They are fine with getting dirty energy from foreign countries, but they want to make it harder to get American energy. Pipelines are part of that ability for us to bring back energy production to America and provide for our own energy needs and not be dependent on other countries.

Although construction on the Mountain Valley pipeline is essentially complete, it continues to be tied up in the courts. I understand the frustration that proponents of the pipeline are experiencing. I especially want to thank Congresswoman MILLER for her leadership because she has truly been fighting to get this project done.

At the end of the day, until this project is done, it is not only going to be helping the people of West Virginia, but so many other people. I look forward to continuing to work through this issue with my friend from West Virginia and others in our Conference as we continue to push for more American energy production that will lower costs for families, not just in my home State of Louisiana or my friend from West Virginia's home State, but also for people all across America.

Bad energy policy hurts families everywhere, especially low-income families. It is time we get this policy right. I thank my friend from West Virginia for her leadership.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I thank Leader SCALISE for taking the time to highlight such an important project. He has been a champion of American energy and the Mountain Valley pipeline is a great example of domestic energy production.

I am from an energy-producing State and I have seen and lived the effects of bad energy policy coming out of Washington, which is exactly why I came to Congress to fight for West Virginians and my like-minded fellow Americans.

Today, I am introducing the complete American pipelines act, a bill to complete the Mountain Valley pipeline and other America-first projects that have been needlessly held up by left-wing radical courts.

All gas from the Mountain Valley pipeline will supply domestic energy markets.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, this means lower energy prices across the country as supply will dramatically increase. The Mountain Valley pipeline is crucial to American energy. Remember that Americans' energy security is our American security.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), a member of our committee.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, Republicans' polluters over people act is a disaster of a bill. Not only does this legislation prioritize massive giveaways to Big Oil, gas corporations, and mining companies, but it sells out hardworking families who want nothing more than to breathe clean air and drink clean water.

If Republicans are successful in making this legislation law, those corporate polluters will deplete our natural resources and destroy millions of acres of wildlife, and they will do it for pennies on the dollar. New pipelines will be constructed without the input of critical Federal agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency.

These massive corporations could be exempt from lawsuits when they spill toxic chemicals or contaminate our drinking water supplies.

This bill has the fingerprints of Big Oil lobbyists all over it.

Perhaps the most embarrassing part of this bill is how good of a return on investment it is for fossil fuel companies.

Last year, a Big Oil CEO admitted during an Energy and Commerce hearing to cashing in on stock he owned in his own company at a time when people were feeling maximum pain at the pump. He told me he did it at a 9 percent markup. That predatory behavior clearly hasn't swayed the authors of H.R. 1.

I would imagine that is because the same Big Oil corporations that stand to benefit most from this bill have donated millions to Republican politicians over the years. They will make that money back in a matter of minutes if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Chair, Congress' job is to serve the hardworking folks that we represent, not pad the profits of oil barons who run ExxonMobil or Shell.

Mr. Chair, our constituents deserve better, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 36¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 36½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the vice chairman of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1.

I stand before you like everybody in this Chamber who is a father and a grandfather, somebody who wants to leave this Earth better than we found it.

□ 1430

Some in the past have argued that we must sacrifice affordable energy and reliable energy so that we can be clean. We have seen Europe go down this path. They pushed back on fracking, and they pushed back on nuclear power. Today, they buy fracked fuel from an enemy.

We have been told that we must give up affordability and reliability so that we can be clean. This is a false choice, and H.R. 1 is a path to affordable, reliable, and clean energy.

Let's be honest. The U.S. energy sector is not the enemy. They are the answer to our energy future.

I ask my colleagues, why do you hate fossil fuels?

Let's hate emissions. Let's hate the emissions and not the source.

This is why H.R. 1 is so important. It is an opportunity to accomplish all three of these goals.

At its core, H.R. 1 is about responsibly building America's energy infrastructure.

The rest of the world is dying for American energy. We can replace dirty Russian, Venezuelan, and Iranian petroleum products. We can reduce more emissions than any proposal on the left simply by using U.S. energy products.

H.R. 1 pushes back on the narrative that has been spun about Republicans not caring about the Earth. More importantly, without the permitting reforms in H.R. 1, none of us can accomplish our climate or energy goals.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the majority's polluters over people act, a massive handout to some of the world's most profitable and most powerful corporations.

It is a Big Oil giveaway that would hike the deficit instead of helping families, instead of protecting our planet, and instead of lowering costs for consumers and slashing energy bills.

Republicans seem to have just one priority, and that is helping the rich get richer. Through price gouging and war profiteering, Big Oil has doubled their profits to record levels. They are hoarding millions of acres of our public land, and they are using these unprecedented resources to line their pockets.

Exxon just announced $35 billion in stock buybacks, and Chevron shareholders are pocketing $75 billion.

Yet, what is the Republican plan? It is to triple down on allegiance to Big Oil, give away more Federal land, invite more offshore drilling, unleash more pollution into our water and our air and our land, and leave the taxpayers footing the bill.

Climate change is here. We don't have time to wait. Americans know that securing our future means investing in clean energy.

Families know their health depends on it; economists know our prosperity depends on it; and the Pentagon knows our national security depends on it. It is only MAGA Republicans who don't understand our future depends on a thriving clean energy economy.

Last year, we proudly enacted the largest climate investment in history, and now we are proudly voting ''no'' on the polluters over people act.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who is a Florida Gator.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from South Carolina for yielding. Go Gators.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, which would unleash American energy, lower energy prices, and restore the United States as energy independent and as an energy leader in the world.

I thank my good friends, Leader SCALISE and Chair RODGERS, and my good friend here from South Carolina—he is a good man even though he roots for the wrong team—for being such strong leaders on the issue and bringing this legislation to the floor.

Since the Biden administration came into office, Americans have been faced with a persisting energy crisis. We are in the midst of unprecedented increases in the costs of living, and I continue to hear from my constituents regarding how difficult it is to make ends meet.

I have heard from numerous constituents who are facing the prospect

of losing their livelihood due to increased energy costs driving up their business' operational costs.

Tragically, other constituents are now facing severe financial hardship and facing increased energy costs while on fixed incomes. Our seniors are having a very hard time, Mr. Chairman.

My constituents deserve energy policies that make energy more affordable for Americans, not more expensive.

Not only will H.R. 1 unleash American energy to decrease costs, but it will also spur the mining and processing of critical minerals domestically. It is essential that we do this. We are too dependent on our adversaries, particularly China, for these minerals that we use in nearly every aspect of our economy. H.R. 1 will allow us to produce innovative technologies and critical resources here at home and not in China.

This bill will return the United States as a global energy leader and secure America's future from dependencies on our adversaries.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Member for yielding. He is a great man, and he is a leader on these issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), who is a member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to call attention to how Republicans' polluters energy package will do little of nothing to finally—and I have to censor my poster here, Mr. Chairman—fix the grid once and for all.

In February 2021, my own State of Texas had a catastrophic grid failure during a deadly winter storm that caused 246 deaths and left 5 million people in record cold temperatures without heat and businesses without power. Last summer, Texans again had to deal with the dangerous and unexpected generation failures that put further strain on our State's electric grid. These extreme weather events are not unique to Texas.

Despite these continued problems of grid resiliency, the Republican-led package we are voting on will do little of nothing to actually fix the grid.

It is, in fact, harmful. It is hyperpartisan. This package will make the grid less stable. We need to make investments in electric transmissions to meet our energy needs, create good-paying jobs, and have cleaner air to breathe.

This package will do little to address the lower energy costs for people across north Texas. Not only will it not help constituents pay their energy bills, but CBO estimates that this bill will actually increase the deficit over the 2023–2033 period by roughly $2.4 billion.

That is why I urge my Republican colleagues to stop putting polluters over people and meet us in the middle to pass a bipartisan, comprehensive solution that bolsters our Nation's energy independence, helps the middle class, and finally fixes the grid.

Fix the grid, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, we should fix the grid and harden it from the EMP threats and other things, but while we are doing that, we need the pipeline infrastructure to get the resources to where they need to go, and that is in our communities so that baseload generation can happen.

Mr. Chairman, there is a gentleman from Ohio who understands energy. He is the chairman of the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

With H.R. 1, we are working to lower energy costs for consumers across America by unleashing American energy and strengthening American supply chains.

H.R. 1 addresses regulatory red tape and permitting barriers to the domestic development of energy without compromising environmental protections.

The Lower Energy Costs Act also encourages domestic processing and refining of critical energy resources to ensure that components for all energy sources can be made right here in America.

As chair of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials, I am proud that H.R. 1 includes seven bills that passed through our subcommittee and full committee through regular order.

The bills encourage the domestic refining of critical energy resources, allow for flexible approaches to permitting, support national security, promote innovation that is currently stalled in EPA red tape, repealed two sections of the Democrats' Inflation Reduction Act, and protect American refining capacity from agency overreach.

I thank Representatives CARTER of Georgia, JOYCE of Pennsylvania, PENCE, CURTIS, PFLUGER, PALMER, and CRENSHAW for their work on this important legislation.

In addition, H.R. 1 includes my bill, the Unlocking Our Domestic LNG Energy Potential Act, under section 10007. The section would amend the Natural Gas Act to repeal all restrictions on the import and export of natural gas. Removing such restrictions would help facilitate timely exports of LNG and help our allies. A stronger LNG export industry also means increased domestic production of natural gas and lower domestic prices.

I have heard my Democratic colleagues across the aisle criticize H.R. 1 because they say it does nothing for clean energy. This could not be further from the truth. H.R. 1 includes several provisions that incorporate focused flexibilities into certain environmental statutes in order to create an improved regulatory landscape for refining and processing critical minerals.

Mr. Chairman, what are the industries that need critical minerals the most? Those are the wind, solar, and battery technology industries—all clean energy technologies.

We do almost no critical mineral refining and processing in the United States. That must change, or we risk becoming dangerously dependent on China for our energy and transportation systems.

The International Energy Agency estimates that the demand for critical minerals will double by 2040. We want to meet that demand with American resources and reduce reliance on China.

I will close by thanking Chair RODGERS for her leadership on the Lower Energy Costs Act. Energy security is national security, and through H.R. 1, we can unleash American energy dominance and lower energy costs for American families, thereby lowering inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. SCHRIER). The doctor is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, just last year, we made the largest investment in clean energy technology and climate science ever. The intention is to spur research and innovation in cutting-edge technologies and then accelerate development and construction of a modernized electric grid, solar and wind farms, modular nuclear reactors, and improved hydropower. However, none of that funding will actually affect climate change if we can't streamline the permitting process.

Frankly, it is pretty exciting to me to think about permitting reform as an area where Democrats and Republicans can work together, but let's be clear that speeding up the permitting process does not mean throwing all environmental protections out the window. That is essentially what today's bill, H.R. 1, their top priority, does today.

It doesn't streamline permitting. It undermines environmental protections and is a huge handout to fossil fuel companies, in some cases allowing them to avoid environmental regulations altogether. It pushes our energy system in the wrong direction.

There is urgency to shift to energy sources that don't emit greenhouse gases. Some of the glaciers on Mount Rainier in my district have already disappeared. That is why we do need to improve the permitting process.

However, the bill we are addressing today decimates that process, putting natural resources at risk and fast-tracking more drilling for oil and gas and mining for minerals on our public lands.

By the way, there are already 9,000 permits out there for oil and gas extraction that aren't even being used, and oil and gas companies are making record-shattering profits right now, quarter over quarter. They don't need another gift from Congress.

It is time to prioritize clean energy projects, and it is those permits that require the most expediency.

This bill isn't permitting reform, and it won't cut costs for American families. When they are ready, I look forward to working with my colleagues on real, serious, pragmatic permitting reform that will allow for the quickest possible transition to cleaner sources. We owe it to generations we will never know.

□ 1445

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chair, Ohio families are paying too much for gasoline. They are paying too much for heat. They are paying too much at the grocery store, partly due to rising production costs on farms.

A recent survey by ABC and The Washington Post found that roughly 40 percent of Americans are financially worse off today than they were just 2 years ago. They are begging for relief from soaring prices, and Republicans are answering their calls for help.

That is why I am proud to support H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. No more relying on dictators for oil. We are going to solve this problem the American way, with American workers, American ingenuity, and American energy.

H.R. 1 does this by fixing the broken permit process so that energy producers can do their jobs faster and cheaper. We are going to unleash American energy, which will lower costs and get our economy moving in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to think of the millions of Americans struggling to make ends meet. Show them you care and vote for H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. THANEDAR).

Mr. THANEDAR. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 is not an all-of-the-above energy bill that will help lower costs for Americans.

I rise today in opposition to this bill because it would worsen the destructive effects of climate change and line the pockets of the wealthy at the expense of the most vulnerable constituents in my district.

Mr. Chair, my constituents are sick and tired of politicians in this town using their positions of power to help corporations at the expense of people.

Fossil fuel companies and the lobbyists want to lessen environmental regulations so that they can pump massive amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and cash in, all at the expense of the people.

In southwest Detroit, corporations continue to emit harmful and unpleasant fumes around the low-income neighborhoods in the area. This bill will help them continue to pollute and worsen environmental injustice.

In my district, climate change has increased the rate and severity of flooding. My constituents must endure property damage, water contamination, and in some cases the loss of loved ones.

Last Congress, this body made historic changes by passing the Inflation Reduction Act, reducing the pollution in our communities that is disproportionately felt by low-income and disadvantaged communities. We must not turn back.

I came to Congress to fight against bills like H.R. 1 because they put my constituents directly at risk. It is absurd to lessen environmental regulations at a time when corporations choose pollution and profits over people. Please don't pass this disastrous bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in full, unambiguous support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The Energy and Commerce Committee recently heard from David Hickman, a farmer, who described our current economy as the most perilous time for American agriculture. He is right, and he is not alone.

Every day that I am in Georgia's First Congressional District, whether I am talking to a parent, a farmer, a teacher, a trucker, or a small business owner, I hear the same concern: Inflation is too high. Everything, from diesel to food, is more expensive under this President, who cannot stop himself from spending your money, stealing your retirement funds, and stomping on your small business.

The average household is paying $10,000 more per year as a result of Biden's policies. What is worse is that pain is the point.

On day one of his Presidency, President Biden declared war on American energy, and at breakneck speed ended American energy independence and killed thousands of jobs.

What came next? Inflation, high interest rates, small businesses closing their doors, and even more inflation.

When you plunge a knife into the heart of our economy, you can't be surprised when it begins bleeding out.

Fortunately, House Republicans are stepping up and delivering solutions for the American people. H.R. 1 will increase American energy production, reform the permitting process for all industries, reverse this administration's anti-energy policies, streamline energy infrastructure, and boost the production and processing of critical minerals. That is a long-winded way of saying that this bill will make our energy sector more affordable, more efficient, and will create more jobs.

The American people told us that inflation and high energy prices were their number one concern, and we are listening by making it the House's number one priority. It doesn't even matter if you think we should ''drill, baby, drill'' or never use fossil fuels again, we need to be able to build in America again.

That is why I am particularly glad that my bill, H.R. 1070, was included in this legislation. It will help bring necessary permitting reform and investment in America's critical mineral mining and processing. Right now we rely almost entirely on China for critical minerals needed for batteries, smartphones, military technologies, and more.

Simply put, this is not energy independence. We depend more on China than we have ever relied on OPEC or any other countries for oil. It is a national security concern to depend on any one country that much for such an essential material.

My district is one of the few places in America that mines critical minerals, and we are eager to bring more of this essential and valuable supply chain home.

H.R. 1 is an important step, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ).

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear. I support our energy economy. I stand by New Mexico's energy workers, who help fuel our economy. New Mexico's Second Congressional District is one of the top energy producing areas in the entire world. In fact, Lea County, in my district, produces more oil than any other county in the United States.

About half of New Mexico's fossil fuel operations are on public lands, and royalties from the industry make up about a third of our State's annual budget. With an industry so large, there are a lot of good-paying jobs for rural New Mexicans.

Congress is not debating a bill to support energy workers that are essential to my district. We aren't even debating ways to lower energy costs for Americans, no matter what name Republicans give this bill. This bill is about the same old thing, padding the pockets of executives at the cost of energy workers.

Just last year, as you can see, when Americans saw gas prices as high as $5 per gallon at the pump, oil and gas companies made not millions, not billions, but trillions of dollars in profit. While my constituents were paying $100 to fill up their pickup truck, Exxon chiefs were making $55 billion in profits. My colleagues across the aisle want to make them even richer at our expense.

In the Permian Basin, oil and gas production has increased nearly every year since 2013, and it is on track to reach new, even higher production

records this year. We are already unleashing American energy, but these profits aren't going to the workers in my district. They are going to the wealthy CEOs with collections of massive mansions and cars. While the energy workers in my district are living right here, in tents and temporary trailer homes, the CEOs are living right up here in Hawaii and mansions all across the world.

While our folks risk their health and safety to make these profits, we need to make sure that our priorities are in the right place. This bill is toxic, literally. It would increase pollution by removing the methane emission regulations and gutting the Clean Air Act.

Asthma rates in southeast New Mexico are the highest in the region, largely connected to methane and other emissions. Republicans want to make this air dirtier, sending more kids to the hospital.

According to Somos Un Pueblo Unido, nearly one in two energy workers has reported an injury on the job, and most of those injuries are permanent. If this bill really cared about the energy industry, it would start by prioritizing the people who work in it.

As the Representative for New Mexico's Second Congressional District, I will always prioritize my constituents, the hardworking energy workers, over the Big Oil CEOs from outside of my district.

That is why I am working on bipartisan legislation to ensure that our energy workers aren't being forgotten. Instead of focusing on growing the record profits for executives and CEOs, my bill would focus on protecting the backbone of our energy economy, our energy workers. I am focused on investing in the workers who have generated hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue to our State.

When I got to Congress, many people told me to be cautious. They said be careful, be scared of the Big Oil barons. I was told that they are powerful and that if I don't agree with them and pad their pockets, I am going to be their number one target.

Guess what? I am not scared, and we won't be silenced. To the CEOs watching this from their glamorous mansions, just know I will fight to ensure New Mexico's workers are a priority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration data, the average price for gasoline in 2022 was $1.80 per gallon more than when President Biden assumed office.

H.R. 1 is not just about energy independence. That is the underlying foundation, but what it is really about is the quality of life for the American people here at home and the cost of energy that is feeding the skyrocketing inflation.

The average price of gas in 2020 was $2.26 per gallon. The average price of gas in 2022 was $4.06 per gallon, reaching a peak of over $5 per gallon in June of 2022.

According to the Department of Energy's Low-Income Energy Affordability Data, the LEAD Tool, low-income households spend 8.6 percent of their income on energy expenses. Depending on location and income, certain households spend as much as 30 percent of their income on energy expenses. The energy burden for low-income households is three times higher than non-low-income households.

In rural parts of the country, like where I represent in Appalachia, you are very familiar with that area, it is a real problem when families have to choose between putting gas in their car or groceries on the table. It is a real challenge when they have to choose between paying their heating bill or buying clothes for their kids to go to school. This is what H.R. 1 begins to address for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

From the minute that President Biden took office, he waged war against American energy production and the independence that we previously held.

The Biden administration canceled the Keystone XL pipeline on day one, imposed a $6 billion tax on natural gas, and promised $27 billion to special interest climate groups, and severely limited our fracking capabilities. These are just a few of the examples of why our energy prices are up 40 percent since the President took office.

In my mind, everything that can be made in America should be, including energy. American-made energy provides jobs, creates economic growth, lowers prices, and is an important part of our national security.

The United States must become energy independent once again, and regulatory hurdles for energy production here at home must be rolled back. This begins with permitting reform and cutting the burdensome red tape that suppresses innovation and development.

I was proud to work on commonsense reforms in the South Carolina General Assembly, and I am excited to see this being done at the Federal level. H.R. 1 is a top priority for House Republicans. We want to work for the people, not against them.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, this legislation will enhance our Nation's domestic energy production while lowering energy costs for Americans across our great country. I urge everybody to support H.R. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 21¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 25½ minutes remaining.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, our friends across the aisle ran for office in 2022 and took the majority narrowly—by five seats.

It was a hard-fought battle, and many promised to reduce the deficit. Here we are today debating H.R. 1, their first major bill, literally number one, and what have they chosen as their top issue in this Congress?

A $117 billion deficit-busting taxpayer giveaway to polluters; as if oil companies who posted record profits in the billions need more help.

First of all, if we are keeping score here, add up this Big Oil giveaway with the rich tax cheat protection act that passed, and that is a whopping $231 billion that would be added to the deficit by legislation that passed this House already.

I thought the Republican majority was running to reduce the deficit. It looks like the exact opposite is happening.

Also, where is the budget?

President Biden presented his. We still see no budget from the House majority.

Second, to call this bill a little out of step would be an understatement. As a result of climate change, we see in Florida extreme hurricanes, rising seas, and extreme heat.

We have public health issues there: asthma, cancer, and other issues.

We see society moving forward. Major auto manufacturers are going all in on electric vehicles. Utilities are moving away from fossil fuels toward wind, solar, nuclear, green hydrogen, and others. Gas in central Florida is between $3 to $3.25. Inflation has dropped 7 months in a row.

This bill looks like it missed the moment, and now it is just a windfall for Big Oil. When gas was sky-high, Mr. Chair, many colleagues across the aisle criticized Biden for using the Strategic Petroleum Reserve during this disruption to lower gas prices.

This bill wouldn't guarantee lower gas prices; not now, not in the future. It would guarantee more pollution, more sickness, and a step backward.

Third, we passed the Inflation Reduction Act, a very popular law that is transforming us to a clean energy economy before our very eyes.

America is moving forward. Apparently, our colleagues across the aisle are the last to know. They want to repeal the Inflation Reduction Act, including popular provisions. That didn't work well under ObamaCare, and I don't think it is going to work out now.

Lastly, it mandates drilling off of Florida shores. Our top industry is tourism. We need to protect our shores.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise today to lend my voice in support of H.R. 1.

President Biden declared war on American energy the day he took office. In fact, he blocked the Keystone XL pipeline that would have yielded 800,000 barrels of oil per day and created 33,000 American jobs.

In an ominous sign of his policies to come, he put America last and approved the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to benefit Russia.

The Biden administration also illegally halted all onshore oil and gas lease sales, crushing the energy market and driving up costs.

American families didn't sign up for or vote for higher energy costs, but that is exactly what the Biden administration has delivered.

In fact, the price of gas reached $5 a gallon just last summer, for the first time in U.S. history. This Lower Energy Costs Act will help restore American energy independence and decrease Biden's harmful regulatory burdens.

In fact, this bill repeals the natural gas tax imposed by the inflation increase act. It stops President Biden from imposing a ban on fracking. It streamlines the Federal permitting process and allows drilling on Federal lands.

It rolls back a $27 billion green slush fund. It gets rid of many other green fees imposed by the inflation increase act.

It ends the moratorium on new coal leasing and helps end dependence on foreign countries for vital energy.

We don't need to go to China or Saudi Arabia for our energy needs. Our country has all that we need right here, put in the ground for us by the Lord above.

H.R. 1 will finally allow energy producers to realize their full potential by ridding them of unnecessary and onerous permitting processes that take years to navigate.

This bill is a step in the right direction to reduce the regulatory burden and reignite American energy independence, which is so vital for our economy.

I thank my Republican friends for prioritizing this important issue in this new Congress, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN).

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Chair, permitting reform, we all want it. There is a simple solution. Separate the question.

But why not? We need to ask why not.

Because this bill includes massive handouts to big corporations and incentivizes them to leak methane into the atmosphere.

Let's just look at the bill's name: LECA. They are telling it like it is, folks, and we should be listening.

There is a choice being made here by House Republicans, Mr. Chair. They are not doing this to make our system more efficient or to lower costs for the American people, quite the opposite.

This bill repeals $4.5 billion in home electrification, a program that the Department of Energy estimates could save Americans thousands of dollars annually.

If we were focused on lowering costs for American families, this is what we would be focused on.

I talk to west Michiganders every single day about what they want and what they need.

We want to protect the Great Lakes. We want to lower our energy costs, and that means investing in conservation efforts and putting smart regulations in place that support the longevity of the Great Lakes economy. That means ensuring a future for the next generation of west Michiganders.

The Big Oil giveaway act does none of that. It greatly expands companies' ability to exploit public land.

Michigan-3 is home to a large portion of the Grand River watershed and miles of beautiful Lake Michigan shoreline. I support protecting our most beautiful protected areas, not stripping them for parts.

What House Republicans are doing is this: Holding an antiquated permitting system hostage to extract benefits for Big Oil corporations.

If they want to come to the table in good faith on serious bipartisan efforts to streamline the permitting process and lower energy costs for American families, I will be the first in line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I proudly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. This is about clean, reliable, and affordable energy.

My constituents in the 17th Congressional District are feeling the pain at the pump, on their electric bills and their home heating costs, and in almost every single one of their purchases due to the increase in energy costs under the Biden administration.

Gas prices have risen over 51 percent since President Biden took office. Residential electrical costs in New York State have risen over 26 percent since President Biden took office, 24 percent nationwide. Utility gas is up 44 percent.

In just the last year, energy costs in the New York metropolitan region are up almost 10 percent. Not only does the cost of energy take a toll on families across America, but it has a compounding effect throughout the supply chain, driving prices of groceries and food ever higher.

This out-of-control inflation has created a massive crunch on the budgets of middle-class families across New York State, but perhaps no more so than right in the Hudson Valley where folks are facing energy bills in the thousands of dollars every month just to heat and power their homes.

It is fueling the affordability crisis in New York State, and it is exactly why I am proud to support H.R. 1, which will restore our Nation's energy independence by increasing the production and export of domestic energy while reducing the regulatory burdens that stifle American energy.

We need an all-of-the-above approach that includes gas, nuclear, and renewables. That has been emphatically clear for years.

Making America more dependent on foreign energy adds more pollution, not less, to our climate. H.R. 1 unleashes American energy and will drive down inflation, providing Hudson Valley families with the real relief they so desperately need.

Just some facts: 60 percent of New Yorkers rely on natural gas, and 70 percent of our electricity is generated by natural gas.

We have had a 60 percent reduction in greenhouse gases because of natural gas, greater than renewables. Those are the facts, and that is why we need to pass H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our country needs energy to flourish. Democrats know that means authorizing energy projects.

The law requires corporations to engage with communities, follow our bedrock environmental principles, and ultimately advance projects that offer greater benefits than costs.

Whether it is oil, natural gas, solar, or wind, the standard is the same. We shouldn't move forward until we know that the project delivers for consumers, taxpayers, and communities.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1 would eliminate that determination and instead put corporate interests like Big Oil in charge of what energy projects get authorized.

H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, gives billions of dollars in taxpayer-funded subsidies to big oil and gas.

It would let fossil fuel companies hoard thousands of unused leases, require the authorization of drilling on federally protected lands, give unilateral authority to corporations to create their own environmental impact statements, and force taxpayers to pay to clean up hazardous mining waste.

Congress should be doing the right thing by looking at reforms that protect taxpayers when approving energy projects.

That is why I offered an amendment that would require oil, gas, and coal companies to put up a bond that actually covers the cost of cleaning up their messes from drilling and mining.

That way, American taxpayers aren't on the hook to foot the billions of dollars needed to find and plug abandoned wells.

Unfortunately, protecting the taxpayer from cleaning up big energy's messes from drilling and mining is too controversial for my colleagues across

the aisle, and my amendment was not put on the floor for a vote.

We can still come together in a bipartisan manner. We can and should enact permitting reform that protects American taxpayers.

That is why I am submitting an amendment for the RECORD that requires the Secretaries of Energy and the Interior to certify that this bill would lower costs for American consumers and ban oil and gas exploration on protected public lands.

These changes protect us all from footing the cost of big energy's record-high profits.

To my colleagues across the aisle: You have an opportunity to prove to your constituents back home that you are putting them over polluters.

Will you stand up for consumers and taxpayers to lower costs, or will you do the bidding of big energy?

This amendment puts that question to each of us.

Are we for the people or for polluters?

With this vote, you will show your allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of this amendment.

Ms. Porter of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 40001. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior jointly submit to Congress a certification that the implementation of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, would lower costs for American consumers and taxpayers.

SEC. 40002. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not authorize any oil and gas exploration activities or conduct an oil and gas lease sale on any unit of the National Park System, national wildlife refuge, national trail, national conservation area, national monument, or national recreation area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Under the Biden administration, American families are facing skyrocketing bills and rising costs of everyday goods.

I see this and experience this every day as I talk to the constituents of Florida's Seventh District. By no fault of their own, they are struggling to put food on the table, gas in their cars, and to pay their bills.

I thank our leadership and I thank Speaker MCCARTHY for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor to help ease the burden many Americans feel by lowering costs.

Not only will H.R. 1 lower energy costs, but it will also streamline our energy infrastructure and make us more competitive on the global stage as we are losing and being outpaced by adversarial nations, such as China and Russia.

President Biden has waged a war, but not on our adversaries, on American energy, and he has made us more reliant on the adversarial nations I mentioned before, Russia and China.

This administration has made us dependent upon our aggressors and weaker than ever, but no more. This legislation will get us one step closer to becoming energy independent and then dominant by increasing exports of American energy. It is time to restore our position on the world stage and ease the burden on every American family.

I thank you so much for this opportunity. I am in strong, strong support of this.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

As a doctor, I am all too familiar with the harmful consequences of pollution and other environmental dangers on people's health.

Frontline communities near high-polluting corporations already bear too much of the burden of environmental injustice.

For example, people living near fossil fuel drilling sites are at greater risk for pre-term birth, cancer, asthma, and other respiratory diseases.

□ 1515

We must do more to protect people's health, not silence the voices of these vulnerable communities like this bill aims to do, not speeding up permit approvals without local families' input on projects that will go in their backyards like this bill aims to do.

This bill will also make the air we breathe dirtier and the people sicker by sacrificing key environmental protections under the Clean Air Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, and other laws, all to increase fossil fuel energy production in a reckless and irresponsible way.

This is the wrong approach. Instead, we should secure America's energy independence with clean, reliable energy that will lower costs for families and protect people's health.

This includes building out our domestic supply chain for critical minerals like lithium while producing renewable energy.

We can do this through projects like geothermal energy production and lithium recovery at the Salton Sea in Imperial County, California, in my district.

The innovative approach we are taking there is responsible energy production with a closed-loop clean system that also creates lithium extraction with geothermal energy.

This is better for the environment, better for our communities, and better for the economy. This shows that we do not have to sacrifice health and the environment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1 and instead work toward solutions that bring everyone together to move our country forward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend and colleague.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend from Ohio for yielding. I rise in strong support for this legislative commitment that House Republicans have initiated, H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. I thank my friend from Ohio for his leadership. I thank my good friend from Arkansas, Chairman BRUCE WESTERMAN of the Natural Resources Committee for his fine work on this important bill.

Under this administration's green energy only push, we are driving up costs for central Arkansas families, hurting our economy, and our national security.

We need in this Nation an all-of-the-above energy approach for the U.S. and for the globe.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration's most recent outlook, by 2050, global energy use will increase nearly 50 percent compared to today. While the share of primary energy consumption from renewables is predicted to increase from 15 to 27 percent by 2050, Mr. Chair, 83 percent of energy consumption in that period will still need to come from coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear. H.R. 1 takes this key step in the right direction.

Instead, Biden officials are only focusing on intermittent energy sources like wind and solar, for which we do not possess large-scale storage or provide a reliable and consistent source of energy.

We need to be a leader in powering the world, and an all-of-the-above energy strategy will do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on climate and for the role he played last Congress in passing the most historic climate legislation in the history of this country. Finally, something inspired young people, not just around this country, but around the world.

Now, what does the other side want to do? They want to start to repeal it.

That legislation which put $369 billion into climate only marked 0.1 percent over the next 10 years of what our economy is going to be, $300 trillion. It was a 0.1 percent down payment, the largest in history; and what do they want to do? They want to take away the $27 billion Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

Where does that money go? It goes to rural America. It goes to factory towns. It goes to communities of color,

who have faced too much pollution, who have too much cancer in their communities. They want to take that money away from rural America, from factory towns, and who do they want to give it to? They want to give it to the fossil fuel companies. The fossil fuel companies, that is really what this bill is about. It is decreasing the royalty rate that fossil fuel companies pay on taxpayer land. It is a handout, a subsidy, a further subsidy to Big Oil.

Now, the GAO has said that it will do nothing to increase oil or gas production, and we all know the facts that oil production and gas production under this President is up. Those are the facts, that it is up.

They don't care about the production. Don't let them confuse you. They want to give subsidies to Exxon, Chevron, and Big Oil that are making record profits off the war in Ukraine and fleecing the American people.

They want to take away money from rural communities, take away money from factory towns, take away money from Americans who are suffering and give fossil fuel subsidies. That is wrong, and I thank Mr. PALLONE for opposing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 1 and permitting reform under the National Environmental Protection Act, also known as NEPA.

Nebraska has been on the frontlines of NEPA's impacts over the course of a decades-long expressway program through my Congressional District. It has taken 10 more years than it should have.

Under the Obama administration, the length of time for NEPA reviews climbed from 3.4 years in 2010 to 5.2 years in 2016.

President Trump rolled back the red tape, but President Biden brought it all back and expanded the prior requirements.

H.R. 1 makes reasonable reforms to ensure that NEPA is applied expeditiously and without unnecessarily burdening States.

In Nebraska, and I suspect way too many other States, commonsense solutions and mitigation strategies to steward our natural resources need to be protected, but we need to do it under NEPA.

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

Mr. Chairman, Republicans keep talking about lowering energy costs, but let's be honest with the American people. Right now, the price of oil is $50 per barrel less than its high last year. The price of a gallon of gasoline is $1.57 less than its high last year. The price of natural gas is 78 percent lower than it was at its high last year.

Of course, we would all like even lower prices, but the bottom line is, this bill is misnamed. It will not lower energy prices. It would make natural gas more expensive by making Americans compete with consumers across the globe. It would make our electricity dirtier and more expensive. It would enrich the oil and gas companies that price-gouged American consumers last year.

This bill is nothing but a handout to the fossil fuel industry that would drive prices higher for Americans.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, saying that gasoline prices are down is a little bit like giving an arsonist a medal for putting out a fire that he helped start.

They are still 50 percent higher than when President Biden took office. That is not counting inputs for ag products like fertilizer, which the natural feed stock is natural gas, all of those different issues.

That is not really the point in all of this. Two things can be true at once: The world's going to need more oil and natural gas and drive more electric cars in the next decade, and this bill has a little bit of something for everyone.

The last time we brought a refinery online in the United States with any true downstream capacity was the year I was born, 1976—46 years ago.

If we want to continue to build more electrification, have more batteries for more American-made electric vehicles, well, we need the rare earths to do it. This bill does those things.

When you live in a small community like I do in the geographic center of North America, we have recognized, very clearly, how hard it is to get the products that North Dakota makes that the rest of the world needs to market. Doesn't matter if it is corn. Doesn't matter if it is fertilizer. Doesn't matter if it is oil. Doesn't matter if it is natural gas.

We used to be the shining example in the whole world on how to put infrastructure in the ground. That is no longer the case, and it is not because Americans don't know how to do it. It is not because North Dakotans don't know how to produce it. It is because alphabet soup agencies in Washington, D.C., make it harder and harder and harder.

When we can't get those projects in the ground, we starve off capital. We are the only country in the world that is both energy and food secure. That is an incredible strategic advantage on the world stage.

In any normal place, we would maximize that. We would do everything we could to increase that, but we don't live in a normal place, Mr. Chairman. We live in Washington, D.C.

This bill will help us get infrastructure in the ground, help us produce those things that the world is starved for, and allow us energy independence, energy dominance, and also help communities in States like mine continue to thrive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act. I will take my time to point out two glaring flaws with this bill: First, H.R. 1 will make energy more expensive for Granite Staters.

Right now, natural gas is the single largest source of electricity in New England. When natural gas prices go up, electricity prices in New Hampshire go up, yet H.R. 1 makes it easier for natural gas producers to export American fuel to foreign adversaries like China. Making it easier for natural gas companies to export fuel to China, where the prices are currently higher, will cause U.S. natural gas prices to rise.

As a result, electricity prices in New Hampshire will rise, too.

My amendment to H.R. 1, which the Rules Committee did not make in order, would have addressed this problem, but instead of putting American consumers first, the majority is focused on lining the pockets of Big Oil and Gas companies.

The solution to our Nation's energy problems is building new low-cost renewables so we aren't reliant on expensive carbon-polluting forms of energy.

Second, H.R. 1 is going to actually weaken control on PFAS chemicals. In New Hampshire, we know just how damaging PFAS can be to our water supply and the communities that rely upon them. Congress should be making it more difficult to bring new PFAS chemicals to the market, but H.R. 1 erodes the chemical review process under the Toxic Substances Control Act, allowing new PFAS chemicals to come on the market without any consideration for the danger that they may present to the public. It is the responsibility of Congress to prevent these dangerous chemicals from coming to the market.

Rather than wasting our time pursuing legislation that puts polluters over people, let's focus on coming together.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we have said it over and over and over again, and there is no denying it. Energy security is national security. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

Unleashing American energy, production, permitting, put American energy back into play to address the needs and concerns of the American people, to lower inflation, and to ensure America's national security on the international stage. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

I look forward to closing here in a few minutes with some striking comments about telling the truth. I heard the ranking member from our Energy and Commerce Committee a little bit ago say, tell the American people the truth, and I respect him greatly. I am going to tell the American people the truth in just a little bit.

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

□ 1530

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

I keep hearing that Republicans want to lower energy costs with this bill and how important it is to export natural gas overseas. I want to take a moment to examine some history here.

Back in 2015, with a Republican-controlled House and a Republican-controlled Senate, Congress passed a bill that repealed the crude export ban. Since then, crude oil and petroleum product exports to China have tripled, and the amount of refining capacity on the East Coast of the United States has decreased by 36 percent.

This is not a coincidence. Lifting the export ban meant that oil producers saw more profits in sending their oil overseas, including to China, and little in refining it here at home. That led to 10 refineries closing in the intervening 7 years, destroying jobs.

It tied the price of oil in the U.S. firmly to the price of oil on global markets, which has been responsible for the gas prices roller coaster we have seen for the past few years.

Now, what that bill did was enrich a very small number of people who export oil at the expense of every other American who now has to pay a little bit more for gasoline.

Republicans, with this bill, want to turn around and do this for the natural gas industry, too. This bill makes it far too easy to export LNG abroad—yes, including to China. This would mean the same process would repeat.

You would pay more for energy. American factories and industries would pay more for energy. A very small sliver of natural gas businesses would profit. It is prioritizing the enrichment of the few over the needs of many Americans.

The sheer gall of calling this the Lower Energy Costs Act, in my opinion, is insulting. It is insulting to refinery workers who lost their jobs. It is insulting to the frontline communities next to fossil fuel plants that suffer from dirtier air. It is insulting to the hundreds of millions of Americans who would have to pay more to keep their houses warm each winter.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Speaker Emeritus of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great leadership in opposing this reckless legislation that is on the floor today.

I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for his leadership, as well as our ranking member on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. LARSEN, for their setting the record straight in the different categories of this legislation.

The gentleman from New Jersey just set the record straight again. I thank the gentleman so much for giving a history lesson to some in this room who may not remember the course of events that has taken us to this place.

Today, Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in sounding the alarm, a five-alarm climate emergency, which is the existential threat of our time.

Many of our colleagues, including our distinguished ranking members, have gone into detail about opposition to this bill. I want to focus on the climate aspect.

It was with pride during my term as Speaker that House Democrats made climate our flagship issue. When we enacted the Inflation Reduction Act, our Nation took a landmark step to rescue our planet. Yet, our progress stands in sharp contrast to the reckless Republican bill before us, which, on every score, puts polluters first.

We know that climate is a health issue. The gentleman referenced that in his comments. While Democrats are slashing pollution to preserve clean air and water, this bill guts bedrock health protections to fast-track polluter projects.

Climate is an economic issue. While Democrats are creating jobs and lowering energy costs, this bill gives $2.4 billion in handouts to the biggest polluters.

Climate is a national security issue. While Democrats are declaring America's energy independence, this bill seeks to keep us at the mercy of oil-rich dictators.

Finally, climate is a moral issue. While Democrats are honoring our obligation to pass on a healthy planet to our children and grandchildren, this bill is nothing short of a dereliction of duty.

It is God's creation. We are religious people here in this body, right? It is God's creation. Don't we have a responsibility to be good stewards of God's creation?

The climate emergency is putting lives at risk right now, with extreme weather pillaging communities that you represent and hitting families at the kitchen table.

With this legislation, Republicans have chosen to ignore the needs of America's working families. Instead, Republicans are putting polluters over people.

For the planet, and for the children, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, as is often said in this Chamber, I didn't anticipate debating, but as I sit on the floor listening to some of the things coming from the Democrats about this bill, a lot of it is just simply not true.

The Democrats are accusing us of providing funds and slush funds to Big Oil, but in the very Inflation Reduction Act that they passed last Congress—on a partisan basis, mind you—there is $20 billion in that bill that goes to the green energy—I don't know—environment slush fund. The EPA is already saying, Mr. Chair, that that $20 billion is being basically earmarked for a handful of special interests that the American people have no idea about.

The Democrats want to lecture us about making sure that we stop the polluters, but their own energy plan actually empowers the biggest polluter on the planet, and that is China. It is China that mines all the minerals for electric batteries, and China does not care about emission standards.

The Democrats have no problem empowering China when it comes to mineral production. They have no problem empowering China when it comes to oil production. They just want to limit it here in the United States.

This is the same backward thinking that the Europeans have realized in the face of Putin's aggression in Ukraine. It was all good to let Russia drill as long as Europe didn't drill.

Mr. Chair, that does not work when it comes to energy production. H.R. 1 brings common sense back to America's energy matrix. It is an all-of-the-above strategy.

Listen, I am a Member who has some issues, but I am voting for the legislation because it is far more important to put America in first position when it comes to energy exploration on the globe, as opposed to funding these Green New Deal think tanks and these Green New Deal energy consortiums that haven't proven that they can deliver baseload power to address the needs of the American people.

We have an energy problem. That is true. Our energy problem starts first with having cheap and readily available energy for poor Americans, middle-income Americans, small business owners, medium-sized business owners, and, yes, even the people who are wealthy among us.

Our economy thrives with a robust energy matrix, not one divided up based upon special interests from the left. That does not work. What works is actually using tried and true energy production standards.

By the way, when we drill for natural gas and explore for natural gas and oil here in America, we do it cleaner than anywhere else on the globe. We do it better than anywhere else on the globe, so much so that people want to import it from us.

That sounds like a quality plan for America, not the dogma from the Democrats.

I have been hearing the talking points all week. Polluters over people? That is a joke. The only people who are putting interests over people are the Democrats with their faulty energy policy. It must stop.

We have to put Americans first. Support H.R. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, today, Republicans have completed the process of trying to determine what exactly their energy policy will be. It is not about energy independence. It is not even about an all-of-the-above energy approach. Instead, it is a return to the glory days for them of oil and gas running the show.

Today's bill, however, does nothing to chart a course for American energy policy. Instead, it is a political messaging bill. Industry admits it.

There was a Politico piece last week detailing how Republican industry allies feel about the bill. Rapidan Energy Group, which is run by Bob McNally, who testified at the Committee on Energy and Commerce's first hearing this year, sent an analysis note to their clients saying that H.R. 1 is doomed in the Senate. Several anonymous Republican Members have said the very same things themselves in press interviews.

Let's be clear: Three months into their majority, instead of using their power to seriously tackle issues in a bipartisan manner—and many of my colleagues on the Democratic side said today they wanted to work with Republicans on real energy policy—Republicans have chosen to put forward a messaging bill that I think is really an insult to every single American that is not an oil or gas executive.

It is a message bill, and the message is this: They want the energy your family uses to be dirtier and more expensive. It is a shame.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am calling this the polluters over people act because it eliminates the environmental protections that keep families and communities safe while doing nothing to lower energy costs. Everyday Americans need relief from high energy costs.

Big Oil is still making record profits, and instead of cracking down on price gouging, House Republicans are handing giveaways to big oil and gas company CEOs without delivering any help to working families.

The East Palestine train derailment and other recent catastrophes have shown just how dangerous putting profits before people can be.

As the climate crisis accelerates, we need real action to support clean, secure, and affordable American energy.

That is what House Democrats delivered last year with our historic investments that will help us lead the world in the transition to clean energy and will truly combat the worsening climate crisis. After all, extreme weather events are becoming more frequent and more extreme.

Just last week, it was the devastating and deadly tornado that ripped through Mississippi. These horrifying extreme weather events are costing families their loved ones, their homes, and their livelihoods.

House Republicans are attacking the very clean energy policies that hold polluters accountable, reduce costs for American families, and combat the worsening climate crisis.

House Republicans have the wrong priorities, and we should defeat the polluters over people act today.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Throughout this debate, my Democratic colleagues have repeated misinformation and engaged in fearmongering as a tactic to convince American families to submit to their green agenda and just accept more expensive and less reliable energy as the new normal to undermine our economy, make the cost of living even higher, and, perhaps even more troubling, severely undermine our national security.

Apparently, my Democratic colleagues are okay with making China great again at the expense of the American people and the rest of the world.

I heard the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my colleague—again, who I have great respect for—say a few minutes ago: Tell the American people the truth.

Well, let's tell the American people some truth. According to a report by the LendingClub, at the end of 2022—that is 2 years into the Biden administration—9.3 million more United States consumers were living paycheck to paycheck compared to the prior year.

Of that group, 75 percent identified inflation as a reason for their financial situation to be worsening.

By the end of 2022, China's oil refining capacity exceeded the United States' oil refining capacity.

According to the International Energy Agency's oil market report, U.S. refining capacity is at 17.6 million barrels per day.

According to the China Petroleum and Chemical Industry Association, China's capacity is at 18.4 million barrels per day.

□ 1545

We are far more dependent on China today for the very rare earth minerals and critical minerals that are needed to pursue the renewable green energy plan that the Democrats are trying to push. You can't get there in the timeframe that they are trying to get there, Mr. Chair, without becoming more dependent on China.

There are those who say that Republicans are climate deniers. That is simply not true. We simply believe that Republicans have better ideas to unleash America's energy and to restore America's energy independence. At the same time that those are good energy policies, they are also good climate policies.

Let me give you an example. Everybody says that the goal of addressing the climate problem is to reduce carbon emissions.

Mr. Chair, if that is truly the goal, why do we not want to export more American natural gas around the world?

According to the American Exploration and Production Council, if we would simply export four times the amount of natural gas that we are exporting today—which we could do easily because we have got a wealth of it—we could lower carbon emissions more than if we were to electrify every vehicle in America, put a solar panel and a battery backup on the home and the rooftop of every residential home in America, and build 57,000 industrial-strength windmills, all combined.

American natural gas is the cleanest form of natural gas on the planet. Our friends and allies in Europe sure wish they had some of that today because they have become dependent on Vladimir Putin for their sources of energy.

Look at the Germans, who decided to throttle their nuclear suite and become dependent on Russia for their energy.

What did they end up doing?

Forest clearing, burning wood to cook their food and heat their homes. We do not want to go the way of Europe. They have already tried all of this.

I implore my Democratic colleagues: We are not arguing about the goal. We agree with cleaner forms of energy.

What we are arguing about, it appears to me, is the timeframe in which to accomplish that and the amount of money and the change in the quality of life that it is going to require for the American people.

I am sure many of you went to college and you studied the business triangle: time, cost, and quality. You can't affect one of those without affecting the other two. With this rush to green, if we want to do this so fast before renewable forms of energy are mature enough technologically to be able to provide the baseload energy for our grid, to put fuel in our automobiles, if we want to do it that fast, it is going to cost a hell of a lot of money, and it is going to change for the worse the quality of life for the American people.

H.R. 1 is a commonsense energy package. If you lower energy costs, you are going to lower inflation. If you lower inflation, you are going to allow the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money. When American people keep their hard-earned

money, they come up with good ideas, and our economy begins to thrive.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 is not about politics. It is about the American people. They are sick and tired of people inside the beltway taking and taking and taking while they are always having to do the giving.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 1. It is the right thing to do for the American people. Let's unleash American energy.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the Polluters Over People Act.

While it claims to lower American energy costs, it would directly result in policies that would cost taxpayers billions in environmental costs. Congress should not pass laws that benefit oil, gas, and mining companies at the expense of our public lands and public health.

I have worked diligently to conserve and protect our public resources, and ensure the federal government is a good steward of our public lands. This bill would severely cut the opportunity for communities to participate in the environmental review process of a project. It also fails to recognize tribal sovereignty; the U.S. federal government must honor its trust and treaty responsibilities to Tribal nations.

H.R. 1 ignores the fact that oil and gas companies have made billions in profits while Americans suffered under high prices at the pump during the height of the COVID–19 pandemic. This bill would lower royalty rates and repeal interest fees to these companies, further lining their pockets while reducing the money the government receives for use of these lands.

Public lands are just that: they belong to the people—not to major corporations. Members of Congress have a responsibility to be good stewards of these resources.

Additionally, many mining companies are foreign-owned, like Antofagasta, the parent company of Twin Metals. That company's proposed sulfide-ore copper mine would put our public lands and waters at great risk of toxic mining pollution. After extraction, Antofagasta would ship our American minerals overseas to China for smelting and to be sold in the global market. How is it in our national interest to repurchase our own mined materials?

The rush to pass this legislation is a national security issue. Safeguards must be put into place when minerals are harvested from public lands—they should not be used to put the integrity of those lands or our national security at risk.

Our laws need to be updated, including meaningful permitting reform to facilitate the green energy transition. That is why Democrats included $1 billion in the Inflation Reduction Act for federal agencies to more quickly and efficiently process permits. But H.R. 1 does not work with agencies to address permitting backlogs. Instead, it slashes environmental regulations and imposes arbitrary time limits on reviews. Permitting reform and updated regulations must be done responsibly, with good-faith participation from local communities, as well as a strong emphasis on equity, environment impacts, and public health. I am happy to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make this happen, but H.R. 1 is not the avenue to do so.

Mr. Chair, let me be clear: H.R. 1 is an attack on our public lands, which belong to Minnesotans and all Americans.

It should be rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 118–30 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Lower Energy Costs Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 10001. SECURING AMERICA'S CRITICAL MINERALS SUPPLY.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ORGANIZATION ACT.—The Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2, by adding at the end the following:

''(d) As used in sections 102(20) and 203(a)(12), the term 'critical energy resource' means any energy resource—

''(1) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

''(2) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.'';

(2) in section 102, by adding at the end the following:

''(20) To ensure there is an adequate and reliable supply of critical energy resources that are essential to the energy security of the United States.''; and

(3) in section 203(a), by adding at the end the following:

''(12) Functions that relate to securing the supply of critical energy resources, including identifying and mitigating the effects of a disruption of such supply on—

''(A) the development and use of energy technologies; and

''(B) the operation of energy systems.''.

(b) SECURING CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE SUPPLY CHAINS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the requirements of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, representatives of the energy sector, States, and other stakeholders, shall—

(A) conduct ongoing assessments of—

(i) energy resource criticality based on the importance of critical energy resources to the development of energy technologies and the supply of energy;

(ii) the critical energy resource supply chain of the United States;

(iii) the vulnerability of such supply chain; and

(iv) how the energy security of the United States is affected by the reliance of the United States on importation of critical energy resources;

(B) facilitate development of strategies to strengthen critical energy resource supply chains in the United States, including by—

(i) diversifying the sources of the supply of critical energy resources; and

(ii) increasing domestic production, separation, and processing of critical energy resources;

(C) develop substitutes and alternatives to critical energy resources; and

(D) improve technology that reuses and recycles critical energy resources.

(2) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''critical energy resource'' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101).

SEC. 10002. PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that States should maintain primacy for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing for oil and natural gas production on State and private lands.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DECLARATION OF A MORATORIUM ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not declare a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing unless such moratorium is authorized by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 10003. RESEARCHING EFFICIENT FEDERAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR NECESSARY ENERGY REFINING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Energy shall direct the National Petroleum Council to—

(1) submit to the Secretary of Energy and Congress a report containing—

(A) an examination of the role of petrochemical refineries located in the United States and the contributions of such petrochemical refineries to the energy security of the United States, including the reliability of supply in the United States of liquid fuels and feedstocks, and the affordability of liquid fuels for consumers in the United States;

(B) analyses and projections with respect to—

(i) the capacity of petrochemical refineries located in the United States;

(ii) opportunities for expanding such capacity; and

(iii) the risks to petrochemical refineries located in the United States;

(C) an assessment of any Federal or State executive actions, regulations, or policies that have caused or contributed to a decline in the capacity of petrochemical refineries located in the United States; and

(D) any recommendations for Federal agencies and Congress to encourage an increase in the capacity of petrochemical refineries located in the United States; and

(2) make publicly available the report submitted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 10004. PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT AN INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (d), no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity, across an international border of the United States without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility under this subsection.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken, by the relevant official or agency identified under subparagraph (B), under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a border-crossing facility for which a person requests a certificate of crossing under this subsection, the relevant official or agency, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility unless the relevant official or agency finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the border-crossing facility is not in the public interest of the United States.

(B) RELEVANT OFFICIAL OR AGENCY.—The relevant official or agency referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil or natural gas pipelines; and

(ii) the Secretary of Energy with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of electric transmission facilities.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), that the border-crossing facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(i) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(ii) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the border-crossing facility.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity—

(A) if the border-crossing facility is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) if a Presidential permit (or similar permit) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order; or

(C) if an application for a Presidential permit (or similar permit) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which such application is denied; or

(ii) two years after the date of enactment of this Act, if such a permit has not been issued by such date of enactment.

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (d) shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.

(B) NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (d) shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

(C) OIL PIPELINES.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (d) shall affect the authority of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to oil pipelines under section 60502 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking ''insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)''.

(B) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–4(b)) is amended by striking ''the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.''.

(c) NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) shall be required pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof.

(d) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No certificate of crossing under subsection (a), or Presidential permit (or similar permit), shall be required for a modification to—

(1) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility for which a Presidential permit (or similar permit) has been issued pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order; or

(3) a border-crossing facility for which a certificate of crossing has previously been issued under subsection (a).

(e) PROHIBITION ON REVOCATION OF PRESIDENTIAL PERMITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not revoke a Presidential permit (or similar permit) issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 12038 (43 Fed. Reg. 4957), Executive Order No. 10485 (18 Fed. Reg. 5397), or any other Executive order for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof, unless such revocation is authorized by an Act of Congress.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) through (d), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official or agency described in subsection (a)(2)(B) shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a); and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BORDER-CROSSING FACILITY.—The term ''border-crossing facility'' means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at an international boundary of the United States.

(2) MODIFICATION.—The term ''modification'' includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, change in flow volume, addition or removal of an interconnection, or an adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations).

(3) NATURAL GAS.—The term ''natural gas'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a).

(4) OIL.—The term ''oil'' means petroleum or a petroleum product.

(5) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION; REGIONAL ENTITY.—The terms ''Electric Reliability Organization'' and ''regional entity'' have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o).

(6) INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR; REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.—The terms ''Independent System Operator'' and ''Regional Transmission Organization'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

SEC. 10005. SENSE OF CONGRESS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE REVOCATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT FOR THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 29, 2019, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P., was granted a Presidential permit to construct, connect, operate, and maintain the Keystone XL pipeline.

(2) On January 20, 2021, President Biden issued Executive Order 13990 (86 Fed. Reg. 7037) that revoked the March 2019 Presidential permit for the Keystone XL.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress disapproves of the revocation by President Biden of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline.

SEC. 10006. SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING RESTRICTIONS ON THE EXPORT OF CRUDE OIL OR OTHER PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States has enjoyed a renaissance in energy production, with the expansion of domestic crude oil and other petroleum product production contributing to enhanced energy security and significant economic benefits to the national economy.

(2) In 2015, Congress recognized the need to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions and repealed all restrictions on the export of crude oil on a bipartisan basis.

(3) Section 101 of title I of division O of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (42 U.S.C. 6212a) established the national policy on oil export restriction, prohibiting any official of the Federal Government from imposing or enforcing any restrictions on the export of crude oil with limited exceptions, including a savings clause maintaining the authority to prohibit exports under any provision of law that imposes sanctions on a foreign person or foreign government (including any provision of law that prohibits or restricts United States persons from engaging in a transaction with a sanctioned person or government), including a foreign government that is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(4) Lifting the restrictions on crude oil exports encouraged additional domestic energy production, created American jobs and economic development, and allowed the United States to emerge as the leading oil producer in the world.

(5) In 2019, the United States became a net exporter of petroleum products for the first time since 1952, and the reliance of the United States on foreign imports of petroleum products has declined to historic lows.

(6) Free trade, open markets, and competition have contributed to the rise of the United States as a global energy superpower.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not impose—

(1) overly restrictive regulations on the exploration, production, or marketing of energy resources; or

(2) any restrictions on the export of crude oil or other petroleum products under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), except with respect to the export of crude oil or other petroleum products to a foreign person or foreign government subject to sanctions under any provision of United States law, including to a country the government of which is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism.

SEC. 10007. UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c);

(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively;

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c), and moving such subsection after subsection (b), as so redesignated;

(4) in subsection (a), as so redesignated, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows: ''(1) The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (in this subsection referred to as the 'Commission') shall have the exclusive authority to approve or deny an application for authorization for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a facility to export natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or import natural gas from a foreign country, including an LNG terminal. In determining whether to approve or deny an application under this paragraph, the Commission shall deem the exportation or importation of natural gas to be consistent with the public interest. Except as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act is intended to affect otherwise applicable law related to any Federal agency's authorities or responsibilities related to facilities to import or export natural gas, including LNG terminals.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the President under the Constitution, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.), the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), or any other provision of law that imposes sanctions on a foreign person or foreign government (including any provision of law that prohibits or restricts United States persons from engaging in a transaction with a sanctioned person or government), including a country that is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, to prohibit imports or exports.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'state sponsor of terrorism' means a country the

government of which the Secretary of State determines has repeatedly provided support for international terrorism pursuant to—

''(A) section 1754(c)(1)(A) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4318(c)(1)(A));

''(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

''(C) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

''(D) any other provision of law.''.

SEC. 10008. PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—The term ''Federal authorization'' has the meaning given that term in section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717n(a)).

(3) NEPA REVIEW.—The term ''NEPA review'' means the process of reviewing a proposed Federal action under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(4) PROJECT-RELATED NEPA REVIEW.—The term ''project-related NEPA review'' means any NEPA review required to be conducted with respect to the issuance of an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act.

(b) COMMISSION NEPA REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES.—In acting as the lead agency under section 15(b)(1) of the Natural Gas Act for the purposes of complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall, in accordance with this section and other applicable Federal law—

(1) be the only lead agency;

(2) coordinate as early as practicable with each agency designated as a participating agency under subsection (d)(3) to ensure that the Commission develops information in conducting its project-related NEPA review that is usable by the participating agency in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization for which the agency is responsible; and

(3) take such actions as are necessary and proper to facilitate the expeditious resolution of its project-related NEPA review.

(c) DEFERENCE TO COMMISSION.—In making a decision with respect to a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, each agency shall give deference, to the maximum extent authorized by law, to the scope of the project-related NEPA review that the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(d) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Commission shall identify, not later than 30 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, any Federal or State agency, local government, or Indian Tribe that may issue a Federal authorization or is required by Federal law to consult with the Commission in conjunction with the issuance of a Federal authorization required for such authorization or certificate.

(2) INVITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall invite any agency identified under paragraph (1) to participate in the review process for the applicable Federal authorization.

(B) DEADLINE.—An invitation issued under subparagraph (A) shall establish a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted to the Commission, which may be extended by the Commission for good cause.

(3) DESIGNATION AS PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—Not later than 60 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall designate an agency identified under paragraph (1) as a participating agency with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act unless the agency informs the Commission, in writing, by the deadline established pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the applicable Federal authorization;

(B) has no special expertise or information relevant to any project-related NEPA review; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments for the record for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(4) EFFECT OF NON-DESIGNATION.—

(A) EFFECT ON AGENCY.—Any agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act may not request or conduct a NEPA review that is supplemental to the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, unless the agency—

(i) demonstrates that such review is legally necessary for the agency to carry out responsibilities in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization; and

(ii) requires information that could not have been obtained during the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(B) COMMENTS; RECORD.—The Commission shall not, with respect to an agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act—

(i) consider any comments or other information submitted by such agency for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission; or

(ii) include any such comments or other information in the record for such project-related NEPA review.

(e) WATER QUALITY IMPACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341), an applicant for a Federal authorization shall not be required to provide a certification under such section with respect to the Federal authorization.

(2) COORDINATION.—With respect to any NEPA review for a Federal authorization to conduct an activity that will directly result in a discharge into the navigable waters (within the meaning of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act), the Commission shall identify as an agency under subsection (d)(1) the State in which the discharge originates or will originate, or, if appropriate, the interstate water pollution control agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point where the discharge originates or will originate.

(3) PROPOSED CONDITIONS.—A State or interstate agency designated as a participating agency pursuant to paragraph (2) may propose to the Commission terms or conditions for inclusion in an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that the State or interstate agency determines are necessary to ensure that any activity described in paragraph (2) conducted pursuant to such authorization or certification will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(4) COMMISSION CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONS.—The Commission may include a term or condition in an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act proposed by a State or interstate agency under paragraph (3) only if the Commission finds that the term or condition is necessary to ensure that any activity described in paragraph (2) conducted pursuant to such authorization or certification will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(f) SCHEDULE.—

(1) DEADLINE FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A deadline for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act set by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act shall be not later than 90 days after the Commission completes its project-related NEPA review, unless an applicable schedule is otherwise established by Federal law.

(2) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each Federal and State agency—

(A) that may consider an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act shall formulate and implement a plan for administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of Federal authorizations in compliance with schedules established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act; and

(B) in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, shall—

(i) formulate and implement a plan to enable the agency to comply with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act;

(ii) carry out the obligations of that agency under applicable law concurrently, and in conjunction with, the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, and in compliance with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act, unless the agency notifies the Commission in writing that doing so would impair the ability of the agency to conduct needed analysis or otherwise carry out such obligations;

(iii) transmit to the Commission a statement—

(I) acknowledging receipt of the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act; and

(II) setting forth the plan formulated under clause (i) of this subparagraph;

(iv) not later than 30 days after the agency receives such application for a Federal authorization, transmit to the applicant a notice—

(I) indicating whether such application is ready for processing; and

(II) if such application is not ready for processing, that includes a comprehensive description of the information needed for the agency to determine that the application is ready for processing;

(v) determine that such application for a Federal authorization is ready for processing for purposes of clause (iv) if such application is sufficiently complete for the purposes of commencing consideration, regardless of whether supplemental information is necessary to enable the agency to complete the consideration required by law with respect to such application; and

(vi) not less often than once every 90 days, transmit to the Commission a report describing the progress made in considering such application for a Federal authorization.

(3) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If a Federal or State agency, including the Commission, fails to meet a deadline for a Federal authorization set forth in the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act, not later than 5 days after such deadline, the head of the relevant Federal agency (including, in the case of a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority) shall notify Congress and the Commission of such failure and set forth a recommended implementation plan to ensure completion of the action to which such deadline applied.

(g) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION.—Federal and State agencies that may consider an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization shall identify, as early as possible, any issues of concern that may delay or prevent an agency from working with the Commission to resolve such issues and granting such authorization.

(B) ISSUE RESOLUTION.—The Commission may forward any issue of concern identified under subparagraph (A) to the heads of the relevant agencies (including, in the case of an issue of concern that is a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority, if applicable) for resolution.

(2) REMOTE SURVEYS.—If a Federal or State agency considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization requires the person applying for such authorization to submit data, the agency shall consider any such data gathered by aerial or other remote means that the person submits. The agency may grant a conditional approval for the Federal authorization based on data gathered by aerial or remote means, conditioned on the verification of such data by subsequent onsite inspection.

(3) APPLICATION PROCESSING.—The Commission, and Federal and State agencies, may allow a person applying for a Federal authorization to fund a third-party contractor to assist in reviewing the application for such authorization.

(h) ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, EFFICIENCY.—For an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that requires multiple Federal authorizations, the Commission, with input from any Federal or State agency considering an aspect of the application, shall track and make available to the public on the Commission's website information related to the actions required to complete the Federal authorizations. Such information shall include the following:

(1) The schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act.

(2) A list of all the actions required by each applicable agency to complete permitting, reviews, and other actions necessary to obtain a final decision on the application.

(3) The expected completion date for each such action.

(4) A point of contact at the agency responsible for each such action.

(5) In the event that an action is still pending as of the expected date of completion, a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay.

(i) PIPELINE SECURITY.—In considering an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall consult with the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration regarding the applicant's compliance with security guidance and best practice recommendations of the Administration regarding pipeline infrastructure security, pipeline cybersecurity, pipeline personnel security, and other pipeline security measures.

SEC. 10009. INTERIM HAZARDOUS WASTE PERMITS FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITIES.

Section 3005(e) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6925(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting ''or'' after ''this section,''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) is a critical energy resource facility,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this subsection:

''(A) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term 'critical energy resource' means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

''(i) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

''(ii) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.

''(B) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY.—The term 'critical energy resource facility' means a facility that processes or refines a critical energy resource.''.

SEC. 10010. FLEXIBLE AIR PERMITS FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, as necessary, revise regulations under parts 70 and 71 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to—

(1) authorize the owner or operator of a critical energy resource facility to utilize flexible air permitting (as described in the final rule titled ''Operating Permit Programs; Flexible Air Permitting Rule'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 6, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 51418)) with respect to such critical energy resource facility; and

(2) facilitate flexible, market-responsive operations (as described in the final rule identified in paragraph (1)) with respect to critical energy resource facilities.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term ''critical energy resource'' means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

(A) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

(B) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.

(2) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY.—The term ''critical energy resource facility'' means a facility that processes or refines a critical energy resource.

SEC. 10011. NATIONAL SECURITY OR ENERGY SECURITY WAIVERS TO PRODUCE CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCES.

(a) CLEAN AIR ACT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, determines that, by reason of a sudden increase in demand for, or a shortage of, a critical energy resource, or another cause, the processing or refining of a critical energy resource at a critical energy resource facility is necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs of the United States, then the Administrator may, with or without notice, hearing, or other report, issue a temporary waiver of any requirement under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) with respect to such critical energy resource facility that, in the judgment of the Administrator, will allow for such processing or refining at such critical energy resource facility as necessary to best meet such needs and serve the public interest.

(2) CONFLICT WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The Administrator shall ensure that any waiver of a requirement under the Clean Air Act under this subsection, to the maximum extent practicable, does not result in a conflict with a requirement of any other applicable Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation and minimizes any adverse environmental impacts.

(3) VIOLATIONS OF OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—To the extent any omission or action taken by a party under a waiver issued under this subsection is in conflict with any requirement of a Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, such omission or action shall not be considered a violation of such environmental law or regulation, or subject such party to any requirement, civil or criminal liability, or a citizen suit under such environmental law or regulation.

(4) EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.—A waiver issued under this subsection shall expire not later than 90 days after it is issued. The Administrator may renew or reissue such waiver pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) for subsequent periods, not to exceed 90 days for each period, as the Administrator determines necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs described in paragraph (1) and serve the public interest. In renewing or reissuing a waiver under this paragraph, the Administrator shall include in any such renewed or reissued waiver such conditions as are necessary to minimize any adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable.

(5) SUBSEQUENT ACTION BY COURT.—If a waiver issued under this subsection is subsequently stayed, modified, or set aside by a court pursuant a provision of law, any omission or action previously taken by a party under the waiver while the waiver was in effect shall remain subject to paragraph (3).

(6) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE; CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY DEFINED.—The terms ''critical energy resource'' and ''critical energy resource facility'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3025(f) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as added by this section).

(b) SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT.—The Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 3024 the following:

''SEC. 3025. WAIVERS FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy,

determines that, by reason of a sudden increase in demand for, or a shortage of, a critical energy resource, or another cause, the processing or refining of a critical energy resource at a critical energy resource facility is necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs of the United States, then the Administrator may, with or without notice, hearing, or other report, issue a temporary waiver of any covered requirement with respect to such critical energy resource facility that, in the judgment of the Administrator, will allow for such processing or refining at such critical energy resource facility as necessary to best meet such needs and serve the public interest.

''(b) CONFLICT WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The Administrator shall ensure that any waiver of a covered requirement under this section, to the maximum extent practicable, does not result in a conflict with a requirement of any other applicable Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation and minimizes any adverse environmental impacts.

''(c) VIOLATIONS OF OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—To the extent any omission or action taken by a party under a waiver issued under this section is in conflict with any requirement of a Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, such omission or action shall not be considered a violation of such environmental law or regulation, or subject such party to any requirement, civil or criminal liability, or a citizen suit under such environmental law or regulation.

''(d) EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.—A waiver issued under this section shall expire not later than 90 days after it is issued. The Administrator may renew or reissue such waiver pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) for subsequent periods, not to exceed 90 days for each period, as the Administrator determines necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs described in subsection (a) and serve the public interest. In renewing or reissuing a waiver under this subsection, the Administrator shall include in any such renewed or reissued waiver such conditions as are necessary to minimize any adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable.

''(e) SUBSEQUENT ACTION BY COURT.—If a waiver issued under this section is subsequently stayed, modified, or set aside by a court pursuant a provision of law, any omission or action previously taken by a party under the waiver while the waiver was in effect shall remain subject to subsection (c).

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED REQUIREMENT.—The term 'covered requirement' means—

''(A) any standard established under section 3002, 3003, or 3004;

''(B) the permit requirement under section 3005; or

''(C) any other requirement of this Act, as the Administrator determines appropriate.

''(2) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term 'critical energy resource' means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

''(A) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

''(B) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.

''(3) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY.—The term 'critical energy resource facility' means a facility that processes or refines a critical energy resource.''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3024 the following:

''Sec. 3025. Waivers for critical energy resource facilities.''.

SEC. 10012. ENDING FUTURE DELAYS IN CHEMICAL SUBSTANCE REVIEW FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCES.

Section 5(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2604(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCES.—

''(A) STANDARD.—For purposes of a determination under paragraph (3) with respect to a chemical substance that is a critical energy resource, the Administrator shall take into consideration economic, societal, and environmental costs and benefits, notwithstanding any requirement of this section to not take such factors into consideration.

''(B) FAILURE TO RENDER DETERMINATION.—

''(i) ACTIONS AUTHORIZED.—If, with respect to a chemical substance that is a critical energy resource, the Administrator fails to make a determination on a notice under paragraph (3) by the end of the applicable review period and the notice has not been withdrawn by the submitter, the submitter may take the actions described in paragraph (1)(A) with respect to the chemical substance, and the Administrator shall be relieved of any requirement to make such determination.

''(ii) NON-DUPLICATION.—A refund of applicable fees under paragraph (4)(A) shall not be made if a submitter takes an action described in paragraph (1)(A) under this subparagraph.

''(C) PREREQUISITE FOR SUGGESTION OF WITHDRAWAL OR SUSPENSION.—The Administrator may not suggest to, or request of, a submitter of a notice under this subsection for a chemical substance that is a critical energy resource that such submitter withdraw such notice, or request a suspension of the running of the applicable review period with respect to such notice, unless the Administrator has—

''(i) conducted a preliminary review of such notice; and

''(ii) provided to the submitter a draft of a determination under paragraph (3), including any supporting information.

''(D) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'critical energy resource' means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

''(i) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

''(ii) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.''.

SEC. 10013. NATURAL GAS TAX REPEAL.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 136 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7436)(relating to methane emissions and waste reduction incentive program for petroleum and natural gas systems) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION.—The unobligated balance of any amounts made available under section 136 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7436)(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) is rescinded.

SEC. 10014. REPEAL OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION FUND.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 134 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7434)(relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION.—The unobligated balance of any amounts made available under section 134 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7434)(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) is rescinded.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 60103 of Public Law 117–169 (relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund) is repealed.

SEC. 10015. KEEPING AMERICA'S REFINERIES OPERATING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The owner or operator of a stationary source described in subsection (b) of this section shall not be required by the regulations promulgated under section 112(r)(7)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(7)(B)) to include in any hazard assessment under clause (ii) of such section 112(r)(7)(B) an assessment of safer technology and alternative risk management measures with respect to the use of hydrofluoric acid in an alkylation unit.

(b) STATIONARY SOURCE DESCRIBED.—A stationary source described in this subsection is a stationary source (as defined in section 112(r)(2)(C) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(2)(C)) in North American Industry Classification System code 324—

(1) for which a construction permit or operating permit has been issued pursuant to the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); or

(2) for which the owner or operator demonstrates to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that such stationary source conforms or will conform to the most recent version of American Petroleum Institute Recommended Practice 751.

SEC. 10016. HOMEOWNER ENERGY FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following are repealed:

(1) Section 50122 of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795a) (relating to a high-efficiency electric home rebate program).

(2) Section 50123 of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795b) (relating to State-based home energy efficiency contractor training grants).

(3) Section 50131 of Public Law 117–169 (136 Stat. 2041) (relating to assistance for latest and zero building energy code adoption).

(b) RESCISSIONS.—The unobligated balances of any amounts made available under each of sections 50122, 50123, and 50131 of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795a, 18795b; 136 Stat. 2041) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) are rescinded.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 50121(c)(7) of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795(c)(7)) is amended by striking '', including a rebate provided under a high-efficiency electric home rebate program (as defined in section 50122(d))''.

DIVISION B—TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, PERMITTING, AND PRODUCTION OF AMERICAN RESOURCES

SEC. 20001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act'' or the ''TAPP American Resources Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

TITLE I—ONSHORE AND OFFSHORE LEASING AND OVERSIGHT

SEC. 20101. ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO IMMEDIATELY RESUME ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall immediately resume quarterly onshore oil and gas lease sales in compliance with the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure—

(A) that any oil and gas lease sale pursuant to paragraph (1) is conducted immediately on completion of all applicable scoping, public comment, and environmental analysis requirements under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) that the processes described in subparagraph (A) are conducted in a timely manner to ensure compliance with subsection (b)(1).

(3) LEASE OF OIL AND GAS LANDS.—Section 17(b)(1)(A) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''Eligible lands comprise all lands subject to leasing under this Act and not excluded from leasing by a statutory or regulatory prohibition. Available lands are those lands that have been designated as open for leasing under a land use plan developed under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and that have been nominated for leasing through the submission of an expression of interest, are subject to drainage in the absence of leasing, or are otherwise designated as available pursuant to regulations adopted by the Secretary.'' after ''sales are necessary.''.

(b) QUARTERLY LEASE SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a minimum of four oil and gas lease sales in each of the following States:

(A) Wyoming.
(B) New Mexico.
(C) Colorado.
(D) Utah.
(E) Montana.
(F) North Dakota.
(G) Oklahoma.
(H) Nevada.
(I) Alaska.
(J) Any other State in which there is land available for oil and gas leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or any other mineral leasing law.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting a lease sale under paragraph (1) in a State described in that paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer all parcels nominated and eligible pursuant to the requirements of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) for oil and gas exploration, development, and production under the resource management plan in effect for the State.

(3) REPLACEMENT SALES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a replacement sale during the same fiscal year if—

(A) a lease sale under paragraph (1) is canceled, delayed, or deferred, including for a lack of eligible parcels; or

(B) during a lease sale under paragraph (1) the percentage of acreage that does not receive a bid is equal to or greater than 25 percent of the acreage offered.

(4) NOTICE REGARDING MISSED SALES.—Not later than 30 days after a sale required under this subsection is canceled, delayed, deferred, or otherwise missed the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that states what sale was missed and why it was missed.

SEC. 20102. LEASE REINSTATEMENT.

The reinstatement of a lease entered into under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) by the Secretary shall be not considered a major Federal action under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

SEC. 20103. PROTESTED LEASE SALES.

Section 17(b)(1)(A) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''The Secretary shall resolve any protest to a lease sale not later than 60 days after such payment.'' after ''annual rental for the first lease year.''.

SEC. 20104. SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(r) SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS PERMITS.—In the event that an oil and gas lease owner has submitted an expression of interest for adjacent acreage that is part of the nature of the geological play and has yet to be offered in a lease sale by the Secretary, they may request a suspension of operations from the Secretary of the Interior and upon request, the Secretary shall grant the suspension of operations within 15 days. Any payment of acreage rental or of minimum royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operations and production; and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding any such suspension period thereto.''.

SEC. 20105. ADMINISTRATIVE PROTEST PROCESS REFORM.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) PROTEST FILING FEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before processing any protest filed under this section, the Secretary shall collect a filing fee in the amount described in paragraph (2) from the protestor to recover the cost for processing documents filed for each administrative protest.

''(2) AMOUNT.—The amount described in this paragraph is calculated as follows:

''(A) For each protest filed in a submission not exceeding 10 pages in length, the base filing fee shall be $150.

''(B) For each submission exceeding 10 pages in length, in addition to the base filing fee, an assessment of $5 per page in excess of 10 pages shall apply.

''(C) For protests that include more than one oil and gas lease parcel, right-of-way, or application for permit to drill in a submission, an additional assessment of $10 per additional lease parcel, right-of-way, or application for permit to drill shall apply.

''(3) ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on January 1, 2024, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall adjust the filing fees established in this subsection to whole dollar amounts to reflect changes in the Producer Price Index, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the previous 12 months.

''(B) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED FILING FEES.—At least 30 days before the filing fees as adjusted under this paragraph take effect, the Secretary shall publish notification of the adjustment of such fees in the Federal Register.''.

SEC. 20106. LEASING AND PERMITTING TRANSPARENCY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the status of nominated parcels for future onshore oil and gas and geothermal lease sales, including—

(A) the number of expressions of interest received each month during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted with respect to which the Bureau of Land Management—

(i) has not taken any action to review;

(ii) has not completed review; or

(iii) has completed review and determined that the relevant area meets all applicable requirements for leasing, but has not offered the relevant area in a lease sale;

(B) how long expressions of interest described in subparagraph (A) have been pending; and

(C) a plan, including timelines, for how the Secretary of the Interior plans to—

(i) work through future expressions of interest to prevent delays;

(ii) put expressions of interest described in subparagraph (A) into a lease sale; and

(iii) complete review for expressions of interest described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A);

(2) the status of each pending application for permit to drill received during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, including the number of applications received each month, by each Bureau of Land Management office, including—

(A) a description of the cause of delay for pending applications, including as a result of staffing shortages, technical limitations, incomplete applications, and incomplete review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws;

(B) the number of days an application has been pending in violation of section 17(p)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2)); and

(C) a plan for how the office intends to come into compliance with the requirements of section 17(p)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2));

(3) the number of permits to drill issued each month by each Bureau of Land Management office during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted;

(4) the status of each pending application for a license for offshore geological and geophysical surveys received during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, including the number of applications received each month, by each Bureau of Ocean Energy management regional office, including—

(A) a description of any cause of delay for pending applications, including as a result of staffing shortages, technical limitations, incomplete applications, and incomplete review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws;

(B) the number of days an application has been pending; and

(C) a plan for how the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management intends to complete review of each application;

(5) the number of licenses for offshore geological and geophysical surveys issued each month by each Bureau of Ocean Energy Management regional office during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted;

(6) the status of each pending application for a permit to drill received during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, including the number of applications received each month, by each Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement regional office, including—

(A) a description of any cause of delay for pending applications, including as a result of staffing shortages, technical limitations, incomplete applications, and incomplete review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws;

(B) the number of days an application has been pending; and

(C) steps the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement is taking to complete review of each application;

(7) the number of permits to drill issued each month by each Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement regional office during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted;

(8) how, as applicable, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement determines whether to—

(A) issue a license for geological and geophysical surveys;

(B) issue a permit to drill; and

(C) issue, extend, or suspend an oil and gas lease;

(9) when determinations described in paragraph (8) are sent to the national office of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement for final approval;

(10) the degree to which Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement field, State, and regional offices exercise discretion on such final approval;

(11) during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, the number of auctioned leases receiving accepted bids that have not been issued to winning bidders and the number of days such leases have not been issued; and

(12) a description of the uses of application for permit to drill fees paid by permit holders during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted.

(b) PENDING APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) complete all requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable law that must be met before issuance of a permit to drill described in paragraph (2); and

(2) issue a permit for all completed applications to drill that are pending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

(1) MINERAL LEASING ACT.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(t) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

''(1) EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending, approved, and not approved expressions of interest in nominated parcels for future onshore oil and gas lease sales in the preceding month.

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending and approved applications for permits to drill in the preceding month in each State office.

''(3) PAST DATA.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior, with respect to each month during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this subsection—

''(A) the number of approved and not approved expressions of interest for onshore oil and gas lease sales during such 5-year period; and

''(B) the number of approved and not approved applications for permits to drill during such 5-year period.''.

(2) OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.—Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

''(1) OFFSHORE GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY LICENSES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending and approved applications for licenses for offshore geological and geophysical surveys in the preceding month.

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending and approved applications for permits to drill on the outer Continental Shelf in the preceding month in each regional office.

''(3) PAST DATA.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior, with respect each month during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this subsection—

''(A) the number of approved applications for licenses for offshore geological and geophysical surveys; and

''(B) the number of approved applications for permits to drill on the outer Continental Shelf.''.

(d) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives all documents and communications relating to the comprehensive review of Federal oil and gas permitting and leasing practices required under section 208 of Executive Order 14008 (86 Fed. Reg. 7624; relating to tackling the climate crisis at home and abroad).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The submission under paragraph (1) shall include all documents and communications submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by members of the public in response to any public meeting or forum relating to the comprehensive review described in that paragraph.

SEC. 20107. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct all lease sales described in the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016) that have not been conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act by not later than September 30, 2023.

(b) GULF OF MEXICO REGION ANNUAL LEASE SALES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except within areas subject to existing oil and gas leasing moratoria beginning in fiscal year 2023, the Secretary of the Interior shall annually conduct a minimum of 2 region-wide oil and gas lease sales in the following planning areas of the Gulf of Mexico region, as described in the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016):

(1) The Central Gulf of Mexico Planning Area.

(2) The Western Gulf of Mexico Planning Area.

(c) ALASKA REGION ANNUAL LEASE SALES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning in fiscal year 2023, the Secretary of the Interior shall annually conduct a minimum of 2 region-wide oil and gas lease sales in the Alaska region of the Outer Continental Shelf, as described in the 2017–2022

Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016).

(d) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting lease sales under subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) issue such leases in accordance with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1332 et seq.); and

(2) include in each such lease sale all unleased areas that are not subject to a moratorium as of the date of the lease sale.

SEC. 20108. FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''subsections (c) and (d) of this section, shall prepare and periodically revise,'' and inserting ''this section, shall issue every five years'';

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Each five-year program shall include at least two Gulf of Mexico region-wide lease sales per year.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''domestic energy security,'' after ''between'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (i) as subsections (h) through (k), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM FOR 2023–2028.—The Secretary shall issue the five-year oil and gas leasing program for 2023 through 2028 and issue the Record of Decision on the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement by not later than July 1, 2023.

''(g) SUBSEQUENT LEASING PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 36 months after conducting the first lease sale under an oil and gas leasing program prepared pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall begin preparing the subsequent oil and gas leasing program under this section.

''(2) REQUIREMENT.—Each subsequent oil and gas leasing program under this section shall be approved by not later than 180 days before the expiration of the previous oil and gas leasing program.''.

SEC. 20109. GEOTHERMAL LEASING.

(a) ANNUAL LEASING.—Section 4(b) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''year'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(3) after paragraph (2), by inserting the following:

''(3) REPLACEMENT SALES.—If a lease sale under paragraph (1) for a year is canceled or delayed, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a replacement sale during the same year.

''(4) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting a lease sale under paragraph (2) in a State described in that paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer all nominated parcels eligible for geothermal development and utilization under the resource management plan in effect for the State.''.

(b) DEADLINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF GEOTHERMAL DRILLING PERMITS.—Section 4 of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) DEADLINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF GEOTHERMAL DRILLING PERMITS.—

''(1) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an application for any geothermal drilling permit, the Secretary shall—

''(A) provide written notice to the applicant that the application is complete; or

''(B) notify the applicant that information is missing and specify any information that is required to be submitted for the application to be complete.

''(2) ISSUANCE OF DECISION.—If the Secretary determines that an application for a geothermal drilling permit is complete under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall issue a final decision on the application not later than 30 days after the Secretary notifies the applicant that the application is complete.''.

SEC. 20110. LEASING FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED COAL APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COAL LEASE.—The term ''coal lease'' means a lease entered into by the United States as lessor, through the Bureau of Land Management, and the applicant on Bureau of Land Management Form 3400–012.

(2) QUALIFIED APPLICATION.—The term ''qualified application'' means any application pending under the lease by application program administered by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) and subpart 3425 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act), for which the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) has commenced.

(b) MANDATORY LEASING AND OTHER REQUIRED APPROVALS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promptly—

(1) with respect to each qualified application—

(A) if not previously published for public comment, publish a draft environmental assessment, as required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and any applicable implementing regulations;

(B) finalize the fair market value of the coal tract for which a lease by application is pending;

(C) take all intermediate actions necessary to grant the qualified application; and

(D) grant the qualified application; and

(2) with respect to previously awarded coal leases, grant any additional approvals of the Department of the Interior or any bureau, agency, or division of the Department of the Interior required for mining activities to commence.

SEC. 20111. FUTURE COAL LEASING.

Notwithstanding any judicial decision to the contrary or a departmental review of the Federal coal leasing program, Secretarial Order 3338, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on January 15, 2016, shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 20112. STAFF PLANNING REPORT.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the staffing capacity of each respective agency with respect to issuing oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits. Each such report shall include—

(1) the number of staff assigned to process and issue oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits;

(2) a description of how many staff are needed to meet statutory requirements for such oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits; and

(3) how, as applicable, the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture plans to address staffing shortfalls and turnover to ensure adequate staffing to process and issue such oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits.

SEC. 20113. PROHIBITION ON CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY OWNERSHIP INTEREST.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Communist Party of China (or a person acting on behalf of the Community Party of China) may not acquire any interest with respect to lands leased for oil or gas under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

SEC. 20114. EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

Nothing in this division, or any amendments made by this division, shall affect—

(1) the Presidential memorandum titled ''Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf From Leasing Disposition'' and dated September 8, 2020;

(2) the Presidential memorandum titled ''Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf From Leasing Disposition'' and dated September 25, 2020;

(3) the Presidential memorandum titled ''Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas off the Atlantic Coast on the Outer Continental Shelf From Leasing Disposition'' and dated December 20, 2016; or

(4) the ban on oil and gas development in the Great Lakes described in section 386 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15941).

TITLE II—PERMITTING STREAMLINING

SEC. 20201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ENERGY FACILITY.—The term ''energy facility'' means a facility the primary purpose of which is the exploration for, or the development, production, conversion, gathering, storage, transfer, processing, or transportation of, any energy resource.

(2) ENERGY STORAGE DEVICE.—The term ''energy storage device''—

(A) means any equipment that stores energy, including electricity, compressed air, pumped water, heat, and hydrogen, which may be converted into, or used to produce, electricity; and

(B) includes a battery, regenerative fuel cell, flywheel, capacitor, superconducting magnet, and any other equipment the Secretary concerned determines may be used to store energy which may be converted into, or used to produce, electricity.

(3) PUBLIC LANDS.—The term ''public lands'' means any land and interest in land owned by the United States within the several States and administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture without regard to how the United States acquired ownership, except—

(A) lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf; and

(B) lands held in trust by the United States for the benefit of Indians, Indian Tribes, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

(4) RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The term ''right-of-way'' means—

(A) a right-of-way issued, granted, or renewed under section 501 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761); or

(B) a right-of-way granted under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185).

(5) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) with respect to public lands, the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) with respect to National Forest System lands, the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) LAND USE PLAN.—The term ''land use plan'' means—

(A) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for a unit of

the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604);

(B) a Land Management Plan developed by the Bureau of Land Management under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

(C) a comprehensive conservation plan developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service under section 4(e)(1)(A) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(e)(1)(A)).

SEC. 20202. BUILDER ACT.

(a) PARAGRAPH (2) OF SECTION 102.—Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''insure'' and inserting ''ensure'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''insure'' and inserting ''ensure'';

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting ''consistent with the provisions of this Act and except as provided by other provisions of law,'' before ''include in every'';

(B) by striking clauses (i) through (v) and inserting the following:

''(i) reasonably foreseeable environmental effects with a reasonably close causal relationship to the proposed agency action;

''(ii) any reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

''(iii) a reasonable number of alternatives to the proposed agency action, including an analysis of any negative environmental impacts of not implementing the proposed agency action in the case of a no action alternative, that are technically and economically feasible, are within the jurisdiction of the agency, meet the purpose and need of the proposal, and, where applicable, meet the goals of the applicant;

''(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

''(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of Federal resources which would be involved in the proposed agency action should it be implemented.''; and

(C) by striking ''the responsible Federal official'' and inserting ''the head of the lead agency'';

(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''any'';

(5) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (I) as subparagraphs (F) through (K), respectively;

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussion and analysis in an environmental document;

''(E) make use of reliable existing data and resources in carrying out this Act;'';

(7) by amending subparagraph (G), as redesignated, to read as follows:

''(G) consistent with the provisions of this Act, study, develop, and describe technically and economically feasible alternatives within the jurisdiction and authority of the agency;''; and

(8) in subparagraph (H), as amended, by inserting ''consistent with the provisions of this Act,'' before ''recognize''.

(b) NEW SECTIONS.—Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 106. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW.

''(a) THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS.—An agency is not required to prepare an environmental document with respect to a proposed agency action if—

''(1) the proposed agency action is not a final agency action within the meaning of such term in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code;

''(2) the proposed agency action is covered by a categorical exclusion established by the agency, another Federal agency, or another provision of law;

''(3) the preparation of such document would clearly and fundamentally conflict with the requirements of another provision of law;

''(4) the proposed agency action is, in whole or in part, a nondiscretionary action with respect to which such agency does not have authority to take environmental factors into consideration in determining whether to take the proposed action;

''(5) the proposed agency action is a rulemaking that is subject to section 553 of title 5, United States Code; or

''(6) the proposed agency action is an action for which such agency's compliance with another statute's requirements serve the same or similar function as the requirements of this Act with respect to such action.

''(b) LEVELS OF REVIEW.—

''(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—An agency shall issue an environmental impact statement with respect to a proposed agency action that has a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

''(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—An agency shall prepare an environmental assessment with respect to a proposed agency action that is not likely to have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, or if the significance of such effect is unknown, unless the agency finds that a categorical exclusion established by the agency, another Federal agency, or another provision of law applies. Such environmental assessment shall be a concise public document prepared by a Federal agency to set forth the basis of such agency's finding of no significant impact.

''(3) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In making a determination under this subsection, an agency—

''(A) may make use of any reliable data source; and

''(B) is not required to undertake new scientific or technical research.

''SEC. 107. TIMELY AND UNIFIED FEDERAL REVIEWS.

''(a) LEAD AGENCY.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If there are two or more involved Federal agencies, such agencies shall determine, by letter or memorandum, which agency shall be the lead agency based on consideration of the following factors:

''(i) Magnitude of agency's involvement.

''(ii) Project approval or disapproval authority.

''(iii) Expertise concerning the action's environmental effects.

''(iv) Duration of agency's involvement.

''(v) Sequence of agency's involvement.

''(B) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the involved Federal agencies may, in addition to a Federal agency, appoint such Federal, State, Tribal, or local agencies as joint lead agencies as the involved Federal agencies shall determine appropriate. Joint lead agencies shall jointly fulfill the role described in paragraph (2).

''(C) MINERAL PROJECTS.—This paragraph shall not apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit.

''(2) ROLE.—A lead agency shall, with respect to a proposed agency action—

''(A) supervise the preparation of an environmental document if, with respect to such proposed agency action, there is more than one involved Federal agency;

''(B) request the participation of each cooperating agency at the earliest practicable time;

''(C) in preparing an environmental document, give consideration to any analysis or proposal created by a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law or a cooperating agency with special expertise;

''(D) develop a schedule, in consultation with each involved cooperating agency, the applicant, and such other entities as the lead agency determines appropriate, for completion of any environmental review, permit, or authorization required to carry out the proposed agency action;

''(E) if the lead agency determines that a review, permit, or authorization will not be completed in accordance with the schedule developed under subparagraph (D), notify the agency responsible for issuing such review, permit, or authorization of the discrepancy and request that such agency take such measures as such agency determines appropriate to comply with such schedule; and

''(F) meet with a cooperating agency that requests such a meeting.

''(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The lead agency may, with respect to a proposed agency action, designate any involved Federal agency or a State, Tribal, or local agency as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency may, not later than a date specified by the lead agency, submit comments to the lead agency. Such comments shall be limited to matters relating to the proposed agency action with respect to which such agency has special expertise or jurisdiction by law with respect to an environmental issue.

''(4) REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION.—Any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency with respect to a proposed agency action under paragraph (1) may submit a written request for such a designation to an involved Federal agency. An agency that receives a request under this paragraph shall transmit such request to each involved Federal agency and to the Council.

''(5) COUNCIL DESIGNATION.—

''(A) REQUEST.—Not earlier than 45 days after the date on which a request is submitted under paragraph (4), if no designation has been made under paragraph (1), a Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency may request that the Council designate a lead agency. Such request shall consist of—

''(i) a precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed agency action; and

''(ii) a detailed statement with respect to each involved Federal agency and each factor listed in paragraph (1) regarding which agency should serve as lead agency.

''(B) TRANSMISSION.—The Council shall transmit a request received under subparagraph (A) to each involved Federal agency.

''(C) RESPONSE.—An involved Federal agency may, not later than 20 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), submit to the Council a response to such request.

''(D) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 40 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), the Council shall designate the lead agency with respect to the relevant proposed agency action.

''(b) ONE DOCUMENT.—

''(1) DOCUMENT.—To the extent practicable, if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to a proposed agency action and the lead agency has determined that an environmental document is required, such requirement shall be deemed satisfied with respect to all involved Federal agencies if the lead agency issues such an environmental document.

''(2) CONSIDERATION TIMING.—In developing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, no involved Federal agency shall be required to consider any information that becomes available after the sooner of, as applicable—

''(A) receipt of a complete application with respect to such proposed agency action; or

''(B) publication of a notice of intent or decision to prepare an environmental impact statement for such proposed agency action.

''(3) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In developing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, the lead agency and any other involved Federal agencies shall only consider the effects of the proposed agency action that—

''(A) occur on Federal land; or

''(B) are subject to Federal control and responsibility.

''(c) REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—Each notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement under section 102 shall include a request for public comment on alternatives or impacts and on relevant information, studies, or analyses with respect to the proposed agency action.

''(d) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED.—Each environmental impact statement shall include a statement of purpose and need that briefly summarizes the underlying purpose and need for the proposed agency action.

''(e) ESTIMATED TOTAL COST.—The cover sheet for each environmental impact statement shall include a statement of the estimated total cost of preparing such environmental impact statement, including the costs of agency full-time equivalent personnel hours, contractor costs, and other direct costs.

''(f) PAGE LIMITS.—

''(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an environmental impact statement shall not exceed 150 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

''(B) EXTRAORDINARY COMPLEXITY.—An environmental impact statement for a proposed agency action of extraordinary complexity shall not exceed 300 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

''(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.—An environmental assessment shall not exceed 75 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

''(g) SPONSOR PREPARATION.—A lead agency shall allow a project sponsor to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement upon request of the project sponsor. Such agency may provide such sponsor with appropriate guidance and assist in the preparation. The lead agency shall independently evaluate the environmental document and shall take responsibility for the contents upon adoption.

''(h) DEADLINES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to a proposed agency action, a lead agency shall complete, as applicable—

''(A) the environmental impact statement not later than the date that is 2 years after the sooner of, as applicable—

''(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 102(2)(C) requires the issuance of an environmental impact statement with respect to such action;

''(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

''(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement for such action; and

''(B) the environmental assessment not later than the date that is 1 year after the sooner of, as applicable—

''(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 106(b)(2) requires the preparation of an environmental assessment with respect to such action;

''(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

''(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment for such action.

''(2) DELAY.—A lead agency that determines it is not able to meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) may extend such deadline with the approval of the applicant. If the applicant approves such an extension, the lead agency shall establish a new deadline that provides only so much additional time as is necessary to complete such environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.

''(3) EXPENDITURES FOR DELAY.—If a lead agency is unable to meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) or extended under paragraph (2), the lead agency must pay $100 per day, to the extent funding is provided in advance in an appropriations Act, out of the office of the head of the department of the lead agency to the applicant starting on the first day immediately following the deadline described in paragraph (1) or extended under paragraph (2) up until the date that an applicant approves a new deadline. This paragraph does not apply when the lead agency misses a deadline solely due to delays caused by litigation.

''(i) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each lead agency shall annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

''(A) identifies any environmental assessment and environmental impact statement that such lead agency did not complete by the deadline described in subsection (h); and

''(B) provides an explanation for any failure to meet such deadline.

''(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify, as applicable—

''(A) the office, bureau, division, unit, or other entity within the Federal agency responsible for each such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement;

''(B) the date on which—

''(i) such lead agency notified the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for the major Federal action is complete;

''(ii) such lead agency began the scoping for the major Federal action; or

''(iii) such lead agency issued a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for the major Federal action; and

''(C) when such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement is expected to be complete.

''SEC. 108. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

''(a) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of compliance with this Act, of a determination made under this Act, or of Federal action resulting from a determination made under this Act, shall be barred unless—

''(1) in the case of a claim pertaining to a proposed agency action for which—

''(A) an environmental document was prepared and an opportunity for comment was provided;

''(B) the claim is filed by a party that participated in the administrative proceedings regarding such environmental document; and

''(C) the claim—

''(i) is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the public comment period for such administrative proceedings and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the lead agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review; and

''(ii) is related to such comment;

''(2) except as provided in subsection (b), such claim is filed not later than 120 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register of agency intent to carry out the proposed agency action;

''(3) such claim is filed after the issuance of a record of decision or other final agency action with respect to the relevant proposed agency action;

''(4) such claim does not challenge the establishment or use of a categorical exclusion under section 102; and

''(5) such claim concerns—

''(A) an alternative included in the environmental document; or

''(B) an environmental effect considered in the environmental document.

''(b) SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—

''(1) SEPARATE FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—The issuance of a Federal action resulting from a final supplemental environmental impact statement shall be considered a final agency action for the purposes of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, separate from the issuance of any previous environmental impact statement with respect to the same proposed agency action.

''(2) DEADLINE FOR FILING A CLAIM.—A claim seeking judicial review of a Federal action resulting from a final supplemental environmental review issued under section 102(2)(C) shall be barred unless—

''(A) such claim is filed within 120 days of the date on which a notice of the Federal agency action resulting from a final supplemental environmental impact statement is issued; and

''(B) such claim is based on information contained in such supplemental environmental impact statement that was not contained in a previous environmental document pertaining to the same proposed agency action.

''(c) PROHIBITION ON INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a violation of this Act shall not constitute the basis for injunctive relief.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a right of judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim with respect to the violation of the terms of a permit, license, or approval.

''(e) REMAND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no proposed agency action for which an environmental document is required shall be vacated or otherwise limited, delayed, or enjoined unless a court concludes allowing such proposed action will pose a risk of an imminent and substantial environmental harm and there is no other equitable remedy available as a matter of law.

''SEC. 109. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The term 'categorical exclusion' means a category of actions that a Federal agency has determined normally does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(C).

''(2) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The term 'cooperating agency' means any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has been designated as a cooperating agency under section 107(a)(3).

''(3) COUNCIL.—The term 'Council' means the Council on Environmental Quality established in title II.

''(4) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term 'environmental assessment' means an

environmental assessment prepared under section 106(b)(2).

''(5) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term 'environmental document' means an environmental impact statement, an environmental assessment, or a finding of no significant impact.

''(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term 'environmental impact statement' means a detailed written statement that is required by section 102(2)(C).

''(7) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term 'finding of no significant impact' means a determination by a Federal agency that a proposed agency action does not require the issuance of an environmental impact statement.

''(8) INVOLVED FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term 'involved Federal agency' means an agency that, with respect to a proposed agency action—

''(A) proposed such action; or

''(B) is involved in such action because such action is directly related, through functional interdependence or geographic proximity, to an action such agency has taken or has proposed to take.

''(9) LEAD AGENCY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'lead agency' means, with respect to a proposed agency action—

''(i) the agency that proposed such action; or

''(ii) if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to such action, the agency designated under section 107(a)(1).

''(B) SPECIFICATION FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMITS.—With respect to a proposed mineral exploration or mine permit, the term 'lead agency' has the meaning given such term in section 40206(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

''(10) MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'major Federal action' means an action that the agency carrying out such action determines is subject to substantial Federal control and responsibility.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'major Federal action' does not include—

''(i) a non-Federal action—

''(I) with no or minimal Federal funding;

''(II) with no or minimal Federal involvement where a Federal agency cannot control the outcome of the project; or

''(III) that does not include Federal land;

''(ii) funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds which do not provide Federal agency compliance or enforcement responsibility over the subsequent use of such funds;

''(iii) loans, loan guarantees, or other forms of financial assistance where a Federal agency does not exercise sufficient control and responsibility over the effect of the action;

''(iv) farm ownership and operating loan guarantees by the Farm Service Agency pursuant to sections 305 and 311 through 319 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1925 and 1941 through 1949);

''(v) business loan guarantees provided by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 7(a) or (b) and of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)), or title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

''(vi) bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions; or

''(vii) extraterritorial activities or decisions, which means agency activities or decisions with effects located entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the United States.

''(C) ADDITIONAL EXCLUSIONS.—An agency action may not be determined to be a major Federal action on the basis of—

''(i) an interstate effect of the action or related project; or

''(ii) the provision of Federal funds for the action or related project.

''(11) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term 'mineral exploration or mine permit' has the meaning given such term in section 40206(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

''(12) PROPOSAL.—The term 'proposal' means a proposed action at a stage when an agency has a goal, is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal, and can meaningfully evaluate its effects.

''(13) REASONABLY FORESEEABLE.—The term 'reasonably foreseeable' means likely to occur—

''(A) not later than 10 years after the lead agency begins preparing the environmental document; and

''(B) in an area directly affected by the proposed agency action such that an individual of ordinary prudence would take such occurrence into account in reaching a decision.

''(14) SPECIAL EXPERTISE.—The term 'special expertise' means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.''.

SEC. 20203. CODIFICATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REGULATIONS.

The revisions to the Code of Federal Regulations made pursuant to the final rule of the Council on Environmental Quality titled ''Update to the Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act'' and published on July 16, 2020 (85 Fed. Reg. 43304), shall have the same force and effect of law as if enacted by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 20204. NON-MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS.

(a) EXEMPTION.—An action by the Secretary concerned with respect to a covered activity shall be not considered a major Federal action under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(b) COVERED ACTIVITY.—In this section, the term ''covered activity'' includes—

(1) geotechnical investigations;

(2) off-road travel in an existing right-of-way;

(3) construction of meteorological towers where the total surface disturbance at the location is less than 5 acres;

(4) adding a battery or other energy storage device to an existing or planned energy facility, if that storage resource is located within the physical footprint of the existing or planned energy facility;

(5) drilling temperature gradient wells and other geothermal exploratory wells, including construction or making improvements for such activities, where—

(A) the last cemented casing string is less than 12 inches in diameter; and

(B) the total unreclaimed surface disturbance at any one time within the project area is less than 5 acres;

(6) any repair, maintenance, upgrade, optimization, or minor addition to existing transmission and distribution infrastructure, including—

(A) operation, maintenance, or repair of power equipment and structures within existing substations, switching stations, transmission, and distribution lines;

(B) the addition, modification, retirement, or replacement of breakers, transmission towers, transformers, bushings, or relays;

(C) the voltage uprating, modification, reconductoring with conventional or advanced conductors, and clearance resolution of transmission lines;

(D) activities to minimize fire risk, including vegetation management, routine fire mitigation, inspection, and maintenance activities, and removal of hazard trees and other hazard vegetation within or adjacent to an existing right-of-way;

(E) improvements to or construction of structure pads for such infrastructure; and

(F) access and access route maintenance and repairs associated with any activity described in subparagraph (A) through (E);

(7) approval of and activities conducted in accordance with operating plans or agreements for transmission and distribution facilities or under a special use authorization for an electric transmission and distribution facility right-of-way; and

(8) construction, maintenance, realignment, or repair of an existing permanent or temporary access road—

(A) within an existing right-of-way or within a transmission or utility corridor established by Congress or in a land use plan;

(B) that serves an existing transmission line, distribution line, or energy facility; or

(C) activities conducted in accordance with existing onshore oil and gas leases.

SEC. 20205. NO NET LOSS DETERMINATION FOR EXISTING RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned that there will be no overall long-term net loss of vegetation, soil, or habitat, as defined by acreage and function, resulting from a proposed action, decision, or activity within an existing right-of-way, within a right-of-way corridor established in a land use plan, or in an otherwise designated right-of-way, that action, decision, or activity shall not be considered a major Federal action under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(b) INCLUSION OF REMEDIATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall consider the effect of any remediation work to be conducted during the lifetime of the action, decision, or activity when determining whether there will be any overall long-term net loss of vegetation, soil, or habitat.

SEC. 20206. DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT ADEQUACY.

The Secretary concerned shall use previously completed environmental assessments and environmental impact statements to satisfy the requirements of section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) with respect to any major Federal action, if such Secretary determines that—

(1) the new proposed action is substantially the same as a previously analyzed proposed action or alternative analyzed in a previous environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; and

(2) the effects of the proposed action are substantially the same as the effects analyzed in such existing environmental assessments or environmental impact statements.

SEC. 20207. DETERMINATION REGARDING RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

Not later than 60 days after the Secretary concerned receives an application to grant a right-of-way, the Secretary concerned shall notify the applicant as to whether the application is complete or deficient. If the Secretary concerned determines the application is complete, the Secretary concerned may not consider any other application to grant a right-of-way on the same or any overlapping parcels of land while such application is pending.

SEC. 20208. TERMS OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) FIFTY YEAR TERMS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any right-of-way for pipelines for the transportation or distribution of oil or gas granted, issued, amended, or renewed under Federal law may be limited to

a term of not more than 50 years before such right-of-way is subject to renewal or amendment.

(2) FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.—Section 501 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) Any right-of-way granted, issued, amended, or renewed under subsection (a)(4) may be limited to a term of not more than 50 years before such right-of-way is subject to renewal or amendment.''.

(b) MINERAL LEASING ACT.—Section 28(n) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(n)) is amended by striking ''thirty'' and inserting ''50''.

SEC. 20209. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS AND DEVELOP INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In fiscal years 2023 through 2025, the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service) and the Secretary of the Interior, after public notice, may accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal entities for dedicated staff, information resource management, and information technology system development to expedite the evaluation of permits, biological opinions, concurrence letters, environmental surveys and studies, processing of applications, consultations, and other activities for the leasing, development, or expansion of an energy facility under the jurisdiction of the respective Secretaries.

(b) EFFECT ON PERMITTING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under subsection (a) will not impact impartial decision making with respect to permits, either substantively or procedurally.

(c) STATEMENT FOR FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR EXPEND FUNDS.—Not later than 60 days after the end of the applicable fiscal year, if the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service) or the Secretary of the Interior does not accept funds contributed under subsection (a) or accepts but does not expend such funds, that Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a statement explaining why such funds were not accepted, were not expended, or both, as the case may be.

SEC. 20210. OFFSHORE GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY LICENSING.

The Secretary of the Interior shall authorize geological and geophysical surveys related to oil and gas activities on the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf, except within areas subject to existing oil and gas leasing moratoria. Such authorizations shall be issued within 30 days of receipt of a completed application and shall, as applicable to survey type, comply with the mitigation and monitoring measures in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), and (g) of section 217.184 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2022), and section 217.185 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2022). Geological and geophysical surveys authorized pursuant to this section are deemed to be in full compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and their implementing regulations.

SEC. 20211. DEFERRAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.

Section 17(p)(3) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) DEFERRAL BASED ON FORMATTING ISSUES.—A decision on an application for a permit to drill may not be deferred under paragraph (2)(B) as a result of a formatting issue with the permit, unless such formatting issue results in missing information.''.

SEC. 20212. PROCESSING AND TERMS OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.

(a) EFFECT OF PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) EFFECT OF PENDING CIVIL ACTION ON PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (2), notwithstanding the existence of any pending civil actions affecting the application or related lease, the Secretary shall process an application for a permit to drill or other authorizations or approvals under a valid existing lease, unless a United States Federal court vacated such lease. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as providing authority to a Federal court to vacate a lease.''.

(b) TERM OF PERMIT TO DRILL.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(u) TERM OF PERMIT TO DRILL.—A permit to drill issued under this section after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall be valid for one four-year term from the date that the permit is approved, or until the lease regarding which the permit is issued expires, whichever occurs first.''.

SEC. 20213. AMENDMENTS TO THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005.

Section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 390. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REVIEW.

''(a) NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REVIEW.—Action by the Secretary of the Interior, in managing the public lands, or the Secretary of Agriculture, in managing National Forest System lands, with respect to any of the activities described in subsection (c), shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, if the activity is conducted pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) for the purpose of exploration or development of oil or gas.

''(b) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to an action of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

''(c) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

''(1) Reinstating a lease pursuant to section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188).

''(2) The following activities, provided that any new surface disturbance is contiguous with the footprint of the original authorization and does not exceed 20 acres or the acreage has previously been evaluated in a document previously prepared under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) with respect to such activity:

''(A) Drilling an oil or gas well at a well pad site at which drilling has occurred previously.

''(B) Expansion of an existing oil or gas well pad site to accommodate an additional well.

''(C) Expansion or modification of an existing oil or gas well pad site, road, pipeline, facility, or utility submitted in a sundry notice.

''(3) Drilling of an oil or gas well at a new well pad site, provided that the new surface disturbance does not exceed 20 acres and the acreage evaluated in a document previously prepared under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) with respect to such activity, whichever is greater.

''(4) Construction or realignment of a road, pipeline, or utility within an existing right-of-way or within a right-of-way corridor established in a land use plan.

''(5) The following activities when conducted from non-Federal surface into federally owned minerals, provided that the operator submits to the Secretary concerned certification of a surface use agreement with the non-Federal landowner:

''(A) Drilling an oil or gas well at a well pad site at which drilling has occurred previously.

''(B) Expansion of an existing oil or gas well pad site to accommodate an additional well.

''(C) Expansion or modification of an existing oil or gas well pad site, road, pipeline, facility, or utility submitted in a sundry notice.

''(6) Drilling of an oil or gas well from non-Federal surface and non-Federal subsurface into Federal mineral estate.

''(7) Construction of up to 1 mile of new road on Federal or non-Federal surface, not to exceed 2 miles in total.

''(8) Construction of up to 3 miles of individual pipelines or utilities, regardless of surface ownership.''.

SEC. 20214. ACCESS TO FEDERAL ENERGY RESOURCES FROM NON-FEDERAL SURFACE ESTATE.

(a) OIL AND GAS PERMITS.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR OIL AND GAS ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not require an operator to obtain a Federal drilling permit for oil and gas exploration and production activities conducted on non-Federal surface estate, provided that—

''(A) the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface mineral estate to be accessed by the proposed action; and

''(B) the operator submits to the Secretary a State permit to conduct oil and gas exploration and production activities on the non-Federal surface estate.

''(2) NO FEDERAL ACTION.—An oil and gas exploration and production activity carried out under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

''(B) shall require no additional Federal action;

''(C) may commence 30 days after submission of the State permit to the Secretary; and

''(D) shall not be subject to—

''(i) section 306108 of title 54, United States Code (commonly known as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966); and

''(ii) section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536).

''(3) ROYALTIES AND PRODUCTION ACCOUNTABILITY.—(A) Nothing in this subsection shall affect the amount of royalties due to the United States under this Act from the production of oil and gas, or alter the Secretary's authority to conduct audits and collect civil penalties pursuant to the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

''(B) The Secretary may conduct onsite reviews and inspections to ensure proper accountability, measurement, and reporting of production of Federal oil and gas, and payment of royalties.

''(4) EXCEPTIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to actions on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

''(5) INDIAN LAND.—In this subsection, the term 'Indian land' means—

''(A) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria; and

''(B) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria, the title to which is held—

''(i) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or an individual Indian;

''(ii) by an Indian tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or

''(iii) by a dependent Indian community.''.

(b) GEOTHERMAL PERMITS.—The Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 30. NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR GEOTHERMAL ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not require an operator to obtain a Federal drilling permit for geothermal exploration and production activities conducted on a non-Federal surface estate, provided that—

''(1) the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface geothermal estate to be accessed by the proposed action; and

''(2) the operator submits to the Secretary a State permit to conduct geothermal exploration and production activities on the non-Federal surface estate.

''(b) NO FEDERAL ACTION.—A geothermal exploration and production activity carried out under paragraph (1)—

''(1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

''(2) shall require no additional Federal action;

''(3) may commence 30 days after submission of the State permit to the Secretary; and

''(4) shall not be subject to—

''(A) section 306108 of title 54, United States Code (commonly known as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966); and

''(B) section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536).

''(c) ROYALTIES AND PRODUCTION ACCOUNTABILITY.—(1) Nothing in this section shall affect the amount of royalties due to the United States under this Act from the production of electricity using geothermal resources (other than direct use of geothermal resources) or the production of any byproducts.

''(2) The Secretary may conduct onsite reviews and inspections to ensure proper accountability, measurement, and reporting of the production described in paragraph (1), and payment of royalties.

''(d) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to actions on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

''(e) INDIAN LAND.—In this section, the term 'Indian land' means—

''(1) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria; and

''(2) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria, the title to which is held—

''(A) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or an individual Indian;

''(B) by an Indian tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or

''(C) by a dependent Indian community.''.

SEC. 20215. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS FOR OIL AND GAS LEASES.

An environmental review for an oil and gas lease or permit prepared pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and its implementing regulations—

(1) shall apply only to areas that are within or immediately adjacent to the lease plot or plots and that are directly affected by the proposed action; and

(2) shall not require consideration of downstream, indirect effects of oil and gas consumption.

SEC. 20216. EXPEDITING APPROVAL OF GATHERING LINES.

Section 11318(b)(1) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 15943(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''to be an action that is categorically excluded (as defined in section 1508.1 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act))'' and inserting ''to not be a major Federal action''.

SEC. 20217. LEASE SALE LITIGATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any oil and gas lease sale held under section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (26 U.S.C. 226) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) shall not be vacated and activities on leases awarded in the sale shall not be otherwise limited, delayed, or enjoined unless the court concludes allowing development of the challenged lease will pose a risk of an imminent and substantial environmental harm and there is no other equitable remedy available as a matter of law. No court, in response to an action brought pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. et seq.), may enjoin or issue any order preventing the award of leases to a bidder in a lease sale conducted pursuant to section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (26 U.S.C. 226) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) if the Department of the Interior has previously opened bids for such leases or disclosed the high bidder for any tract that was included in such lease sale.

SEC. 20218. LIMITATION ON CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for a mineral project, energy facility, or energy storage device shall be barred unless—

(1) the claim is filed within 120 days after publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law pursuant to which judicial review is allowed; and

(2) the claim is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the public comment period for such permit, license, or approval and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review.

(b) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall create a right to judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or approval.

(c) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to or supersede a claim subject to section 139(l)(1) of title 23, United States Code.

(d) MINERAL PROJECT.—In this section, the term ''mineral project'' means a project—

(1) located on—

(A) a mining claim, millsite claim, or tunnel site claim for any mineral;

(B) lands open to mineral entry; or

(C) a Federal mineral lease; and

(2) for the purposes of exploring for or producing minerals.

SEC. 20219. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON PERMITS TO DRILL.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report detailing—

(1) the approval timelines for applications for permits to drill issued by the Bureau of Land Management from 2018 through 2022;

(2) the number of applications for permits to drill that were not issued within 30 days of receipt of a completed application; and

(3) the causes of delays resulting in applications for permits to drill pending beyond the 30 day deadline required under section 17(p)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2)).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report issued under subsection (a) shall include recommendations with respect to—

(1) actions the Bureau of Land Management can take to streamline the approval process for applications for permits to drill to approve applications for permits to drill within 30 days of receipt of a completed application;

(2) aspects of the Federal permitting process carried out by the Bureau of Land Management to issue applications for permits to drill that can be turned over to States to expedite approval of applications for permits to drill; and

(3) legislative actions that Congress must take to allow States to administer certain aspects of the Federal permitting process described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 20220. E–NEPA.

(a) PERMITTING PORTAL STUDY.—The Council on Environmental Quality shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress within 1 year of the enactment of this Act on the potential to create an online permitting portal for permits that require review under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) that would—

(1) allow applicants to—

(A) submit required documents or materials for their application in one unified portal;

(B) upload additional documents as required by the applicable agency; and

(C) track the progress of individual applications;

(2) enhance interagency coordination in consultation by—

(A) allowing for comments in one unified portal;

(B) centralizing data necessary for reviews; and

(C) streamlining communications between other agencies and the applicant; and

(3) boost transparency in agency decision-making.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the Council of Environmental Quality to carry out the study directed by this section.

TITLE III—PERMITTING FOR MINING NEEDS

SEC. 20301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BYPRODUCT.—The term ''byproduct'' has the meaning given such term in section 7002(a) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(a)).

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian Tribe'' has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(3) MINERAL.—The term ''mineral'' means any mineral of a kind that is locatable (including, but not limited to, such minerals located on ''lands acquired by the United States'', as such term is defined in section 2 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands) under the Act of May 10, 1872 (Chapter 152; 17 Stat. 91).

(4) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(D) Guam;

(E) American Samoa;

(F) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and

(G) the United States Virgin Islands.

SEC. 20302. MINERALS SUPPLY CHAIN AND RELIABILITY.

Section 40206 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (30 U.S.C. 1607) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**CRITICAL MINERALS**'' and inserting ''**MINERALS**'';

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) LEAD AGENCY.—The term 'lead agency' means the Federal agency with primary responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit or lease for a mineral project.

''(2) MINERAL.—The term 'mineral' has the meaning given such term in section 20301 of the TAPP American Resources Act.

''(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term 'mineral exploration or mine permit' means—

''(A) an authorization of the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service, as applicable, for exploration for minerals that requires analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

''(B) a plan of operations for a mineral project approved by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service; or

''(C) any other Federal permit or authorization for a mineral project.

''(4) MINERAL PROJECT.—The term 'mineral project' means a project—

''(A) located on—

''(i) a mining claim, millsite claim, or tunnel site claim for any mineral;

''(ii) lands open to mineral entry; or

''(iii) a Federal mineral lease; and

''(B) for the purposes of exploring for or producing minerals.'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''critical'' each place such term appears;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''critical mineral production on Federal land'' and inserting ''mineral projects'';

(B) by inserting '', and in accordance with subsection (h)'' after ''to the maximum extent practicable'';

(C) by striking ''shall complete the'' and inserting ''shall complete such'';

(D) in paragraph (1), by striking ''critical mineral-related activities on Federal land'' and inserting ''mineral projects'';

(E) in paragraph (8), by striking the ''and'' at the end;

(F) in paragraph (9), by striking ''procedures.'' and inserting ''procedures; and''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) deferring to and relying on baseline data, analyses, and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the environmental or reclamation permits for the proposed mineral project.'';

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''critical'' each place such term appears; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''mineral-related activities on Federal land'' and inserting ''mineral projects'';

(6) in subsection (e), by striking ''critical'';

(7) in subsection (f), by striking ''critical'' each place such term appears;

(8) in subsection (g), by striking ''critical'' each place such term appears; and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—For purposes of maximizing efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal permitting and review processes described under subsection (c), the lead agency in the Federal permitting and review processes of a mineral project shall (in consultation with any other Federal agency involved in such Federal permitting and review processes, and upon request of the project applicant, an affected State government, local government, or an Indian Tribe, or other entity such lead agency determines appropriate) enter into a memorandum of agreement with a project applicant where requested by the applicant to carry out the activities described in subsection (c).

''(2) TIMELINES AND SCHEDULES FOR NEPA REVIEWS.—

''(A) EXTENSION.—A project applicant may enter into 1 or more agreements with a lead agency to extend the deadlines described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (h)(1) of section 107 of title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 by, with respect to each such agreement, not more than 6 months.

''(B) ADJUSTMENT OF TIMELINES.—At the request of a project applicant, the lead agency and any other entity which is a signatory to a memorandum of agreement under paragraph (1) may, by unanimous agreement, adjust—

''(i) any deadlines described in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) any deadlines extended under subparagraph (B).

''(3) EFFECT ON PENDING APPLICATIONS.—Upon a written request by a project applicant, the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any application for a mineral exploration or mine permit or mineral lease that was submitted before the date of the enactment of the TAPP American Resources Act.''.

SEC. 20303. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.

Section 7002(f) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''critical'' both places such term appears; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 20304. DESIGNATION OF MINING AS A COVERED SECTOR FOR FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES.

Section 41001(6)(A) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)(A)) is amended by inserting ''mineral production,'' before ''or any other sector''.

SEC. 20305. TREATMENT OF ACTIONS UNDER PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION 2022–11 FOR FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (c), an action described in subsection (b) shall be—

(1) treated as a covered project, as defined in section 41001(6) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)), without regard to the requirements of that section; and

(2) included in the Permitting Dashboard maintained pursuant to section 41003(b) of that Act (42 13 U.S.C. 4370m–2(b)).

(b) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—An action described in this subsection is an action taken by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to Presidential Determination 2022–11 (87 Fed. Reg. 19775; relating to certain actions under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950) or the Presidential Memorandum of February 27, 2023, titled ''Presidential Waiver of Statutory Requirements Pursuant to Section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, on Department of Defense Supply Chains Resilience'' (88 Fed. Reg. 13015) to create, maintain, protect, expand, or restore sustainable and responsible domestic production capabilities through—

(1) supporting feasibility studies for mature mining, beneficiation, and value-added processing projects;

(2) byproduct and co-product production at existing mining, mine waste reclamation, and other industrial facilities;

(3) modernization of mining, beneficiation, and value-added processing to increase productivity, environmental sustainability, and workforce safety; or

(4) any other activity authorized under section 303(a)(1) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 15 (50 U.S.C. 4533(a)(1)).

(c) EXCEPTION.—An action described in subsection (b) may not be treated as a covered project or be included in the Permitting Dashboard under subsection (a) if the project sponsor (as defined in section 41001(18) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 21 4370m(18))) requests that the action not be treated as a covered project.

SEC. 20306. NOTICE FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION ACTIVITIES WITH LIMITED SURFACE DISTURBANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days before commencing an exploration activity with a surface disturbance of not more than 5 acres of public lands, the operator of such exploration activity shall submit to the Secretary concerned a complete notice of such exploration activity.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—Notice submitted under subsection (a) shall include such information the Secretary concerned may require, including the information described in section 3809.301 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(c) REVIEW.—Not later than 15 days after the Secretary concerned receives notice submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall—

(1) review and determine completeness of the notice; and

(2) allow exploration activities to proceed if—

(A) the surface disturbance of such exploration activities on such public lands will not exceed 5 acres;

(B) the Secretary concerned determines that the notice is complete; and

(C) the operator provides financial assurance that the Secretary concerned determines is adequate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXPLORATION ACTIVITY.—The term ''exploration activity''—

(A) means creating surface disturbance greater than casual use that includes sampling, drilling, or developing surface or underground workings to evaluate the type, extent, quantity, or quality of mineral values present;

(B) includes constructing drill roads and drill pads, drilling, trenching, excavating test pits, and conducting geotechnical tests and geophysical surveys; and

(C) does not include activities where material is extracted for commercial use or sale.

(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) with respect to lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) with respect to National Forest System lands, the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 20307. USE OF MINING CLAIMS FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) SECURITY OF TENURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A claimant shall have the right to use, occupy, and conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, if—

''(i) such claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee required by section 10102 and the claim maintenance fee required by subsection (a); or

''(ii) in the case of a claimant who qualifies for a waiver under subsection (d), such claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee and complies with the required assessment work under the general mining laws.

''(B) OPERATIONS DEFINED.—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'operations' means—

''(i) any activity or work carried out in connection with prospecting, exploration, processing, discovery and assessment, development, or extraction with respect to a locatable mineral;

''(ii) the reclamation of any disturbed areas; and

''(iii) any other reasonably incident uses, whether on a mining claim or not, including the construction and maintenance of facilities, roads, transmission lines, pipelines, and any other necessary infrastructure or means of access on public land for support facilities.

''(2) FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT.—A claimant that fulfills the requirements of this section and section 10102 shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of any provision of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act that requires the payment of fair market value to the United States for use of public lands and resources relating to use of such lands and resources authorized by the general mining laws.

''(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to diminish the rights of entry, use, and occupancy, or any other right, of a claimant under the general mining laws.''.

SEC. 20308. ENSURING CONSIDERATION OF URANIUM AS A CRITICAL MINERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7002(a)(3)(B)(i) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(a)(3)(B)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) oil, oil shale, coal, or natural gas;''.

(b) UPDATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall publish in the Federal Register an update to the final list established in section 7002(c)(3) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(c)(3)) in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 20309. BARRING FOREIGN BAD ACTORS FROM OPERATING ON FEDERAL LANDS.

A mining claimant shall be barred from the right to use, occupy, and conduct operations on Federal land if the Secretary of the Interior finds the claimant has a foreign parent company that has (including through a subsidiary)—

(1) a known record of human rights violations; or

(2) knowingly operated an illegal mine in another country.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL LAND USE PLANNING

SEC. 20401. FEDERAL LAND USE PLANNING AND WITHDRAWALS.

(a) RESOURCE ASSESSMENTS REQUIRED.—Federal lands and waters may not be withdrawn from entry under the mining laws or operation of the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws unless—

(1) a quantitative and qualitative geophysical and geological mineral resource assessment of the impacted area has been completed during the 10-year period ending on the date of such withdrawal;

(2) the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Defense, conducts an assessment of the economic, energy, strategic, and national security value of mineral deposits identified in such mineral resource assessment;

(3) the Secretary conducts an assessment of the reduction in future Federal revenues to the Treasury, States, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Historic Preservation Fund, and the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund resulting from the proposed mineral withdrawal;

(4) the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, conducts an assessment of military readiness and training activities in the proposed withdrawal area; and

(5) the Secretary submits a report to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs of the Senate, that includes the results of the assessments completed pursuant to this subsection.

(b) LAND USE PLANS.—Before a resource management plan under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or a forest management plan under the National Forest Management Act is updated or completed, the Secretary or Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, in consultation with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall—

(1) review any quantitative and qualitative mineral resource assessment that was completed or updated during the 10-year period ending on the date that the applicable land management agency publishes a notice to prepare, revise, or amend a land use plan by the Director of the United States Geological Survey for the geographic area affected by the applicable management plan;

(2) the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Defense, conducts an assessment of the economic, energy, strategic, and national security value of mineral deposits identified in such mineral resource assessment; and

(3) submit a report to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs of the Senate, that includes the results of the assessment completed pursuant to this subsection.

(c) NEW INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall provide recommendations to the President on appropriate measures to reduce unnecessary impacts that a withdrawal of Federal lands or waters from entry under the mining laws or operation of the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws may have on mineral exploration, development, and other mineral activities (including authorizing exploration and development of such mineral deposits) not later than 180 days after the Secretary has notice that a resource assessment completed by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in coordination with the State geological surveys, determines that a previously undiscovered mineral deposit may be present in an area that has been withdrawn from entry under the mining laws or operation of the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws pursuant to—

(1) section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714); or

(2) chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code.

SEC. 20402. PROHIBITIONS ON DELAY OF MINERAL DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall not carry out any action that would pause, restrict, or delay the process for or issuance of any of the following on Federal land, unless such lands are withdrawn from disposition under the mineral leasing laws, including by administrative withdrawal:

(1) New oil and gas lease sales, oil and gas leases, drill permits, or associated approvals or authorizations of any kind associated with oil and gas leases.

(2) New coal leases (including leases by application in process, renewals, modifications, or expansions of existing leases), permits, approvals, or authorizations.

(3) New leases, claims, permits, approvals, or authorizations for development or exploration of minerals.

(b) PROHIBITION ON RESCISSION OF LEASES, PERMITS, OR CLAIMS.—The President, the Secretary, or Secretary of Agriculture as applicable, may not rescind any existing lease, permit, or claim for the extraction and production of any mineral under the mining laws or mineral leasing and mineral materials laws on National Forest System land or land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, unless specifically authorized by Federal statute, or upon the lessee, permittee, or claimant's failure to comply with any of the provisions of the applicable lease, permit, or claim.

(c) MINERAL DEFINED.—In subsection (a)(3), the term ''mineral'' means any mineral of a kind that is locatable (including such minerals located on ''lands acquired by the United States'', as such term is defined in section 2 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands) under the Act of May 10, 1872 (Chapter 152; 17 Stat. 91).

SEC. 20403. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means—

(A) National Forest System land;

(B) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702));

(C) the outer Continental Shelf (as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331)); and

(D) land managed by the Secretary of Energy.

(2) PRESIDENT.—The term ''President'' means—

(A) the President; and

(B) any designee of the President, including—

(i) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(ii) the Secretary of Commerce;

(iii) the Secretary of Energy; and

(iv) the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) PREVIOUSLY UNDISCOVERED DEPOSIT.—The term ''previously undiscovered mineral deposit'' means—

(A) a mineral deposit that has been previously evaluated by the United States Geological Survey and found to be of low mineral potential, but upon subsequent evaluation is determined by the United States Geological Survey to have significant mineral potential; or

(B) a mineral deposit that has not previously been evaluated by the United States Geological Survey.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

TITLE V—ENSURING COMPETITIVENESS ON FEDERAL LANDS

SEC. 20501. INCENTIVIZING DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.

(a) OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS ROYALTY RATE.—Section 8(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''not less than 16⅔ percent, but not more than 18¾ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14', and not less than 16⅔ percent thereafter,'' each place it appears and inserting ''not less than 12.5 percent'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''not less than 16⅔ percent, but not more than 18¾ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14', and not less than 16⅔ percent thereafter,'' each place it appears and inserting ''not less than 12.5 percent'';

(3) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''not less than 16⅔ percent, but not more than 18¾ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14', and not less than 16⅔ percent thereafter,'' and inserting ''not less than 12.5 percent''; and

(4) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''not less than 16⅔ percent, but not more than 18¾ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14', and not less than 16⅔ percent thereafter,'' and inserting ''not less than 12.5 percent''.

(b) MINERAL LEASING ACT.—

(1) ONSHORE OIL AND GAS ROYALTY RATES.—

(A) LEASE OF OIL AND GAS LAND.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(I) by striking ''not less than 16⅔'' and inserting ''not less than 12.5''; and

(II) by striking ''or, in the case of a lease issued during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14', 16⅔ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease''; and

(ii) by striking ''16⅔ percent'' each place it appears and inserting ''12.5 percent''.

(B) CONDITIONS FOR REINSTATEMENT.—Section 31(e)(3) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188(e)(3)) is amended by striking ''20'' inserting ''16⅔''.

(2) OIL AND GAS MINIMUM BID.—Section 17(b) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''$10 per acre during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled 'An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14'.'' and inserting ''$2 per acre for a period of 2 years from the date of the enactment of the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''$10 per acre'' and inserting ''$2 per acre''.

(3) FOSSIL FUEL RENTAL RATES.—Section 17(d) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) All leases issued under this section, as amended by the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987, shall be conditioned upon payment by the lessee of a rental of not less than $1.50 per acre per year for the first through fifth years of the lease and not less than $2 per acre per year for each year thereafter. A minimum royalty in lieu of rental of not less than the rental which otherwise would be required for that lease year shall be payable at the expiration of each lease year beginning on or after a discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities on the lands leased.''.

(4) EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FEE.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by repealing subsection (q).

(5) ELIMINATION OF NONCOMPETITIVE LEASING.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(II) by adding at the end ''Lands for which no bids are received or for which the highest bid is less than the national minimum acceptable bid shall be offered promptly within 30 days for leasing under subsection (c) of this section and shall remain available for leasing for a period of 2 years after the competitive lease sale.''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) If the United States held a vested future interest in a mineral estate that, immediately prior to becoming a vested present interest, was subject to a lease under which oil or gas was being produced, or had a well capable of producing, in paying quantities at an annual average production volume per well per day of either not more than 15 barrels per day of oil or condensate, or not more than 60,000 cubic feet of gas, the holder of the lease may elect to continue the lease as a noncompetitive lease under subsection (c)(1).

''(B) An election under this paragraph is effective—

''(i) in the case of an interest which vested after January 1, 1990, and on or before October 24, 1992, if the election is made before the date that is 1 year after October 24, 1992;

''(ii) in the case of an interest which vests within 1 year after October 24, 1992, if the election is made before the date that is 2 years after October 24, 1992; and

''(iii) in any case other than those described in clause (i) or (ii), if the election is made prior to the interest becoming a vested present interest.'';

(B) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) LANDS SUBJECT TO LEASING UNDER SUBSECTION (B); FIRST QUALIFIED APPLICANT.—

''(1) If the lands to be leased are not leased under subsection (b)(1) of this section or are not subject to competitive leasing under subsection (b)(2) of this section, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this chapter shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding, upon payment of a non-refundable application fee of at least $75. A lease under this subsection shall be conditioned upon the payment of a royalty at a rate of 12.5 percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Leases shall be issued within 60 days of the date on which the Secretary identifies the first responsible qualified applicant.

''(2)(A) Lands (i) which were posted for sale under subsection (b)(1) of this section but for which no bids were received or for which the highest bid was less than the national minimum acceptable bid and (ii) for which, at the end of the period referred to in subsection (b)(1) of this section no lease has been issued and no lease application is pending under paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall again be available for leasing only in accordance with subsection (b)(1) of this section.

''(B) The land in any lease which is issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection or under subsection (b)(1) of this section which lease terminates, expires, is cancelled or is relinquished shall again be available for leasing only in accordance with subsection (b)(1) of this section.''; and

(C) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) PRIMARY TERM.—Competitive and noncompetitive leases issued under this section shall be for a primary term of 10 years: Provided, however, That competitive leases issued in special tar sand areas shall also be for a primary term of 10 years. Each such lease shall continue so long after its primary term as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Any lease issued under this section for land on which, or for which under an approved cooperative or unit plan of development or operation, actual drilling operations were commenced prior to the end of its primary term and are being diligently prosecuted at that time shall be extended for two years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.''.

(6) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''section 17(b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b) or (c) of section 17 of this Act'';

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) insert ''either'' after ''rentals and''; and

(II) insert ''or the inclusion in a reinstated lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 17(c) of this Act of a requirement that future rentals shall be at a rate not less than $5 per acre per year, all'' before ''as determined by the Secretary''; and

(ii) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3)(A) payment of back royalties and the inclusion in a reinstated lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 17(b) of this Act of a requirement for future royalties at a rate of not less than 16⅔ percent computed on a sliding scale based upon the average production per well per day, at a rate which shall be not less than 4 percentage points greater than the competitive royalty schedule then in force and used for royalty determination for competitive leases issued pursuant to such section as determined by the Secretary: Provided, That royalty on such reinstated lease shall be paid on all production removed or sold from such lease subsequent to the termination of the original lease;

''(B) payment of back royalties and inclusion in a reinstated lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 17(c) of this Act of a requirement for future royalties at a rate not less than 16⅔ percent: Provided, That royalty on such reinstated lease shall be paid on all production removed or sold from such lease subsequent to the cancellation or termination of the original lease; and'';

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1), strike ''in the same manner as the original lease issued pursuant to section 17'' and insert ''as a competitive or a noncompetitive oil and gas lease in the same manner as the original lease issued pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of section 17 of this Act'';

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraph (3) and (4), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the issuance of a lease in lieu of an abandoned patented oil placer mining claim shall be treated as a noncompetitive oil and gas lease issued pursuant to section 17(c) of this Act.'';

(D) in subsection (g), by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsections (d) and (f)'';

(E) by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

''(h) ROYALTY REDUCTIONS.—

''(1) In acting on a petition to issue a noncompetitive oil and gas lease, under subsection (f) of this section or in response to a request filed after issuance of such a lease, or both, the Secretary is authorized to reduce the royalty on such lease if in his judgment it is equitable to do so or the circumstances warrant such relief due to uneconomic or other circumstances which could cause undue hardship or premature termination of production.

''(2) In acting on a petition for reinstatement pursuant to subsection (d) of this section or in response to a request filed after reinstatement, or both, the Secretary is authorized to reduce the royalty in that reinstated lease on the entire leasehold or any tract or portion thereof segregated for royalty purposes if, in his judgment, there are uneconomic or other circumstances which could cause undue hardship or premature termination of production; or because of any written action of the United States, its agents or employees, which preceded, and was a major consideration in, the lessee's expenditure of funds to develop the property under the lease after the rent had become due and had not been paid; or if in the judgment of the Secretary it is equitable to do so for any reason.'';

(F) by redesignating subsections (f) through (i) as subsections (g) through (j), respectively; and

(G) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) ISSUANCE OF NONCOMPETITIVE OIL AND GAS LEASE; CONDITIONS.—Where an unpatented oil placer mining claim validly located prior to February 24, 1920, which has been or is currently producing or is capable of producing oil or gas, has been or is hereafter deemed conclusively abandoned for failure to file timely the required instruments or copies of instruments required by section 1744 of title 43, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such failure was inadvertent, justifiable, or not due to lack of reasonable diligence on the part of the owner, the Secretary may issue, for the lands covered by the abandoned unpatented oil placer mining claim, a noncompetitive oil and gas lease, consistent with the provisions of section 17(e) of this Act, to be effective from the statutory date the claim was deemed conclusively abandoned. Issuance of such a lease shall be conditioned upon:

''(1) a petition for issuance of a noncompetitive oil and gas lease, together with the required rental and royalty, including back rental and royalty accruing from the statutory date of abandonment of the oil placer mining claim, being filed with the Secretary- (A) with respect to any claim deemed conclusively abandoned on or before January 12, 1983, on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after January 12, 1983, or (B) with respect to any claim deemed conclusively abandoned after January 12, 1983, on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after final notification by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction of the determination of the abandonment of the oil placer mining claim;

''(2) a valid lease not having been issued affecting any of the lands covered by the abandoned oil placer mining claim prior to the filing of such petition: Provided, however, That after the filing of a petition for issuance of a lease under this subsection, the Secretary shall not issue any new lease affecting any of the lands covered by such abandoned oil placer mining claim for a reasonable period, as determined in accordance with regulations issued by him;

''(3) a requirement in the lease for payment of rental, including back rentals accruing from the statutory date of abandonment of the oil placer mining claim, of not less than $5 per acre per year;

''(4) a requirement in the lease for payment of royalty on production removed or sold from the oil placer mining claim, including all royalty on production made subsequent to the statutory date the claim was deemed conclusively abandoned, of not less than 12½ percent; and

''(5) compliance with the notice and reimbursement of costs provisions of paragraph (4) of subsection (e) but addressed to the petition covering the conversion of an abandoned unpatented oil placer mining claim to a noncompetitive oil and gas lease.''.

TITLE VI—ENERGY REVENUE SHARING

SEC. 20601. GULF OF MEXICO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUE.

(a) DISTRIBUTION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUE TO GULF PRODUCING STATES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''50'' and inserting ''37.5''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''50'' and inserting ''62.5'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''75'' and inserting ''80''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''25'' and inserting ''20''; and

(2) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts disbursed to a Gulf producing State under this section shall be treated as revenue sharing and not as a Federal award or grant for the purposes of part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(b) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after ''Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28–0404–0–1–651).'' the following:

''Payments to States pursuant to section 105(a)(2)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432; 43 U.S.C. 1331 note) (014–5535–0–2–302).''.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 20602. PARITY IN OFFSHORE WIND REVENUE SHARING.

(a) PAYMENTS AND REVENUES.—Section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''(A) The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''(B) The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(B) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN 3 NAUTICAL MILES SEAWARD OF STATE SUBMERGED LAND.—The Secretary''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR OFFSHORE WIND PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS.—

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

''(I) COVERED OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT.—The term 'covered offshore wind project' means a wind powered electric generation project in a wind energy area on the outer Continental Shelf that is not wholly or partially located within an area subject to subparagraph (B).

''(II) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term 'eligible State' means a State a point on the coastline of which is located within 75 miles of the geographic center of a covered offshore wind project.

''(III) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—The term 'qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues' means all royalties, fees, rentals, bonuses, or other payments from covered offshore wind projects carried out pursuant to this subsection on or after the date of enactment of this subparagraph.

''(ii) REQUIREMENT.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

''(aa) 12.5 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in the general fund of the Treasury;

''(bb) 37.5 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund; and

''(cc) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse to each eligible State an amount determined pursuant to subclause (II).

''(II) ALLOCATION.—

''(aa) IN GENERAL.—Subject to item (bb), for each fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the amount made available under subclause (I)(cc) shall be allocated to each eligible State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each eligible State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

''(bb) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to an eligible State each fiscal year under item (aa) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts made available under subclause (I)(cc).

''(cc) PAYMENTS TO COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—

''(AA) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pay 20 percent of the allocable share of each eligible State, as determined pursuant to item (aa), to the coastal political subdivisions of the eligible State.

''(BB) ALLOCATION.—The amount paid by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions under subitem (AA) shall be allocated to each coastal political subdivision in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 31(b)(4) of this Act.

''(iii) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under subclause (I) of clause (ii) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with such subclause during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

''(iv) AUTHORIZED USES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), each eligible State shall use all amounts received under clause (ii)(II) in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws, only for 1 or more of the following purposes:

''(aa) Projects and activities for the purposes of coastal protection and resiliency, including conservation, coastal restoration, estuary management, beach nourishment, hurricane and flood protection, and infrastructure directly affected by coastal wetland losses.

''(bb) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources, including through fisheries science and research.

''(cc) Implementation of a federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation management plan.

''(dd) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects.

''(ee) Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with this section.

''(ff) Infrastructure improvements at ports, including modifications to Federal navigation channels, to support installation of offshore wind energy projects.

''(II) LIMITATION.—Of the amounts received by an eligible State under clause (ii)(II), not more than 3 percent shall be used for the purposes described in subclause (I)(ee).

''(v) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to clause (vi)(III), amounts made available under items (aa) and (cc) of clause (ii)(I) shall—

''(I) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this subparagraph;

''(II) remain available until expended; and

''(III) be in addition to any amount appropriated under any other Act.

''(vi) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Governor of each eligible State that receives amounts under clause (ii)(II) for the applicable fiscal year shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the use of the amounts by the eligible State during the period covered by the report.

''(II) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—On receipt of a report submitted under subclause (I), the Secretary shall make the report available to the public on the website of the Department of the Interior.

''(III) LIMITATION.—If the Governor of an eligible State that receives amounts under clause (ii)(II) fails to submit the report required under subclause (I) by the deadline specified in that subclause, any amounts that would otherwise be provided to the eligible State under clause (ii)(II) for the succeeding fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury.

''(vii) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts disbursed to an eligible State under this subsection shall be treated as revenue sharing and not as a Federal award or grant for the purposes of part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(b) WIND LEASE SALES FOR AREAS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE OF TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 33 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(b) WIND LEASE SALE PROCEDURE.—Any wind lease granted pursuant to this section shall be considered a wind lease granted under section 8(p), including for purposes of the disposition of revenues pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 8(p)(2).''.

(c) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after ''Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28–0404–0–1–651).'' the following:

''Payments to States pursuant to subparagraph (C)(ii)(I)(cc) of section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)).''.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 20603. ELIMINATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE FEE UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking ''and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b),'';

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively;

(4) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of subsection (b) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)''; and

(5) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii) of subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (c)(2)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)(B)''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 355(a)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''Subject to the provisions of section 35(b) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(b)), all'' and inserting ''All''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''of the Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 450; 30 U.S.C. 191),'' and inserting ''of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191)''.

(2) Section 20(a) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1019(a)) is amended, in the second sentence of the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the provisions of subsection (b) of section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(b)) and section 5(a)(2) of this Act'' and inserting ''section 5(a)(2)''.

(3) Section 205(f) of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1735(f)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''this Section'' and inserting ''this section''; and

(B) by striking the fourth, fifth, and sixth sentences.

2SEC. 20604. SUNSET.

This title, and the amendments made by this title, shall cease to have effect on September 30, 2032, and on such date the provisions of law amended by this title shall be restored or revived as if this title had not been enacted.

DIVISION C—WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION AND ENERGY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 30001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act of 2023''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this division is as follows:

SEC. 30002. CERTIFICATION.

Section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''may result'' and inserting ''may directly result'';

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking ''activity'' and inserting ''discharge'';

(iii) in the third sentence, by striking ''applications'' each place it appears and inserting ''requests'';

(iv) in the fifth sentence, by striking ''act on'' and inserting ''grant or deny''; and

(v) by inserting after the fourth sentence the following: ''Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act of 2023, each State and interstate agency that has authority to give such a certification, and the Administrator, shall publish requirements for certification to demonstrate to such State, such interstate agency, or the Administrator, as the case may be, compliance with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307. A decision to grant or deny a request for certification shall be based only on the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, and the grounds for the decision shall be set forth in writing and provided to the applicant. Not later than 90 days after receipt of a request for certification, the State, interstate agency, or Administrator, as the case may be, shall identify in writing all specific additional materials or information that are necessary to grant or deny the request.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence, by striking ''notice of application for such Federal license or permit'' and inserting ''receipt of a notice under the preceding sentence'';

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking ''any water quality requirement'' and inserting ''any applicable provision of section 301, 302, 303, 306, or 307'';

(iii) in the fifth sentence, by striking ''insure compliance with applicable water quality requirements.'' and inserting ''ensure compliance with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307.'';

(iv) in the final sentence, by striking ''insure'' and inserting ''ensure''; and

(v) by striking the first sentence and inserting ''On receipt of a request for certification, the certifying State or interstate agency, as applicable, shall immediately notify the Administrator of the request.'';

(C) in paragraph (3), in the second sentence, by striking ''section'' and inserting ''any applicable provision of section'';

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''applicable effluent limitations or other limitations or other applicable water quality requirements will not be violated'' and inserting ''no applicable provision of section 301, 302, 303, 306, or 307 will be violated'';

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking ''will violate applicable effluent limitations or other limitations or other water quality requirements'' and inserting ''will directly result in a discharge that violates an applicable provision of section 301, 302, 303, 306, or 307,''; and

(iii) in the third sentence, by striking ''such facility or activity will not violate the applicable provisions'' and inserting ''operation of such facility or activity will not directly result in a discharge that violates any applicable provision''; and

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking ''the applicable provisions'' and inserting ''any applicable provision'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''any applicable effluent limitations and other limitations, under section 301 or 302 of this Act, standard of performance under section 306 of this Act, or prohibition, effluent standard, or pretreatment standard under section 307 of this Act, and with any other appropriate requirement of State law set forth in such certification, and'' and inserting ''the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, and any such limitations or requirements''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) For purposes of this section, the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 are any applicable effluent limitations and other limitations, under section 301 or 302, standard of performance under section 306, prohibition, effluent standard, or pretreatment standard under section 307, and requirement of State law implementing water quality criteria under section 303 necessary to support the designated use or uses of the receiving navigable waters.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 118–30. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable

for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DONALDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall conduct a study on how to streamline regulatory timelines relating to developing new power plants by examining practices relating to various power generating sources, including fossil and nuclear generating sources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the time and the effort here.

In an effort to ultimately streamline the regulatory approval timeline, my amendment requires the implementation of a study that explores the licensing and permitting process of other energy sources under the Department of Energy's jurisdiction.

By studying the licensing procedures of various energy sources, we can streamline the regulatory process overall by cutting down unnecessary red tape.

My amendment seeks to optimize American power production, create a sense of ease and standardization in the regulatory maze surrounding various energy sources and examine other regulatory procedures to safely expedite the approval timeline.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 10007. SENSE OF CONGRESS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE DENIAL OF JORDAN COVE PERMITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 19, 2020, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission granted two Federal permits to Jordan Cove Energy Project, L.P., to site, construct, and operate a new liquefied natural gas export terminal in Coos County, Oregon.

(2) On the same day, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline, L.P., to construct and operate the proposed Pacific Connector Pipeline in the counties of Klamath, Jackson, Douglas, and Coos of Oregon.

(3) The State of Oregon denied the permits and the certificate necessary for these projects.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress disapproves of the denial of these permits by the State of Oregon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is simple and straightforward. My amendment provides congressional disapproval of the denial of the Jordan Cove project permits.

The Jordan Cove project was an important liquefied natural gas proposal that would have been the only West Coast LNG export terminal and would have been essential to exporting LNG to our allies in the Pacific and freedom around the world.

The Department of Energy determined that the Jordan Cove project was expected to create 6,000 jobs during peak construction and generate up to $100 million in State and local tax revenue annually.

Importantly, this project would have allowed us to export clean liquefied natural gas to our allies, many of which have been dependent on energy from Russia, OPEC, Venezuela, and even Iran.

America makes the cleanest energy around the world. In fact, our natural gas is 42 percent cleaner than Russian gas. American innovation, in particular, fracking, has allowed America to be the global leader in emissions since 2000.

In 2016, the United States Geological Survey released a report that increased the estimate of technically recoverable natural gas in the Mancos shale deposit from 1.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to a staggering 66.3 trillion, a 40-fold increase.

David Ludlam, who worked for the West Slope Colorado Oil and Gas Association, said, there is enough natural gas to power the State of California for 50 years right in Colorado's Third District's backyard, and the need for our community to join the global energy marketplace has never been more urgent.

A West Coast LNG export terminal would have shaved critical days and significant costs off exports to Asia, eliminated threats associated with hurricanes, and reduced our reliance on the Panama Canal, which causes significant uncertainty and delays.

We should be advancing energy infrastructure projects to help ensure American energy dominance and help promote economic growth through a true all-of-the-above energy policy, not having elected politicians and bureaucrats pick winners and losers in the energy sector.

Importantly, Jordan Cove has significant bipartisan support. In fact, the project in Colorado was supported by former-U.S. Senator Cory Gardner, U.S. Senator MICHAEL BENNET, former-Governor JOHN HICKENLOOPER, the Colorado Senate, the liberal Denver Post, the liberal Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, and local governments in western Colorado, including Mesa, Garfield, Rio Blanco, Moffat, Routt, Delta, and many other counties and municipalities in my region.

While similar project proposals have languished for decades, Jordan Cove was on track for success after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission granted two Federal permits for the Jordan Cove Energy Project and issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline in March of 2019.

Unfortunately, the anti-pipeline, anti-natural gas, liberal Governor's administration in Oregon denied the permits and the certificate necessary for these projects, essentially killing the project in December of 2021 when the company pulled out, citing their inability to obtain the necessary State permits in the immediate future.

If Green New Deal extremists in the Governor's office actually cared about the environment, they would have supported this project as natural gas emissions result in significantly fewer air pollutants and carbon dioxide emissions, and this important project would have advanced local, regional, and global emissions reduction goals.

Like the Keystone XL pipeline, Jordan Cove was a major opportunity killed by extreme environmentalists whose sole agenda isn't protecting the environment, isn't being good stewards of what we have been blessed with, but is keeping our American energy sources in the ground and killing off fossil fuels.

America deserves an American energy strategy that works for all Americans, and this amendment makes clear that we should not allow States with a misguided agenda to kill projects of national and global energy importance.

Mr. Chair, I support adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1600

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I hope after today we don't hear Republicans talk about States' rights again. Pipeline and LNG projects require both Federal and State permits. The spirit of the Clean Water Act clearly demands that States have a say in the requirements and permits that projects

in their State are subject to. This amendment disapproves of the State of Oregon's decision to deny permits to the Jordan Cove LNG export project.

Mr. Chair, who are we to disapprove of Oregon's decision?

I don't live in Oregon. The distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado offering this amendment doesn't live in Oregon. Oregon decided in a democratic fashion what standards projects had to meet in order to build in the State. Jordan Cove didn't meet those standards and it didn't get the permits and it didn't get built. I don't see anything objectionable there.

If Congress spent floor time debating every State decision that one Member of the House disagreed with, we would never get anything done. I just think this is a meaningless sense of Congress resolution. If this passes and the bill somehow becomes law, it won't bring the project back. It is really a messaging amendment, being added to, in my opinion, a messaging bill.

I would also note that my colleague, Congresswoman VAL HOYLE, staunchly opposes this amendment and has a long history of opposing the Jordan Cove LNG project. Unfortunately, she has come down with COVID and regrets that she is unable to be on the floor to discuss this amendment.

Republicans promised when they took the majority that they were going to be serious legislators dealing with actual issues the country is facing. I don't see that here.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HERN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CRENSHAW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. STATE PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 1422(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h–1(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''Within ninety days'' and inserting ''(A) Within ninety days'';

(B) by striking ''and after reasonable opportunity for presentation of views''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) If, after 270 calendar days of a State's application being submitted under paragraph (1)(A) or notice being submitted under paragraph (1)(B), the Administrator has not, pursuant to subparagraph (A), by rule approved, disapproved, or approved in part and disapproved in part the State's underground injection control program—

''(i) the Administrator shall transmit, in writing, to the State a detailed explanation as to the status of the application or notice; and

''(ii) the State's underground injection control program shall be deemed approved under this section if—

''(I) the Administrator has not after another 30 days, pursuant to subparagraph (A), by rule approved, disapproved, or approved in part and disapproved in part the State's underground injection control program; and

''(II) the State has established and implemented an effective program (including adequate recordkeeping and reporting) to prevent underground injection which endangers drinking water sources.'';

(2) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) Before promulgating any rule under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection, the Administrator shall—

''(A) provide a reasonable opportunity for presentation of views with respect to such rule, including a public hearing and a public comment period; and

''(B) publish in the Federal Register notice of the reasonable opportunity for presentation of views provided under subparagraph (A).''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) PREAPPLICATION ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall work as expeditiously as possible with States to complete any necessary activities relevant to the submission of an application under paragraph (1)(A) or notice under paragraph (1)(B), taking into consideration the need for a complete and detailed submission.

''(6) APPLICATION COORDINATION FOR CLASS VI WELLS.—With respect to the underground injection control program for Class VI wells (as defined in section 40306(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 300h-9(a))), the Administrator shall designate one individual at the Agency from each regional office to be responsible for coordinating—

''(A) the completion of any necessary activities prior to the submission of an application under paragraph (1)(A) or notice under paragraph (1)(B), in accordance with paragraph (5);

''(B) the review of an application submitted under paragraph (1)(A) or notice submitted under paragraph (1)(B);

''(C) any reasonable opportunity for presentation of views provided under paragraph (4)(A) and any notice published under paragraph (4)(B); and

''(D) pursuant to the recommendations included in the report required under paragraph (7), the hiring of additional staff to carry out subparagraphs (A) through (C).

''(7) EVALUATION OF RESOURCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the individual designated under paragraph (6) shall transmit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report, including recommendations, regarding the—

''(i) availability of staff and resources to promptly carry out the requirements of paragraph (6); and

''(ii) additional funding amounts needed to do so.

''(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'appropriate Congressional Committees' means—

''(i) in the Senate—

''(I) the Committee on Environment and Public Works; and

''(II) the Committee on Appropriations; and

''(ii) in the House of Representatives—

''(I) the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and

''(II) the Committee on Appropriations.''.

(b) FUNDING.—In each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, amounts made available by title VI of division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act under paragraph (7) of the heading ''Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' (Public Law 117–58; 135 Stat. 1402) may also be made available, subject to appropriations, to carry out paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of section 1422(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as added by this section.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) apply to all applications submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency after the date of enactment of this Act to establish an underground injection control program under section 1422(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h–1); and

(2) with respect to such applications submitted prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the 270 and 300 day deadlines under section 1422(b)(2)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as added by this section, shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I really hope this amendment can be bipartisan. I see no reason why it wouldn't be. It simply provides predictability for States applying for primacy of class 6 carbon capture wells. It is very straight forward. When a State submits a primacy application to the EPA, the EPA has 270 days to either approve or deny the application.

If the EPA is unable to do so within that generous time window, we give them another 30 days to explain why. If, for whatever reason, the EPA fails to make a determination after 300 days, then the State can move forward.

Importantly, we preserve EPA's ability to deny the application or revoke the approval using emergency measures under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Why is this needed?

Unfortunately, when States submit primacy applications for these wells, it can take years for the EPA to even bother to review the application. There is a lot more demand for carbon capture projects. They are ramping up around the country, especially in Houston. The need for expanded permitting capacity has greatly increased.

The EPA should not be the roadblock to projects that are designed to reduce carbon emissions. Let me say that again: Reduce carbon emissions.

The International Energy Agency said carbon capture is necessary to meet national, regional, and even corporate emissions reductions goals. Even EPA administrator Michael Regan called carbon capture a priority

for the Biden administration. It is a bipartisan issue.

States like Texas have already proven they can manage these wells and giving them primacy will be a game changer for speeding up carbon capture projects. Giving States regulatory certainty is critical to successful carbon capture projects moving forward in their States. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. Chair, there is no reason why this should not be bipartisan, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from Texas' amendment would undermine EPAs critical Underground Injection Control program and endanger the health of communities around the Nation, in my opinion.

The Underground Injection Control program, or UIC, regulates injection wells to protect drinking water sources.

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act, EPA implements the program, but can delegate primary enforcement authority, or primacy, to a State.

To be granted primacy, States must demonstrate to EPA that they, among other things, have regulations in place that meet various minimum requirements.

The point of this application and EPA approval process is to ensure there is a Federal floor to regulations so drinking water is protected across the country.

This amendment seeks to expedite approvals of primacy applications by effectively rubber-stamping State UIC programs for class 6 wells, those used for carbon sequestration, if EPA hasn't acted on the State application within the review period.

Just like other permit deadline provisions of the polluters over peoples act, this would be dangerous.

While this amendment targets class 6 wells used for underground injection of carbon dioxide, the text, as written, would apply to State program applications or program revisions for all well types, including hazardous waste injection wells.

UIC programs should be rigorous and protective. We should not gamble with people's drinking water. Once water is contaminated, we cannot easily reverse course.

If Republicans care about the implementation of this program, they would support EPA as it works to ensure robust State programs are in place before granting primacy.

In fact, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law provided $25 million toward that goal. So if States want primacy, they should complete the application process and be held to the Federal standard so Americans know their water is safe. Circumventing this process will only put communities in jeopardy.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I have a brief response to the gentleman's remarks. This does not change at all the Safe Drinking Water Act that the EPA regulates. All it says is there is a timeline for that primacy application. It can always be denied within that timeline.

By the way, the entire point of this is to reduce carbon emissions. It should be bipartisan.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment with Congressman CRENSHAW.

The only thing dangerous about this is not implementing this, not moving at the speed of relevancy. That is what we are trying to accomplish here. I agree with my colleague from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW) that this should be bipartisan.

We should be allowing the States to do what they do to reduce those emissions. This amendment is critical to ensure the States can deploy carbon capture utilization and storage technologies.

As was mentioned, the Safe Drinking Water Act allows States to apply for primacy enforcement responsibility of underground injection control wells, including class 6 wells that are used for injection of CO_2 into the deep subsurface formations for long-term storage.

Only two States, North Dakota and Wyoming, currently have received a delegation of primary enforcement responsibility over class 6 wells. States' historic experience with handling these permits and the familiarity with their own geology translates to faster review times. It does not negatively impact drinking water. The freedom to craft those programs in a manner that makes sense the most should be relied upon at that local level.

Unfortunately, those applications for primacy are often held up with the EPA without any clarity. As you heard, those 270 days are completely unfortunate to moving at that speed of relevancy.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, to pass this, to let the States do what they can do to help not only drinking water, but emissions control.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, opposing this amendment would mean that you want more carbon emissions in the air, that you don't want carbon sequestration. I am pretty sure that is not what you all want. We all want the same thing here.

This is a commonsense amendment that simply expedites the permitting process, which is well established. Everyone knows it is safe. It doesn't change any regulations. It doesn't circumvent any EPA regulations or standards for drinking water at all.

This is a commonsense amendment. If we can't agree on things like this, it just tells me that we are looking for disagreement for the sake of disagreement. That makes me sad. It really does.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ESTES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

SEC. 10017. USE OF INDEX-BASED PRICING IN ACQUISITION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS FOR THE SPR.

Section 160(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6240(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) as clauses (i) through (vi), respectively (and adjusting the margins accordingly);

(2) by striking ''The Secretary shall'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall''; and

(3) by striking ''Such procedures shall take into account the need to—'' and inserting the following:

''(2) INCLUSIONS.—Procedures developed under this subsection shall—

''(A) require acquisition of petroleum products using index-based pricing; and

''(B) take into account the need to—''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chair, my amendment would protect our country and American families in the event of a national emergency by requiring the Department of Energy to refill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at a competitive market rate.

We all remember that President Biden chose to tap the SPR for political reasons as he tried to mask his failed energy policies that caused gas prices to soar. When President Biden took office, the average weekly price for a gallon of gas was $2.38. It was already $3.53 prior to Putin invading Ukraine before hitting record highs last summer. Despite depleting our SPR, we still have a weekly average of $3.42.

Since draining the SPR to address an energy and inflation crisis of his own making, President Biden and his administration continue to abdicate their responsibility to replenish the reserve.

In October 2022, the White House announced it would implement a first-of-

its-kind rule establishing a system of fixed-price contracts for replenishing the SPR. Per the administration's policy, they intend to purchase crude oil for the SPR when prices are at or below about $67 or $72 per barrel.

The untested fixed-price bid system imposed by the White House has allowed the administration to ignore its responsibility to resupply the SPR to the detriment of the United States' economic and national security.

In January of this year, the DOE rejected bids from several producers to refill the SPR because the market rate for crude oil at the time was well above the administration's arbitrary fixed price. This deceptive policy gives the DOE a convenient excuse not to refill the SPR and keep it at record lows, leaving our Nation less safe and prepared.

My amendment would remedy this problem by requiring the DOE to use the commonly accepted index-based pricing bid process.

Historically, the index-based bid process is used to solicit contracts to refill the SPR and is a standard pricing regime used in the global oil and gas market. Using this more accepted metric, DOE would competitively bid at the market rate for crude oil when buying for the SPR.

This bidding system will ensure that DOE will meet its obligations to refill the SPR and not circumvent that obligation with an arbitrary price ceiling.

Further, the Federal Government should not be a speculator in the crude oil market. The fixed-price scheme dreamed up by the White House ignores the basic economic realities of how petroleum products are traded in the marketplace. If the administration is concerned about the price of oil not being a good deal for taxpayers, it should end its war on safe and reliable American energy.

My amendment would ensure the SPR refill bid process reflects market realities rather than the price mandates of the administration, and restores our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is desperately needed for our national security.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, frankly, I have no idea why this amendment is being offered. It would force the Department of Energy to ride the roller coaster that is the oil future's market, without any option to just pay a simple fixed price for a barrel of oil.

If oil goes up $20 per barrel between when DOE purchases oil for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and when it is delivered, well, that is too bad. We are now paying $20 per barrel more, and we will have to buy less oil.

This amendment unnecessarily restrains DOE and makes purchasing petroleum products to refill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more expensive. DOE recognized as much when it issued a rulemaking last fall clarifying that it could purchase oil at a fixed price, as common sense would dictate.

There is no reason that it should be illegal for the Department of Energy to sign a contract saying that it will purchase oil for $70 per barrel. No reason that I can think of. Except, of course, if you are an oil company that wants the Department of Energy to pay more to refill the reserve.

□ 1615

However, if you are an average American, then this amendment is a raw deal. It constrains the Department of Energy's usage of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is partially responsible for the tremendous over $1.50 per gallon fall in the cost of gasoline we have seen since last summer's peak gas prices.

I will note that when the Department of Energy issued its notice of proposed rulemaking this last summer, industry did not object. In fact, the Department of Energy only received one comment on the rulemaking from Employ America, which was unambiguously positive.

That comment stated that the rule change ''is an important step to reduce the volatility of oil prices over the short and medium term, improve our Nation's energy security, and a necessary step to ensure that acquisition procedures more fully align with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve's governing statute.''

This amendment will put the usage of index pricing on par with the Department of Energy's duty to acquire petroleum products for the reserve as cheaply as possible. I don't understand that mission. It will only serve to diminish the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The amendment is necessary because it addresses the Biden administration's mismanagement of our Nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

President Biden has drained the SPR to the lowest levels since 1983. More than 40 percent has been liquidated in less than 2 years.

The Department of Energy has no meaningful plan to refill our strategic stockpile. Instead, the Department created new rules to allow it to use fixed-price bidding.

As we expected, the Biden administration's price-fixing scheme is failing. When DOE put out its bid, there were no takers.

The SPR is at its lowest level since 1983. We must replenish it as soon as possible to protect our economy from a true supply interruption.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chairman, this commonsense amendment restores the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to protect our Nation's security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment, as well as the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HERN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ESTES). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. SENSE OF CONGRESS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED TAX HIKES ON THE OIL AND NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY IN THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that President Biden's fiscal year 2024 budget request proposes to repeal tax provisions that are vital to the oil and natural gas industry of the United States, resulting in a $31,000,000,000 tax hike on oil and natural gas producers in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress disapproves of the proposed tax hike on the oil and natural gas industry in the President's fiscal year 2024 budget request.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, President Biden and congressional Democrats continue their attacks on traditional energy with proposed tax hikes that will kill jobs, raise fuel prices, and leave America more dependent on foreign oil.

This administration's proposed oil and natural gas tax hikes are harmful to our economy. The oil and natural gas industry accounts for 10.3 million jobs and is nearly 8 percent of our Nation's GDP.

This amendment shows it is the sense of Congress that we disapprove of this administration's proposed harmful tax hikes on the oil and gas industry.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be simultaneously concerned about high prices at the

pump while aggressively pursuing an agenda designed to entirely phase out oil and gas from domestic energy production. The audio simply doesn't match the video.

Uncertainty surrounding energy policy decisions in D.C. is causing oil and natural gas producers to make decisions based on unfavorable policies that haven't passed yet.

Repealing the immediate deduction of intangible drilling cost would cost 265,000 jobs. For every job lost in the oil and gas sector by repealing IDCs, two-and-one-half times as many indirect jobs are lost.

The percentage depletion deduction is the small business deduction for the smaller producers of oil and gas. Eliminating percentage depletion would force many family-owned small businesses to lay off employees or, worse, shut down operations altogether.

I am proud to support H.R. 1 to restore American energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of our colleagues to disapprove of President Biden's tax hikes on the oil and gas industry by supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I could not disagree more with this amendment. It claims that President Biden's budget would repeal tax breaks that are ''vital to the oil and natural gas industry of the United States.''

This is the same Big Oil that last year saw just six companies make a shocking $200 billion in profit and then spend billions to enrich their shareholders with stock buybacks and dividends, all while gouging American drivers at the pump.

So, I hope the gentleman will forgive me if I don't think that Big Oil needs a tax break.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman offered this amendment because I think it is very illustrative of how Democrats and Republicans are in different places. Democrats and President Biden are fighting every day to keep Americans' Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid safe. Republicans, however, apparently only value the tax breaks that their Big Oil friends love.

Just yesterday, Speaker MCCARTHY sent President Biden a letter on the national debt, but I guess cutting tax breaks for fossil fuels is a real red line for Republicans. They would rather us default than impact their special interests.

It is fitting that this amendment is being added to the polluters over people act.

For all of my colleagues today, it is very simple. If you are on the side of the polluters, then support this amendment. If you are on the side of the people, then you must oppose it.

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

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment expresses disapproval of the proposed tax hikes on the oil and gas industry in President Biden's 2024 budget. It is estimated that the President's budget request would result in a $31 billion tax hike on the industry.

This is another move by this administration to harm the domestic oil and gas industry and undercut their global competitiveness despite asking them to produce more.

The independent oil and gas producers develop 91 percent of the wells in the United States, producing 83 percent of America's oil and 90 percent of its natural gas.

I think it is important to note that integrated companies don't get 100 percent of the tax break, only non-integrated companies. The small oil and gas producers that exist in western North Dakota, eastern Montana, Kansas, and Oklahoma that produce the majority of America's oil are the producers that the Biden administration wants to raise taxes on.

The Biden budget proposal also calls out these producers for failing to invest in production. Meanwhile, this administration is doing everything to tax and regulate the industry out of existence.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

SEC. 10017. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EXPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after section 163 (42 U.S.C. 6243) the following:

''SEC. 164. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EXPORTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prohibit the export or sale of petroleum products drawn down from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, under any provision of law, to—

''(1) the People's Republic of China;

''(2) the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

''(3) the Russian Federation;

''(4) the Islamic Republic of Iran;

''(5) any other country the government of which is subject to sanctions imposed by the United States; and

''(6) any entity owned, controlled, or influenced by—

''(A) a country referred to in any of paragraphs (1) through (5); or

''(B) the Chinese Communist Party.

''(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may issue a waiver of the prohibition described in subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies that any export or sale authorized pursuant to the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

''(c) RULE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Lower Energy Costs Act, the Secretary shall issue a rule to carry out this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DRAWDOWN AND SALE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.—Section 161(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(a)) is amended by inserting ''and section 164'' before the period at the end.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 163 the following:

''Sec. 164. Prohibition on certain exports.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, while there is a great deal of divisive and partisan debate on the energy bill that is being considered this week, I rise to offer a bipartisan, commonsense, and straightforward amendment to protect U.S. national security in times of energy crisis.

The amendment closes a dangerous loophole that has existed since 2015 which allows our foreign adversaries to purchase our strategic oil supply.

As the law is currently written, oil from the Strategic Oil Reserve is sold by the Department of Energy to the highest bidder with few exceptions on what countries can purchase from the U.S. supply. That means that our fiercest adversaries, like China, Russia, Iran, or North Korea and other sanctioned governments, can purchase and export our strategic oil. In fact, companies owned by and affiliated with the Chinese Communist Party have won purchase contracts during the past two Presidential administrations.

Simply put, this loophole threatens our national security, and it poses serious harm to American families. The American people need Congress to act and to act quickly.

That is why I reached across the aisle to introduce the Banning Oil Exports to Foreign Adversaries Act with my colleague, Representative DON BACON. My amendment includes the straightforward and commonsense solution put forward by our bill. It prohibits the export or sale of the Strategic Petroleum

Reserve to China, North Korea, Russia, Iran, and any country currently under U.S. sanctions.

In January, my colleagues and I voted to pass a bill through the House of Representatives that would prohibit the sale of our strategic reserve to China, but that legislation does not go far enough.

Do we want North Korea buying American oil? How about Iran or Russia?

As a veteran and one of the most bipartisan Members of this body, my position remains clear. We must make sure that we put national security over party politics. We must ensure that our foreign adversaries are not allowed to profit at the expense of American safety and security.

My amendment reflects the fact that Congress has more work to do on this to close this dangerous loophole, not just for China but for any foreign adversary that poses a threat to our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats alike, to support this amendment and to include the bipartisan Banning Oil Exports to Foreign Adversaries Act in this legislation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. DOMESTIC ENERGY INDEPENDENCE REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to Congress a report that identifies and assesses regulations promulgated by the Administrator during the 15-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act that have—

(1) reduced the energy independence of the United States;

(2) increased the regulatory burden for energy producers in the United States;

(3) decreased the energy output by such energy producers;

(4) reduced the energy security of the United States; or

(5) increased energy costs for consumers in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have proposed to the Lower Energy Costs Act will help Congress identify harmful regulations that have shut down American energy and increased costs on all Americans. This amendment instructs the EPA to identify and access existing regulations that have negatively impacted the United States' energy independence and energy security.

This amendment will provide transparency about the actions taken by the Biden administration to increase regulatory burdens for energy producers, diminish energy output for the United States, and raise the cost of energy for all Americans.

I grew up working in the west Texas oil fields, so I know firsthand that the best thing we can do for energy producers in our country is to get the Federal Government out of the way and reduce the number of burdensome regulations.

Unfortunately, from day one, President Biden has waged war on American energy and done everything in his power to undo all the incredible work of the Trump administration to make our country energy independent.

Since January 2021, the EPA has recklessly issued new rules and regulations with no regard for their adverse effects on Americans and our energy security.

They have continued to diminish America's energy independence and take aim at America's interests and citizens without meaningful consultation with industry leaders or a logical plan to move forward.

□ 1630

It is time we identify the EPA regulations that have played a direct role in shutting down our energy production and added additional expenses to the already burdensome day-to-day cost of living for Americans.

As many of my Republican colleagues have mentioned, H.R. 1 is just the beginning of our work on critical energy solutions that will lift the red tape and expand the production of affordable and reliable energy rather than hamstring our domestic producers.

The underlying bill is a strong piece of legislation that will reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign energy sources and get us back on track to putting America first.

My amendment strengthens an already good bill and will allow Congress to pinpoint EPA regulations that negatively impact American families, small businesses, the agriculture industry, and our national security.

We must show Americans that we will not stand by while the EPA puts the needs of the environmental special interest groups ahead of the needs of the American people.

While some may wrongfully speak out against H.R. 1, this is an incredibly strong bill, and it is only the beginning of what the House majority is going to accomplish to unleash American energy.

My amendment is a commonsense addition to the bill, and it instructs the EPA to conduct an after-action review to make sure we are doing what is in the best interests of our country.

I urge every Member in this body to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, the gentleman appears to be fixated on undermining key EPA safeguards put in place over the last 15 years under the guise of being too costly, while the history of environmental protection, especially under the Clean Air Act, shows this is simply untrue.

The United States can have both a clean environment and a strong economy. It is a false choice to assume otherwise. Republicans who claim that ambitious climate action and economic prosperity are at odds are simply ignoring the facts. This is the same argument that industry has used every time the Clean Air Act has been strengthened, and it has been debunked each and every time.

When Congress debated the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the oil industry said, ''The technology to meet these standards simply does not exist today,'' and predicted major supply disruptions, while chemical companies said the law would cause severe economic and social disruption.

None of these gloom-and-doom predictions has ever come true. Instead, our air got cleaner, and our economy flourished.

The history of the Clean Air Act shows that the United States can reduce carbon pollution while creating jobs and strengthening our economy. Since its adoption in 1970, the Clean Air Act has reduced key air pollutants by roughly 78 percent, while the economy has almost quadrupled in size.

By EPA's own estimates, the benefits derived from the Clean Air Act exceed costs by a factor of more than 30–1. Let that sink in for a minute. Republicans like to claim that protecting Americans from pollution and tackling the climate crisis will sink the United States economy, but time and time again, we have seen that economic prosperity and environmental protection do go hand in hand.

The Clean Air Act has also made the United States the world leader in pollution control technology, generating hundreds of billions of dollars for U.S. companies and creating millions of jobs.

The standards targeted by this amendment are also widely popular: Clean car standards that help Americans drive cleaner and more fuel-efficient vehicles; mercury and air toxics standards that clean up deadly mercury and other hazardous air pollutants from power plants; and methane

standards for the oil and gas sector that are supported by industry.

The polluters over people act is the latest in a long line of sad attempts to undermine critical environmental and public health protections. These tired arguments continue to ring false and hollow. This amendment is more of the same.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose it and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer support for Representative JACKSON's amendment.

In Texas, across America, and deep in the waters off of our coastline rests an abundance of untapped energy. Through American ingenuity and technical innovations, we now have the ability to explore these natural resources and return the United States to its status as a net exporter of oil and natural gas.

Frankly, Mr. Chair, there are so many excessive regulations, we may need to limit the number of pages in this report we are asking for. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment requires the EPA Administrator and the Secretary of Energy to issue a report on harmful regulations that degrade our energy independence and raise costs for consumers. It requires the Biden administration take a hard look at how their own policies are hurting American consumers with high prices and less energy reliability.

The Biden administration has imposed harmful energy policies on American consumers since day one, such as canceling the Keystone XL pipeline and imposing a moratorium on oil and gas extraction on Federal lands.

We need to expand our American energy and our production, and I support this amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the support of my colleagues on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. MACE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 9, insert the following:

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(A) the results of the ongoing assessments conducted under paragraph (1)(A);

(B) a description of any actions taken pursuant to the Department of Energy Organization Act to mitigate potential effects of critical energy resource supply chain disruptions on energy technologies or the operation of energy systems; and

(C) any recommendations relating to strengthening critical energy resource supply chains that are essential to the energy security of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, first off, I thank the leadership of our party and our Conference here today for H.R. 1 and for including some baseline text protecting the coastline of South Carolina.

South Carolina's beaches are paved with gold. We have clean air, clean water, a beautiful environment, beautiful trees, a beautiful landscape, beautiful beaches, and we were able to get baseline text in H.R. 1 this week that would protect our shoreline from offshore drilling.

There is no oil out there. We don't need to study it; we don't need to drill; we don't need to look for it. It does not exist, and the coast of South Carolina does not want it. I thank folks for including that in this legislation and protecting our coastline. My State of South Carolina is deeply appreciative of that in the baseline text.

This amendment really looks at the necessity to have an all-of-the-above strategy and approach to energy. Our policy should reflect our need to study and find uses for alternative energy sources, and that is what this amendment will do today.

This amendment requires the Secretary of Energy to report annually on ongoing assessments of alternative and renewable energy sources. It is needed to protect American energy security. As the world becomes more unstable, we need to rely on clean American energy right here at home and what other sources, alternative sources, of energy are available to us right here in the United States.

We need to ensure that we take steps to preserve the environment, as well as why we need an offshore drilling ban but also looking at alternative sources of energy.

Our overall goal here is to strengthen our supply chains and to advance American energy security with this amendment.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I choose not to speak in opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This section of H.R. 1 provides that the Department of Energy import new functions to identify the criteria of the energy resources, the minerals, and materials needed for our great American energy systems. It requires DOE to identify supply chain vulnerabilities, the vulnerabilities to supply disruptions by our adversaries like Russia and China, and it requires DOE to act to address risks to facilitate action across agencies, industry states, and to do something about them.

The amendment here by Representative MACE requires that DOE keep Congress informed in a timely manner of the risks to supply chains and the actions taken or that Congress may want to take to those risks. This is an important amendment to assist Congress and to keep the public informed of the energy security risks we face.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 10017. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on how banning natural gas appliances will affect the rates and charges for electricity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply requires a study to look at the impact that a ban on natural gas appliances would have on electricity prices.

In my home State of New York, Governor Kathy Hochul has proposed to implement a ban on gas-powered appliances, including gas stoves, beginning in 2025, less than just 2 years from now.

The notion that the State is going to tell New Yorkers that they can't use the most affordable option to heat their homes or cook their dinner is beyond belief. This proposal will undoubtedly increase the demand and cost for electricity, which is already incredibly expensive for my constituents in upstate New York, all spending hundreds, even thousands of dollars more for their electricity.

My amendment will shed light on the costs of Governor Hochul's proposal and what that cost will have on New Yorkers, and by extension, all Americans.

This is not a partisan issue. My Democratic colleagues should join me in seeking transparency and identifying the effects that this proposal and others like it will have on the cost of electricity.

H.R. 1, the bill in chief, delivers on our commitment to lower energy costs for the American people, and I wholeheartedly support it.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, let me reiterate what has been said before. Neither the Biden administration nor the Department of Energy is trying to ban gas stoves. No one is coming into your home to remove that stove. I implore my colleagues across the aisle to stop lying to the American people about this. Apparently, Republicans think that standards to make something better, to make it more efficient, is a ban.

Regardless, this amendment makes no sense. This amendment calls for a study on how banning natural gas appliances will affect rates and charges for electricity. As I said, no one is actually talking about a ban, but the funny thing is we already know that electrification does result in lowering energy bills.

Electric appliances like heat pumps save households money because they are more efficient than gas appliances. Especially as we see fuel prices rise, electrification becomes even more critical, more important.

Republicans see the tide turning against their friends in the oil and gas industry, so how do they respond?

With a big energy package and a bunch of amendments that attempt to lock Americans into a dirty, expensive fossil fuel choice.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With due respect to all my colleagues, there is a State that is proposing to ban gas appliances. In fact, New York is not only planning to ban simply through new construction, but will require that transition within 2 years, even retrofitting or making changes to construction of existing homes.

In the case of New York, we know already we shoulder the highest burden, highest cost of not only taxation and electricity costs, but this will just add insult to injury. I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

□ 1645

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. The Biden administration will stop at nothing in its war on American energy.

Democrats' next target is Americans' home appliances, including stoves, your furnace, and your hot water heater.

In the last 2 years, we have seen far-reaching regulatory proposals and executive orders to restrict the use of natural gas.

As we speak, DOE is proposing to ban more than half of the gas stoves currently on the market. Some States, like California and New York, are going even further to ban natural gas pipelines and the sale of gas-powered appliances and equipment.

The American people are paying for these gas bans in the form of higher prices and surging utility bills. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment so that the GAO can study the true cost of gas bans.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 10017. GAS KITCHEN RANGES AND OVENS.

The Secretary of Energy may not finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule titled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Conventional Cooking Products; Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking and announcement of public meeting'' (88 Fed. Reg. 6818; published February 1, 2023) with respect to energy conservation standards for gas kitchen ranges and ovens, or any substantially similar rule, including any rule that would directly or indirectly limit consumer access to gas kitchen ranges and ovens.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, Federal bureaucrats at the Department of Energy are threatening access to gas stoves for millions of Americans through the rulemaking process.

In fact, the DOE admits that up to 50 percent of all gas stoves currently on the market or in use in American households will not meet the proposed standards.

This amendment would stop the DOE from imposing this regulation. According to the DOE's own analysis, in 2020, 38 percent of Americans used natural gas to cook in their homes.

The Energy Information Administration says cooking with gas is three times cheaper than cooking with electricity.

The American people see this for what it is; a direct attack on all natural gas use in the country and another example of the Biden administration's desire to control every decision we make. Moreover, this rule is essentially a tax on consumers who are already being squeezed by inflation.

My Democratic colleagues would argue that these rules were crafted for the purpose of saving consumers money.

The DOE estimates the regulation would reduce energy use by 3.4 percent, resulting in a savings of only $21.89 over a gas range's life span. That is $1.45 per year over an average life span of 15 years for a gas range.

These miniscule savings indicate this regulation is really not about the consumers' pocketbooks; it is about Federal control at the behest of radical green energy groups who want the complete elimination of the use of natural gas.

I will point out were this to happen, there would be far less food to cook because natural gas is essential to fertilizer for food crops. Its elimination would cut food production in half worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I will start by saying I have good news for my colleagues across the aisle.

The Department of Energy isn't banning gas stoves. It doesn't even have the authority to ban gas stoves. This amendment, like this whole bill, is political messaging.

What DOE is doing is proposing a standard to make new residential gas stoves more efficient and cut gas waste, not to ban them.

The proposed standard is so reasonable that half of the current models already meet it, including all entry-level models.

They already meet the standard, and for those that don't meet the standard, manufacturers have until 2027 to upgrade their product line, so this really isn't anything outrageous.

Also, DOE is required by law to review and update standards for appliances like refrigerators and air conditioning units.

DOE is actually late with this stove standard. It was supposed to be completed in 2017, but we are glad they are working on it now.

Models that meet the proposed standard consume 30 percent less energy than the least efficient models on the market. That is, indeed, significant.

The full proposed rule, which also includes updated standards for electric and gas residential stoves and ovens, would result in up to $1.7 billion worth in savings for United States consumers and avert about 22 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions over 30 years of sales.

I stand in deep opposition to this amendment. This amendment would bar DOE from finalizing any future efficiency standards for gas stoves, locking consumers into less efficient appliances that are certainly more costly to use.

This is just political fearmongering. It is a waste of our time, and I do urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the fact that my Democratic colleague admitted that half the stoves do not meet the standard.

When he says that half already meet it, you know, by my math, the other half doesn't.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment shows the clear difference in the vision between House Republicans and the Biden administration and my Democratic colleagues' views on these things.

Their claim that this regulation will save American households money is another painful example of how bad they are on math.

House Republicans believe in American energy abundance, and the administration believes in energy restrictions.

We believe in consumer choice, and the administration believes in heavy-handed government mandates.

We believe that consumers back home should make their own decisions, while the administration believes Federal bureaucrats should decide what Americans can and can't do on a daily basis, including what they can use to cook their families' meals.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The amendment would stop the Department of Energy from implementing punitive regulations to ban natural gas stoves.

Earlier this year, we learned that the Biden administration was considering a nationwide ban on gas stoves when Consumer Product Safety Commissioner Trumka said gas stoves were a hidden hazard, and all options are on the table to restrict their use.

Weeks later, the DOE issued a proposed efficiency rule that would ban up to 96 percent of existing stoves on the market.

DOE's punitive regulations to ban gas stoves is a massive expansion of their statutory authority. DOE should be focused on expanding energy options rather than banning them.

DOE's regulatory assault will force the American people to change out their reliable gas stoves for more expensive and less reliable electric appliances.

This amendment would stop DOE from banning those gas stoves, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk that has been approved by the Rules Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 24, insert the following:

(c) REGULATION OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING WITHIN THE SUSQUEHANNA, DELAWARE, AND POTOMAC RIVER BASINS.—Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REGULATION OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 91–575 (84 Stat. 1509), the Delaware River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 87–328 (75 Stat. 688), or the Potomac River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 91–407 (84 Stat. 856), the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, as applicable, may not finalize, implement, or enforce any regulation relating to hydraulic fracturing that is issued pursuant to any authority other than that of the State in which the regulation is to be implemented or enforced.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the unelected and unaccountable Delaware River Basin Commission, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River from improving hydraulic fracturing regulations more stringent, more stringent than those passed by the duly-elected State representatives and Senate in which the regulation is to be implemented or enforced.

According to the Energy Information Administration, last year, residential natural gas prices were the highest on record. That is awesome. I am sure consumers love that.

The best way to combat these record-high prices is with more competition; simply, more supply and demand. It is to produce more natural gas in America in places like my home State of Pennsylvania, the second-largest natural gas producer in the Nation.

Unfortunately, again, unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the Delaware River Basin Commission have instituted a hydraulic fracturing ban for a portion of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, stripping away property rights and mineral rights from Pennsylvanians in contravention of the will of their very own legislature.

The result is a prohibition on the development of critical shale plays in eastern Pennsylvania that can bring desperately needed natural gas to market and the unconstitutional taking of mineral rights of all Pennsylvanians.

Using this playbook, radical environmentalists and unelected bureaucrats will next prevent hydraulic fracturing in the Susquehanna River Basin and the Potomac River Basin, as well.

The threat of this expansion undermines investor confidence and exploration and development projects throughout the Commonwealth and further restricts domestic natural gas production.

To be clear, this amendment simply clarifies that these three commissions cannot impose restrictions more stringent than those passed by the State in which the regulation is being implemented or enforced.

It makes no changes to the ability of States to regulate hydraulic fracturing as they see fit, as their legislatures see fit, as their citizens see fit. This means

it would have zero impact on existing fracturing bans in the State of New York.

Instead, this amendment simply makes clear that Pennsylvanians can use their property and mineral rights as they see fit, subject to the Pennsylvania laws passed by their elected representatives, the way it is supposed to be done.

Enough is enough already. It is time to stop this underhanded attack on property rights, representative government, and State sovereignty and restore American energy security.

Opposition to this amendment is support for a hydraulic fracturing ban and for higher natural gas prices for your constituents and your citizens.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and rein in these unelected bureaucrats waging war on Americans in their very homes and support this amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FITZGERALD). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the Delaware River Basin Commission is made up of representatives from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and my home State of New Jersey.

The commission oversees drinking water quality for the Delaware River Watershed, a vitally important role that impacts millions of people across four States.

Congress created the commission over 60 years ago and gave it powers to regulate the Delaware River Watershed.

Crucially, each State's democratically elected leaders signed up to join the commission, and each State receives a vote on the commission.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, the commission banned fracking in its watershed, and this wasn't a controversial decision.

In fact, it was unanimous. It was a 4–0 vote to help protect the public health of the 13 million citizens in the watershed and to preserve the waters themselves.

Today, Republicans want to retroactively take away the rights of the citizens of these four States and their elected representatives. They want to take away the powers that Congress gave the commission just because they don't like the outcome.

I would suggest this: If you really care about clean rivers and waters, I urge you to oppose this amendment. If you care about people's rights to safe drinking water, I urge you to oppose this amendment.

I would like to think that all my colleagues care about these things, so I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Mr. PERRY's amendment makes very clear that the States have primacy for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing for oil and natural gas production on State and private lands.

We cannot allow unelected bureaucrats or independent commissions to prohibit oil and gas production activities that are safe and permitted under State law.

The Biden administration and radical environmentalists are waging a war on American energy, and they want to ban hydraulic fracturing.

The United States has become the world's number one energy producer thanks in part to technological innovations like hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling.

According to a recent study placing a moratorium on fracking would mean a $900 billion increase in U.S. household energy costs, $7.1 trillion in potential losses to the U.S. economy through 2030, and over 7 million fewer U.S. jobs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment and standing up for American energy and American energy workers.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, if you don't want to vote for this, I get it. You can tell your constituents at home that you stand for people that are unelected. Most folks at home have never even heard of the Delaware River Basin Commission. They don't even know about interstate compacts.

Here is what they know: They want to live their lives, and they want to vote for elected officials to make decisions that are important to them. If it is so dangerous, how come it is banned here but not there? In the rest of Pennsylvania, we do it.

Mr. Chairman, this is just taking the people's rights away, their voices away from their elected officials, and it is literally the definition of tyranny.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Governors are the four commissioners. The Governor of Pennsylvania is the chairman of the commission. They may delegate to someone to actually go to the meetings, but they are making these decisions.

I don't understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that we should take away the rights of the Governors who are on these commissions to make the decision that was a 4–0 decision. If they decide that they want something different in the Delaware watershed than in their individual States, that is their prerogative, but they made this decision. They voted 4–0.

Again, I don't see the point, and I think it is really egregious for us to take away the powers of the Governors, as they are elected by the people of the four States to make this decision about fracking within their watershed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that has been approved by the Rules Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. ENERGY SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking ''sections 126 and 115 (relating to interstate and international pollution abatement)'' and inserting ''section 126 (relating to interstate pollution abatement)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment repeals section 115 of the Clean Air Act. This vital amendment protects the autonomy of the States over their own energy sectors by ensuring that unelected, unaccountable EPA bureaucrats cannot seize control over these vital industries under the guise of emissions reductions.

The Constitution clearly reserves this power to the States, and it is long overdue that we bring Federal policies back in line with the very Constitution that we swore an oath to.

Section 115 gives EPA the authority to impose emission reductions on the States if the administrator finds, based on the word of some international organization—just based on their good word—that American air pollution endangers the public health and welfare of another country. Imagine if we could do that to China? The administrator determines that that country will lower their emissions a commensurate amount.

Put a different way, section 115 allows the EPA to rely on the credibility of the same international elites who misled us about COVID to force our

constituents to change every aspect of their lives because some European nation thought it would be great to do the same thing. Now, we would have to do the same thing.

This is no longer a hypothetical.

Since President Biden reentered the Paris climate agreement, it can be argued that these conditions have been met and EPA can immediately impose devastating requirements as it was argued when the Obama administration first entered the agreement. Subjecting such an important sector of our economy to the whims of foreign bureaucrats is downright reckless and hands U.S. sovereignty over to a foreign ideologue—not even foreign governments, just foreign bureaucrats.

Removing the broadly written language in section 115 is the only way to prevent the delegation of nearly unlimited power over State energy sectors to the EPA bureaucrats and removes the ability of international organizations to meddle in our energy sector.

It is vital that we prevent this Federal power grab before it imposes devastating economic consequences by empowering the States to meet the needs and interests of their own citizens.

Language to prevent the use of section 115 of the Clean Air Act has passed the House three times under Republican majorities: Twice in the 115th Congress and once in the 114th.

To those who view this amendment as premature because the administration has not yet acted under section 115, the impact was never questioned in the past. How many times do we have to wake up and say, well, I didn't think they would do it? I didn't think they would actually defund the police. I didn't think they would have the IRS show up at the guy's house when he was testifying in Congress.

Heaven forbid, I didn't believe they would actually try and ban my gas stove. I thought they were just kidding around. They didn't really mean it. They do mean it.

We know the administration is going to do so because the radical environmental groups that control their agenda have come out and said it.

Here are a couple examples. The League of Conservation Voters: ''While there has been limited use of section 115, numerous scholars have advocated for its use as a pathway to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly since the Paris Agreement.''

How about Foreign Policy for America: This amendment would undermine EPA's authority for ''its potential future applications to greenhouse gases.'' Yeah, we want to undermine their authority and make the authority of the States preeminent. The authority of citizens should be preeminent.

Preemptively removing this authority from the administration before they can act is vital to U.S. sovereignty and our economic well-being.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the Perry amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, a common refrain that I hear from Republicans is that unilateral action by the United States to reduce greenhouse gases would harm our economy and wouldn't move the needle on reducing global emissions. The core of this argument is that if we are going to address climate change, we need to coordinate an international response.

Of course, this argument completely falls apart when you take a look at the actions of the House Republicans. Many cheered as the previous administration removed the United States from the Paris Agreement. Exiting the largest international agreement to combat global climate change not only weakened our diplomatic standing abroad, but it made it abundantly clear that Republicans don't care about addressing climate change.

Now, thankfully, President Biden rejoined the Paris Agreement, putting that embarrassing chapter behind us, but it appears that House Republicans want to go back to burying their heads in the sand when it comes to combating climate change, as was made clear by this amendment.

This amendment would repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act, which provides EPA with a tool to address air pollution while promoting international cooperation to combat climate change.

As my Republican colleagues should know by now, air pollution does not respect boundaries, whether these are State or international. Section 115 provides the EPA administrator the authority to set limits on an air pollutant that is harming public health and welfare in another country as long as the other country grants reciprocal rights to the United States.

The gentleman's amendment would remove this discretionary authority, gutting our ability to cooperate with our neighbors. We have agreements with Canada and with Mexico, and we show leadership with the international community by working with our neighbors to try to deal with air pollution.

Climate change is a global problem. We need to work with other nations like we worked with Canada and Mexico and provide the leadership to encourage international engagements to tackle this crisis.

I have to say: I don't believe the Republican majority wants to act on climate crisis internationally or domestically. Case in point, the polluters over people act we are dealing with today. It attempts to repeal popular provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act: The greenhouse gas reduction fund, the methane emissions reduction program, and $4.5 billion in home electrification rebates.

Now, House Democrats took historic action to combat the climate crisis by passing the Inflation Reduction Act, which included unparalleled investments in climate and clean energy.

Not a single House Republican voted for it, but if we can't act domestically and we can't act in coordination with our neighbors, even Canada and Mexico, what are we going to do to address the threat caused by the climate crisis?

According to this amendment, the answer is apparently nothing. We are not going to do anything domestically. We are not going to do anything with our neighbors. We are not going to do anything internationally. We are going to do nothing. I just think that is unacceptable.

At a time of real crisis, as highlighted by the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Report, we should empower EPA to combat dangerous climate change and strongly encourage other nations to do the same. We shouldn't be taking any tools off the table, and that is what this amendment does. It takes the tool off the table.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), since I know he wants to speak favorably about me.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, before I start, I will point out that it sounds like we want to cooperate with our foreign neighbors when it comes to environmental control, but we don't want to import energy from them or we don't want to export energy to them. I find that a little bit ironic.

That being said, I regretfully stand in opposition to this amendment.

After Congress reviewed and preserved the Clean Air Act in 1977, it did play an important role in cross-border pollution issues of the late 1970s with Canada. Before we strike an entire section of the Clean Air Act involving air pollutants, the committee of jurisdiction should examine the issues, particularly to make sure we avoid any unintended consequences.

For example, we should make sure that striking this section does not undermine the ability to reduce international air emissions that harm the United States.

I commit to working with my friend from Pennsylvania to take this through regular order, but I am a big fan of the committee process. Let's see that it works.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, after line 3, insert the following:

(j) WITHDRAWAL OF POLICY STATEMENTS.—The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall withdraw—

(1) the updated policy statement titled ''Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Facilities'' published in the Federal Register on March 1, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 11548); and

(2) the interim policy statement titled ''Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Natural Gas Infrastructure Project Reviews'' published in the Federal Register on March 11, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 14104).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering here directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, as we refer to it, to withdraw two policy statements that massively expand the role of climate hysteria in certification of natural gas infrastructure, like pipelines and LNG export terminals.

In February 2022, FERC released two radical policy statements that massively increased the role that the emissions play in its certification of natural gas pipelines and LNG export terminals, which are so critical to our ability to affect world consumption of gas so that we can drive down CO_2 and expand our role in the world and expand American energy interests.

This included requiring FERC to consider the upstream and downstream impact on emissions that building a new natural gas pipeline would have.

Even Senator MANCHIN said: ''The Commission went too far by prioritizing a political agenda over their main mission—ensuring our Nation's energy reliability and security.''

I want everybody to hear this. This move by FERC came 1 week before Russia invaded Ukraine. This administration is perfectly fine empowering our enemies to appease the climate activists, the climate cult. We saw it with Nord Stream 2. We see it right here.

We refuse to expand American energy right when we could be sticking it to Putin. Instead, we have everybody over here clamoring about what we need to do in Ukraine instead of having gotten in front of that by exporting American energy, by making sure that we control the world's supply of energy by putting out clean-burning American natural gas.

Just 1 week after FERC made this move, Russia invaded Ukraine, massively disrupting European natural gas supplies.

When the Western world was begging for U.S. LNG, this administration was giving them the middle finger to appease the climate cult.

Meanwhile, our enemies—China, Iran, Russia, Venezuela—are massively pumping out emissions. China has 1,100 coal-fired plants. They are adding two a week. We are not adding squat to our natural gas or coal production capacity.

Texas is about to be 50 percent wind and solar because we refuse to actually produce the coal and gas necessary to have power on a cloudy, windless day.

China accounts for 30 percent of global emissions—and increasing. Russian natural gas exports to Europe release 41 percent more emissions than U.S. LNG.

Bottom line: This administration's war on U.S. energy will not do a thing to help the environment but will hurt freedom and prosperity here and abroad.

We should accept this amendment. This amendment should be agreed to across the spectrum because it is good for American oil and gas. It is good for the world. It will actually help drive down CO_2 while making our country stronger and helping us push back on Russia in the process.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I frankly don't understand the purpose of this amendment.

Last spring, FERC issued an updated policy statement, an interim guidance, detailing how the Commission should treat new applications for natural gas pipelines and account for greenhouse gas emissions. The Commission, a month later, clarified that both documents were drafts and that it would seek further input and comments on the drafts. That is it.

These documents are not final rules or orders from the Commission. They are not law. They are a draft, draft documents that the Commission has put out to solicit industry and stakeholder feedback, and that is the way we want the government to work for it to be responsive.

Withdrawing these documents from draft status, which is what I think the gentleman's amendment would do, would have no impact on any policy and, instead, I think, would just create further confusion and possibly release FERC from the duty to consider industry's comments on the draft.

It may be that the real reason that the Republicans offered this amendment is that they don't think that FERC should consider greenhouse gas emissions. They don't think that these emissions should matter when FERC makes a decision about whether or not to authorize a new natural gas pipeline.

This doesn't change the law. The law currently requires FERC to consider the greenhouse gas impacts of a certificate it grants. Multiple Federal court rulings have held that the agency must think about these issues based on the statute, and the interim policy statement was meant to create certainty for industry on how the Commission would do that.

Instead, Republicans want to send FERC and, frankly, all parts of the Federal Government back into confusion. If you want to say that FERC shouldn't consider greenhouse gases—I am not in favor of that—you should amend the statute to say that.

By simply saying that these draft rules should be withdrawn, that is going to tell industry, how do you deal with this? How are they going to know what to do if there are no rules, no policy, no input from them whatsoever?

I think it would be wrong to change the statute to say that they shouldn't take greenhouse gas impacts into consideration, but that is not what this amendment does. This amendment says to just get rid of these drafts, and then industry would have no input into any of this. I don't think industry would support that.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the previous speaker. I think this draft amendment was designed to have certainty. I think it was designed to have certainty, in that no new pipelines would get put into the ground.

By mitigating both upstream and downstream carbon, if anybody who understands the way economics of a pipeline work, not only are you delaying this process even further, which is what H.R. 1 is trying to constrict, but you will make it nearly impossible and not economically viable to get pipe in the ground.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is an energy economic regulator, not a climate regulator.

This is a good amendment. It will take draft language that had no business being introduced to begin with and remove it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I agree with my friend (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no issues with the fact that they were amending these drafts and leaving it in draft form, we just want to give the certainty of saying to remove these. They were clearly a bad idea.

That is exactly what Senator MANCHIN was saying. Let's not go down this road.

This is the problem with FERC. FERC is becoming a radical organization that is inserting itself in places where it does not belong. When the executive branch oversteps its bounds, it is incumbent upon Congress, in Article I, to do something about it.

We are simply saying to pull these. Admit that this was a foolish direction to go, and let's ensure that we are sending a strong signal that we are pro-pipeline, pro-moving American LNG and making sure that we are exporting energy to the world that is actually clean burning and will help our economy, help push back on Putin, not make us reliable on China, and make us a heck of a lot stronger.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again, FERC is not radical. There is a statute that says that FERC has to consider greenhouse gas emissions. They put out a policy statement about how they are going to do that and asked for the industry to look at it and give their input.

All this amendment does is to say to put that aside. Then how does the FERC—do they just issue another draft saying here is another way to look at it?

I just think this is very confusing. I do think FERC should take into consideration greenhouse gas emissions. They are required to by the law.

Unless the gentleman is going to change that, it makes no sense to say that they can't get industry input about how they do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is the Chair's understanding that amendment No. 14 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in Part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 20309 the following:

SEC. 20310. PERMIT PROCESS FOR PROJECTS RELATING TO EXTRACTION, RECOVERY, OR PROCESSING OF CRITICAL MATERIALS.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED PROJECT.—Section 41001(6)(A) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii)(III), by striking ''; or'' and inserting '';'';

(2) in clause (iv)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) is related to the extraction, recovery, or processing from coal, coal waste, coal processing waste, pre-or post-combustion coal byproducts, or acid mine drainage from coal mines of—

''(I) critical minerals (as such term is defined in section 7002 of the Energy Act of 2020);

''(II) rare earth elements; or

''(III) microfine carbon or carbon from coal.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report evaluating the timeliness of implementation of reforms of the permitting process required as a result of the amendments made by this section on the following:

(1) The economic and national security of the United States.

(2) Domestic production and supply of critical minerals, rare earths, and microfine carbon or carbon from coal.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which is imperative to bringing home an essential supply chain and protecting our national security, all while protecting the environment.

Rare earth elements and critical minerals are essential components in the daily lives of Americans, as well as in national security technology from home computers, televisions, and vehicles, to major weapons systems, including lasers, guided missile systems, jet engines, and alloys for armored vehicles.

Currently, China controls the bulk of the global supply of these critical minerals and rare earths that support America's economy and defense industrial base.

The demand for these minerals will steadily increase as the global economy adopts new technologies, placing the United States and its allies at a growing disadvantage unless steps are taken to shift production and sourcing away from Chinese Communist Party-controlled entities.

The risk of supply disruptions is amplified by U.S. dependence on unreliable foreign sources and red tape that disincentivizes domestic sourcing.

It is estimated that 80 percent of rare earth minerals in the United States come from China. For too long, bureaucratic red tape and uncertainty in the permitting process forced critical mineral and rare earth operations overseas.

This amendment works to jump-start American critical mineral, rare-earth element, and carbon production to make our supply chains more resilient while creating opportunities for coal and coal byproducts to be used in new, clean, and innovative ways.

According to Bureau of Land Management estimates, there are nearly 5,200 coal-related abandoned mine sites that have yet to be fully reclaimed. Through this amendment, we are creating an avenue for rare earths to be extracted from coal waste at these abandoned mine sites.

This would not only help the United States with this critical supply chain need but also address our Nation's environmental and reclamation needs.

□ 1730

Specifically, this amendment would include projects related to extraction, recovery, or processing of critical minerals, rare earth elements, or carbon from coal, coal waste, coal processing waste, or pre- or post-combustion coal byproducts, or acid mine drainage from coal mines as covered projects eligible for FAST–41 permitting for the purposes of securing the economic and national security of the United States.

Mr. Chair, whether you are like me, a member of the Congressional Coal Caucus or a member of the Sustainable Energy Caucus or a national security hawk or a member of the Select Committee on Strategic Competition between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, every Member of Congress should be for this win-win-win solution, a win to reclaim these abandoned mine sites and fix an environmental problem, a win for the coal industry and the workers in the coal industry who need alternatives to combustion of coal now that we are in the transition phase of our energy development in our country, and certainly a win for national security. This is a way for us to end overdependence on the Chinese Communist Party for critical, national security sensitive supply chain needs.

The United States must innovate and secure its supply chain of sensitive strategic materials in order to reduce reliance on Chinese Communist Party-controlled materials overseas.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on my amendment, which I expect to be fully bipartisan, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, House Democrats filed several amendments to H.R. 1 that would help mitigate some of the outright damage to our climate, our communities, and our economic future that this bill would cause.

Unfortunately, only 7 out of 95 were made in order to get an open debate and an up-or-down vote.

Some Republicans have also filed amendments that I support. But I am afraid that at the end of the day, there is ultimately no path forward for making H.R. 1 any semblance of a legislative proposal that the American people, not polluters, deserve.

The polluters over people act will actively and aggressively take us backward regarding emissions and in our

transition to clean energy. It guts our bedrock environmental laws and takes communities out of the permitting process entirely, the public's right to know. Some of the Republican amendments add to that mess.

To start, I rise today in opposition to this amendment, which would make a harmful bill even worse by arbitrarily eroding community protections under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

This amendment greatly expands the limited environmental review standards of the 2015 FAST Act to a series of coal waste extraction activities that can cause significant environmental damage and warrant strong environmental review standards.

There is already a deliberate process in place under the FAST Act to expand its limited environmental review standards to new types of projects under certain conditions. This amendment is a legislative end run around that deliberative process that inappropriately curtails public input, environmental review, and judicial review under NEPA.

At its most basic level, NEPA simply requires government agencies to assess significant environmental and public health impacts before a decision is made and potentially harmful activities like coal waste extraction begin. NEPA doesn't stop these activities. It simply assures that their impacts are considered and that the public knows.

This amendment undermines the basic purposes of NEPA. I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118–30 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. HERN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. MOLINARO of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118–30 offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—221

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moylan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—208

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer
Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Pelosi
Sewell
Wexton

□ 1801

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, LANDSMAN, and Ms. MACE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chair, I regret that I was not able to be present for rollcall No. 167 on agreeing to the amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 167.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HERN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CAREY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 118–

30 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moylan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Peltola
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—206

Adams
Aguilar
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Roy
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Santos
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1807

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7, printed in part B of House Report 118–30 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—245

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moskowitz
Moylan
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pappas
Pence
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Scholten
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Sherrill
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao

Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vasquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Costa
Courtney
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1813

Messrs. JOHNSON of Georgia, LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 9, printed in part B of House Report 118–30 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 163, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—268

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moskowitz
Moulton
Moylan
Mrvan
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Ryan
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—163

Adams
Aguilar
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Crockett
Crow
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
García (IL)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Khanna
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Stansbury
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Murphy
Radewagen
Rutherford

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1817

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I was recorded as "no," but I intended to vote "aye" on rollcall No. 170.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 10, printed in part B of House Report 118–30 offered

by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—251

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Costa
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moskowitz
Moylan
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Trone
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Courtney
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Khanna
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Loudermilk
Mast

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1822

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 11, printed in part B of House Report 118–30 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 223, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—210

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
González-Colón
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiley
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moylan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Radewagen
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer

Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Joyce (OH)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
LaLota
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawler
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Molinaro
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Santos
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1827

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12, printed in part B of House Report 118–30 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 336, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—96

Aderholt
Arrington
Babin
Banks
Bean (FL)
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Cammack
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Comer
Crane
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Ellzey
Emmer
Ezell
Fallon
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Foxx
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Golden (ME)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guest
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hudson
Hunt
Jackson (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lesko
Loudermilk
Luna
Luttrell
Massie
McClintock
McCormick
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Mills
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Norman
Ogles
Perez
Perry
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Santos
Schweikert
Self
Sessions
Stauber
Steube
Tiffany
Timmons
Van Duyne
Waltz
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Zinke

NOES—336

Adams
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Bush
Calvert
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
González-Colón
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller-Meeks
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Moylan
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Radewagen
Ramirez
Raskin
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sablan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym

NOT VOTING—8

Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen
Good (VA)
Hoyle (OR)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote on seven roll call votes, today. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 167, ''no'' on rollcall No. 168, ''no'' on rollcall No. 169, ''no'' on rollcall No. 170, ''no'' on rollcall No. 171, ''no'' on rollcall No. 172, and ''no'' on rollcall No. 173.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF THE MISSISSIPPI TORNADOES

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. The Mississippi delegation mourns those who lost their lives in the recent tornadoes that devastated our beloved State of Mississippi.

We also come together to honor the bravery and heroism of our first responders and county and city leadership, who worked tirelessly to save lives and restore order in the midst of chaos.

In Rolling Fork, Silver City, Winona, Amory, Wren, Egypt, Smithville, and all the other communities affected from the Mississippi River Delta to the north Mississippi hills, we know that the pain of loss and destruction is still fresh in your hearts.

We offer our deepest condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their loved ones. We cannot imagine the depth of your grief, but we stand with you in solidarity.

As we mourn the loss of life, we must also acknowledge the strength and resilience of our communities.

In times of disaster, we come together to support one another and rebuild. We have seen this time and time again, and we know that Mississippi will come back stronger.

In the face of such devastation, we find comfort in the words of the Bible. In Psalms 34:18, it says: ''The Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit.''

We know that in times of trial, we can turn to God for strength and comfort. May God bless Mississippi, and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, last Friday night, a lot of Mississippi was damaged by a very serious tornado. Over 20 lives were lost.

To paint a picture, these are communities that under the best of times struggle, communities where we don't have public transportation, where there is not a single motel room in the entire county, and where the downtown area no longer exists.

For the people of Rolling Fork, Silver City, Black Hawk, and a lot of other Mississippi communities that are only a ZIP Code tied to some other people, we are saddened by that destruction.

Importantly, President Biden approved record disaster approval within 2 days because destruction was clear as to the help that was needed.

The State of Mississippi and the locals involved in it, we are resilient people, but we can't do it by ourselves. Our national support system has kicked into place. Churches have stepped forward.

We look forward to the long-term recovery, and we are talking about years, not months, before those communities will be made whole again.

I thank all of you who have expressed your concern and sympathy and those of you who invested in the communities. I can assure you it is much appreciated.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Mississippi delegation, I ask for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 124, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 20221. LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 139(l) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''150 days'' each place it appears and inserting ''90 days''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 330(e) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''150 days'' and inserting ''90 days''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking ''150 days'' and inserting ''90 days''.

(2) Section 24201(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''of 150 days''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

□ 1845

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment which inserts my 90-Day Review Act into H.R. 1. My amendment will further improve H.R. 1's overall goal of ensuring reasonable timelines and predictability for projects by shortening the timeline to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval of a major infrastructure project from 150 days to 90 days.

Frivolous litigation should not be a hurdle to critical infrastructure projects that will improve the lives of Americans across the country. For far too long, we have put trial lawyers' interests ahead of the American people. Burdensome litigation causes our hardworking men and women to sit idle on job sites as they wait on court processes.

It is far past time that Congress reduces the Federal Government's stranglehold on critical infrastructure projects and helps job creators put the American people to work.

By streamlining the Federal litigation timeline, my amendment will help reduce frivolous litigation, cut red tape, and help critical infrastructure projects move forward in a more timely manner. My amendment will reduce the amount of time it takes to construct real and important infrastructure projects like highways, bridges, railways, dams, and other important projects that will improve the lives of the people in my district and all across America.

Last Congress, we saw Democrats ram through a trillion-dollar infrastructure bill where only 9 percent of it actually went to infrastructure. Rather than focusing on meaningful reforms, this bill funded a slush fund at the Department of Energy for Green New Deal projects; tens of billions of dollars to subsidize the electric vehicle industry, establish programs to cool down pavement, reduce idling done by trucks, and even study racist roads and bridges. Yes, Mr. Chair, you heard that correctly.

Instead of spending time on this unpopular, America last agenda, House Republicans have proposed real reforms like this one, and it would cut red tape and speed up construction. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment as well as the underlying bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would further restrict access to the courts to hold polluters accountable when they violate the law and unlawfully harm public health and the environment.

The underlying bill already bars additional review of a permit, license, or approval under all Federal laws unless filed within 120 days. This amendment reduces judicial review times even further to 90 days for major infrastructure projects that can greatly harm communities.

By contrast, judicial review under most of our Federal environmental and public health laws is generally 5 to 6 years.

Congress included a judicial review period of this length in most of these laws because often serious public health and environmental effects aren't known within the first 120 days and certainly not within 90 days.

Judicial review is a key enforcement mechanism for most of our major environmental and public health laws. This amendment doubles down on the underlying bill's effort to gut the enforcement of our Nation's laws and to give polluters a virtual blank check.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Boebert amendment No. 127. One of the

main goals of the Lower Energy Costs Act is to create certainty in the Federal permitting process for those looking to invest in and build projects that will power our future.

Litigation is one of the main drivers of the uncertainty and delays associated with the NEPA process that holds back critical energy and infrastructure projects. This amendment revises the time frame within which a claimant can file a lawsuit seeking review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for a major infrastructure project, such as a highway project, from 150 to 90 days.

The purpose is to allow critical infrastructure projects to proceed more efficiently without the prolonged threat of a lawsuit that could delay or halt these essential transportation projects.

This amendment still allows a potential claimant a reasonable time frame of 3 months to file a lawsuit and does not impact environmental protections.

I support this amendment and encourage my colleagues to support its inclusion in the bill.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, it is simply a public right that the public has an opportunity to seek redress in the courts. To limit that should not be part of this legislation. I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SECTION _____. ONE FEDERAL DECISION FOR PIPELINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 60144. Efficient environmental reviews and one Federal decision

''(a) EFFICIENT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall apply the project development procedures, to the greatest extent feasible, described in section 139 of title 23 to any pipeline project that requires the approval of the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(2) REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall incorporate into agency regulations and procedures pertaining to pipeline projects described in paragraph (1) aspects of such project development procedures, or portions thereof, determined appropriate by the Secretary in a manner consistent with this section, that increase the efficiency of the review of pipeline projects.

''(3) DISCRETION.—The Secretary may choose not to incorporate into agency regulations and procedures pertaining to pipeline projects described in paragraph (1) such project development procedures that could only feasibly apply to highway projects, public transportation capital projects, and multimodal projects.

''(4) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (l) of section 139 of title 23 shall apply to pipeline projects described in paragraph (1).

''(b) ADDITIONAL CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—The Secretary shall maintain and make publicly available, including on the Internet, a database that identifies project-specific information on the use of a categorical exclusion on any pipeline project carried out under this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''60144. Efficient environmental reviews and one Federal decision.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to further bipartisan efforts to streamline the environmental permitting process by applying one Federal decision to certain pipeline safety actions.

Agencies such as the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration can be required to undertake lengthy and burdensome Federal environmental reviews that can take several months, and often times, even years to complete.

As a result, essential safety and energy actions are stalled or sometimes completely stopped, which can limit our energy resources, limit our ability to be energy independent, and unnecessarily create scarcities, higher prices, and threats to the safety and health of our citizens.

This amendment represents just another step toward eliminating these problems. It sets reasonable goals for reviewing the environmental impacts of certain pipeline safety actions. Specifically, it limits the review time to 2 years, consolidates Federal reviews into one streamlined process and document, and removes unnecessary delays in making final agency decisions.

This amendment builds on bipartisan support and precedent for requiring agencies to undertake one Federal decision when reviewing the potential environmental impacts of the Federal action. Similar efforts have been signed into law, including for Federal reviews of highway projects as part of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act signed by President Biden in 2021.

It is recognized that through one Federal decision, we can sensibly streamline energy and energy safety projects, including pipelines, without compromising environmental protections.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to accelerate pipeline construction, and it does so by undermining informed decisionmaking and meaningful review which falls under the National Environmental Policy Act and other established bedrock laws.

We have an extensive record showing that NEPA is not a meaningful cause of energy project delays, period. When a delay does occur, it is usually because of the permit applicant who is causing the delay or because of the lack of funding for agency staff and resources at permitting offices.

While we cannot do anything about applicant delays, we have already addressed the other core issue, and we should be celebrating that. Democrats fought to get more than $1 billion in the Inflation Reduction Act to staff up Federal agencies' permitting offices so they would be able to efficiently and effectively process permits.

The Council on Environmental Quality has also now told us that because of what Democrats delivered, even the most extensive form of environmental review will, in most cases, take 2 years or less. By the way, that was the target timeline of industry, Trump, and Senator MANCHIN.

Democrats are making quick, but high-quality reviews a reality. Republicans simply want to mandate low-quality reviews or none at all.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for his leadership on this amendment. I also want to thank Chairman WESTERMAN who has been absolutely incredible on H.R. 1, ensuring that we bring down the cost of energy, ensuring that we bring American energy security back to the table, and ensuring that we actually begin reducing emissions because we know that this administration has actually increased emissions.

What this amendment does is it actually, somewhat comically, is modeled exactly after what my friend, the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, just objected to. It does exactly what he actually voted for in the infrastructure bill. That is all this does.

To hear somebody suggest that this is actually contrary to the environment is remarkable, and, in fact, it defies logic. There is study after study

that shows that by putting energy in a pipeline, by putting carbon dioxide for sequestration in a pipeline, it is safer. It is safer than the alternative of putting it on a truck, a barge, a rail where you have a better chance of leaking, and it has higher emissions.

To hear somebody object to this under the auspices of being concerned about the environment, I don't know if it is uninformed, if it is ignorant, or if it is just not telling the truth. I don't know. This amendment is a bipartisan amendment.

I am going to say it again: It is an amendment that Democrats in this body voted for months ago in the infrastructure bill. That is what this does. If you care about the environment, you should support this amendment.

Again, I thank my friend from Arkansas for his leadership.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, this important amendment simply builds off existing bipartisan efforts to sensibly streamline environmental reviews by applying one Federal decision to certain pipeline projects as my friend from Louisiana indicated.

At a time when our domestic energy independence is suffering and energy prices are increasing, we must look for ways to support our energy safety, infrastructure, and production.

This amendment represents one way of doing that. It does not remove or alter environmental protections, rather it merely streamlines the process and consolidates essential government agencies and decisionmaking under one Federal decision.

To reiterate what Mr. GRAVES said, it really defies explanation that my friend from the other side would oppose this, given the fact that he just voted for it in the Infrastructure Investment Act.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. KIM of California). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. DONALDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 137, after line 2, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes the following:

(1) The current status of uranium deposits in the United States with respect to the amount and quality of uranium contained in such deposits.

(2) A comparison of the United States to the rest of the world with respect to the amount and quality of uranium contained in uranium deposits.

(3) Policy considerations, including potential challenges, of utilizing the uranium from the deposits described in paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. What this amendment really does is it requires a study on America's current uranium supply, specifically looking into the status of and the quality of such domestic uranium deposits, and it seeks policy solutions relating to America's domestic uranium challenges.

My amendment also requires analysis of America's supply in comparison to other countries around the globe.

In short, Madam Chair, if you are going to embrace nuclear power in the United States, we also have to understand what our uranium needs are. We have to be able to assess them, and that is what the nature of my amendment does.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) to talk about this amendment, as well.

Mr. SELF. Madam Chair, I rise in support of Representative DONALDS' amendment.

The most logical path forward for a clean, reliable electrical supply is nuclear power.

The U.S. Navy operates 80 nuclear-powered vessels with more than 5,400 reactor-years of accident-free operation.

The face of nuclear power is changing to a generation of small modular reactors that deliver power with lower initial capital costs and more flexibility in placement.

Today, we import 95 percent of our high-assay low-enriched uranium from Russia. A startling quote in a Reuters article says that, without Moscow, the U.S. nuclear power industry could collapse in 1 to 1½ years.

Today, I speak for Mr. DONALDS' amendment, which will help lead America back to total energy abundance by finding and evaluating American sources of uranium.

If you want a Green New Deal, this is it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not necessarily opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the amendment offered by my colleague from Florida, Mr. DONALDS, requires the Secretary to submit a report to Congress that includes the status of uranium deposits in the U.S., information on the quality of these deposits compared to the rest of the world, and policy considerations regarding the use of these deposits.

Although this amendment concerns only the making of a report, I want to take a moment to highlight the history of uranium mining in this country as it relates to our indigenous communities.

One example I will use is the Navajo Nation. From the 1940s to the 1980s, nearly 30 million tons of uranium ore were extracted from the Nation's lands, exposing generations of Tribal members to the contamination that permeated these sites.

After the mining companies were done, they simply left their operations and failed to engage in any cleanup measures.

Today, there are over 500 abandoned uranium mines on the Tribal Nation's lands, and this continues to be a serious concern for the Nation's Tribal leadership as we speak.

As you can imagine, these mines have contributed to chronic health outcomes among Tribal members and have left countless homes and water sources with elevated levels of radiation.

When we consider the status of uranium mining in this country, we must also consider the inequitable history that this industry has imposed specifically upon Tribal communities.

I hope that in addition to the information my colleague would like to be included in the amendment's report, we can also work to include a survey of the industry's historical practices and expected challenges and outcomes to local and surrounding communities.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, it is important for us to understand that there are two key investments that America is going to need to make. One is increasing our domestic uranium mining capabilities, and number two is bolstering our domestic uranium conversion and enrichment capabilities.

If the concern of the United States is to find a way to increase baseload power, and also the necessary concern about emissions, then nuclear power is the path forward for that. We have to take stock of our uranium capabilities here in the United States.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the chair of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. We have spoken about the link between hard rock minerals and national security today, but there is one resource highlighted by this amendment that must be discussed, and that is uranium.

Domestic uranium is essential for national security, given its role in nuclear deterrence and empowering the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program.

Uranium also supports the United States biomedical community because it is vital to the production of medical isotopes.

As the gentleman has pointed out, the majority of our uranium supply comes from Russia and former Soviet Bloc countries, unfortunately.

We have ample deposits of uranium here in the United States. We just have to mine it and process it, and we need to use more of it to create more nuclear power.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment. I support it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, my comments about uranium mining and the reports that are requested in this amendment, I am not arguing with the request. My point is that there is a history here of impacted communities.

What do we do with waste? That challenge, the contamination, the cleanup requirements, what are the company's responsibilities? That should all be part of a survey.

If we are aggressively pursuing uranium as a source, then we need to aggressively pursue the protections, information, and intended and unintended consequences of uranium mining, of which we have a history. That is the request.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his concerns, and that is something I definitely want to work on as we move forward.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of Representative ESCOBAR, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 20103.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, when the government offers up public land for an oil and gas lease sale, the public has a right to challenge the agency's decision.

Challenges can be for any number of reasons, from concerns about air or water, harming cultural heritage, threatening wildlife, or hurting recreational or agricultural businesses in the area.

The polluters over people act puts an arbitrary time limit on these challenges, saying that any claim must be resolved within 60 days so the agency can get on with issuing the leases.

If these challenges have merit, they should be fully considered. The arbitrary deadline shuts the American people out of the decisionmaking process.

This amendment would restore the American people's voice on how their public lands are used.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I oppose this unnecessary amendment as it would strike a provision in the bill that reinforces current law and requires the Bureau of Land Management to resolve protests to oil and gas lease sales within 60 days of payment by the winning bidder.

This amendment proposes a standard of accountability for Federal agencies that is worse than the status quo. In current practice, the BLM resolves most protests before lease sales even occur.

For example, when the BLM's New Mexico State office received formal protests for their June 30, 2022, oil and gas lease sale, BLM was able to review and respond to the protests by June 29, completing the process in 42 days and before the sale even occurred.

Once a lease is bid on and won, current law requires leases to be issued within 60 days following payment by the successful bidder.

This amendment strikes a good governance provision that does nothing more than reaffirms current law.

Just yesterday, DOI Secretary Deb Haaland testified before the House Appropriations Committee where she stated: ''Energy independence is a priority to President Biden.''

If energy independence is a priority to President Biden, then House Democrats should not be taking our Nation backward. Let's not undo current law that is actually working.

For those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Energy independence, clean, renewable, safe energy, is what we are all for. This amendment continues to have the public involved in decisionmaking that affects them, their communities, and their families.

Madam Chair, I urge approval of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chair, the whole purpose of passing H.R. 1 is to make it easier to build and move America forward.

Lease awardees, under current law, are subject to extensive delays if the lease sale is protested. These delays could take weeks, months, or even years.

Meanwhile, the prices at the gas pump continue to skyrocket while we have acres of land ready to be put into production.

The current situation makes very little sense. Allowing for practically unfettered protests to lease sales with no timeline is a de facto ban on development—except this way, the administration doesn't have to admit that they actually are trying to ban American energy. It just takes a wink and a nod to the radical, wealthy, activist lawyer class that exists only to ''keep it in the ground.''

Working together, Interior and their friends in the protest class just drag it out, protest after protest, while American workers and families struggle to afford their daily commute.

Section 20103 of H.R. 1 resolves this problem by putting in place a commonsense timeframe that concludes 60 days after the awardee makes the payment.

Striking this section, as my colleague's amendment does, is just another attempt at slowing down any sort of oil and gas development. I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I encourage opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 74, line 9, insert ''or American farmland or any lands used for American renewable energy production'' before the period at the end.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

□ 1915

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of this amendment. This amendment will prohibit the Communist Party of China

from acquiring any interest in American farmland or lands used for American renewable energy production.

China has been aggressively acquiring foreign agricultural and energy assets around the world, and the United States has not been immune to this trend. Our country's food security and energy independence are at stake, and we must take action to protect our critical resources.

In 2013, a Chinese company purchased 300 acres of farmland in North Dakota. This acquisition caused concern among farmers and policymakers in North Dakota and beyond.

This amendment directly addresses these concerns by prohibiting the Communist Party of China, or any person acting on its behalf, from acquiring any interest in American farmland or lands used for American energy production.

It is crucial that we learn from past experiences and take necessary measures to protect our domestic resources and ensure our food security and energy independence.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and join me in protecting our critical resources, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I am happy to support my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who seem to be taking an interest in supporting our homegrown, clean energy economy.

Unfortunately, there isn't much else in H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, that will help us shift to the clean energy future that we need to combat the climate crisis.

I will also say, I am significantly more concerned about foreign-owned companies buying up oil, gas, and minerals and polluting in the United States without consequence.

This amendment aligns with my efforts to increase transparency around who is operating on our lands and my efforts on raising global standards. Let's make sure we have good actors operating on our lands. We owe that much to the American people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the amendment.

Madam Chair, in recent years, there has been a concerning trend of the Chinese Communist Party purchasing farmland right here in America, including land used for farming, forestry, and other energy production.

In fact, the CCP just tried to purchase almost 400 acres of land right outside of Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota, creating a clear and present danger to our national security.

Not only does this jeopardize our national security, but takes valuable land away from our American farmers who toil day in and day out to grow crops used to feed America and provide liquid fuel options for transportation.

As a proud recipient of the Friends of the Farm Bureau award and a member of the Congressional Biofuels Caucus, I hear firsthand from our farming communities of the very real fears about the Chinese-purchased land.

If COVID taught us anything, it is that we cannot depend on adversarial nations for our supply chains, much less let them increase their hold and influence over our land.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for offering his amendment, and I urge its support.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, again, I support this amendment by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. PEREZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 22, insert ''technological needs and'' after ''address''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment requiring permitting agencies to determine their technology needs and report them to Congress.

Like many of my colleagues across the aisle, I support permitting reforms. We can agree that existing permitting programs are onerous, saddling Americans with rules and regulations that are challenging at best to navigate.

Unfortunately, both parties share some of the blame for creating this mess. It is Congress that has spent decades under-resourcing permitting agencies, a big cause of the backlog we are seeing today.

Congress' infrastructure investments of the last few years are critical for my district and the entire country. Simply funding projects is not enough, though. That is not the goal of recent legislation. Getting projects built is the goal.

Whether it is bridges, broadband, ports, or power lines, making sure that permits are being issued in a consistent and timely manner is key to any project's success.

I want to make clear that ensuring predictability is an important piece of the permitting puzzle, one often left out of the discussion. When someone is applying for permits, potential approval or disapproval shouldn't be at the whims of whoever is reviewing their application. Using new technology to improve consistency can help provide the certainty that businesses crave to pursue critical projects in the first place.

These reforms can't continue to help big businesses beat out our small businesses. The endless red tape involved in getting permits is a major burden for small businesses.

In sector after sector of our economy, market consolidation is squeezing America's small businesses and harming consumers. A business of five employees should be on a level playing field with a business of 5,000 employees when it comes to navigating the permitting system. Ensuring that predictability is one way permitting programs can work better for small businesses.

Right now we don't even know what resources permitting agencies need, and that is why the provision in H.R. 1 that agencies assess their staffing needs and report them to Congress is so important. My amendment simply extends that requirement to cover technology, as well.

Technology, we all know, is changing so fast right now, and giving permitting agencies better tools can help on so many fronts. New software, including programs using machine learning, can better coordinate simultaneous application reviews by agencies, it can improve agencies' communication with applicants so they can know where their permits are in the process and any additional material that may be needed for certification.

New technology can improve predictability and timely review. This is a straightforward measure that would help make the government work the way it ought to.

Congress needs to make sure that permitting agencies have the staff, technology, and resources to issue permits and expand permitting capacity.

I am proud to offer this amendment to ensure agencies' technology needs are met, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the

amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment would require the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Commerce to determine the technological needs for their respective permitting programs and report those needs to Congress annually.

The permitting process can be a significant barrier to economic development and innovation in our country, made even worse if outdated technology and bureaucratic inefficiencies are hindering the process.

While far from a total solution to our Nation's permitting woes, identifying technological deficiencies that contribute to inefficiencies could help Congress prioritize scarce resources to modernize the permitting process.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Madam Chair, this reporting requirement is important for making sure permitting agencies work right. Making sure agencies have the technology they need will improve processes, reduce compliance costs, and speed up permitting.

The whole amendment is just 10 pages. It is a straightforward, good-government provision.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 20309, insert the following:

SEC. 20310. NATIONAL STRATEGY TO RE-SHORE MINERAL SUPPLY CHAINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Geological Survey, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense, Energy, and State, shall—

(1) identify mineral commodities that—

(A) serve a critical purpose to the national security of the United States, including with respect to military, defense, and strategic mobility applications; and

(B) are at highest risk of supply chain disruption due to the domestic or global actions of any covered entity, including price-fixing, systemic acquisition and control of global mineral resources and processing, refining, and smelting capacity, and undercutting the fair market value of such resources; and

(2) develop a national strategy for bolstering supply chains in the United States for the mineral commodities identified under paragraph (1), including through the enactment of new national policies and the utilization of current authorities, to increase capacity and efficiency of domestic mining, refining, processing, and manufacturing of such mineral commodities.

(b) COVERED ENTITY.—In this section, the term ''covered entity'' means an entity that—

(1) is subject to the jurisdiction or direction of the People's Republic of China;

(2) is directly or indirectly operating on behalf of the People's Republic of China; or

(3) is owned by, directly or indirectly controlled by, or otherwise subject to the influence of the People's Republic of China.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. It is well known by now that foreign nations, China in particular, are dominating global supply chains for hardrock minerals like copper, nickel, lithium, and dozens of others.

China's overwhelming presence in the minerals marketplace is not due to an inherent advantage in mineral reserves but instead is the result of a decades-long strategy to take control of dozens of commodities, from mining to manufacturing.

For instance, China's ''go global'' strategy, which began in the 1990s, included $390 billion in outbound direct investments in the mining sector.

Today, China is the primary global supplier of cobalt for batteries, despite having very limited domestic reserves, through its aggressive investment and processing capacity and foreign direct investment in mines around the world.

China also has billions invested in nickel projects in Indonesia, home to one-quarter of overall global reserves.

Nickel and cobalt are only two out of dozens of minerals that will see surging demand in the coming years. Examples of China's mineral dominance go on and on.

Just yesterday, DOI Secretary Haaland testified before the House Appropriations Committee, where she agreed that electric vehicles and renewables deepen our dependence on China. Congressman RESCHENTHALER specifically asked Secretary Haaland if electric vehicles and renewables deepen our dependence on China, and she replied yes.

We must not put China over America. We must return our Nation to energy independence. H.R. 1 combats the crisis of Chinese control of the global mineral supply chain.

My colleague's amendment is a great addition to H.R. 1. The amendment directs the U.S. Geological Survey and the Departments of Defense, Energy, and State to identify the mineral supply chains needed for military, defense, and national security purposes that are at greatest risk of disruption because of China.

Once identified, the administration must develop a strategy to bring these supply chains back to the United States, including through bolstering U.S. domestic mining, refining, processing, and manufacturing.

This amendment speaks to the core of the bill under consideration today, the need to increase the domestic production of energy and minerals, a critical part of maintaining our national security.

I support this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting its inclusion in the package.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, we already have a national strategy in critical minerals. The Democratic-passed Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act built on the Energy Policy Act of 2020 to give agencies broad authorities to responsibly decrease reliance on China by diversifying sources, finding substitutes, and, importantly, recycling and reusing, something Republicans often ignore in favor of rushing into new mining.

This amendment puts a focus on new mining without essential protections for communities and the environment.

Many of the minerals we need for a clean energy transition in the United States are within 35 miles of Tribal land, yet neither this amendment nor the underlying bill addresses the impact of domestic mining on indigenous communities at all. It doesn't address the long-overdue need to reform the Mining Law of 1872.

We know there will be increased demand for minerals as we transition to renewable energy. That is why it is essential to reform the mining law, period.

□ 1930

We need to ensure better protections for the environment; a fair return to the American people that royalties be paid, and a seat at the table for Tribal government, as it is dictated in the government-to-government and trust responsibility that Congress holds.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and instead work on real, meaningful reform to support the clean energy transition.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which creates a national strategy for America to reshore our mineral supply chains.

Madam Chair, I want to just reiterate what the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee just said. Yesterday, the Secretary of the Interior of this Nation, who is in charge of millions of acres of Federal land, when asked on a mineral withdrawal in the biggest cooper-nickel find in the world, in northeastern Minnesota, called the Duluth Complex—which has 95 percent of this Nation's nickel reserve, almost 90 percent of the cobalt reserve, 75 percent of the platinum root metals, and a third of our copper—when the Secretary of the Interior yesterday was asked if there is critical minerals in that find, this is her answer: I don't know what kind of minerals were there. I don't think there were critical minerals.

The Secretary of the Interior has no idea that cobalt and nickel are part of the critical minerals, of the 37 critical minerals identified by the Department of Energy. This is her response.

We need a national strategy to reshore these minerals. I want to reiterate: This is offensive to my constituents who are ready and able to mine these critical minerals to secure our supply chain for this Nation. We have to secure our supply chain. We have to hold the dependency of this great Nation in the palm of our own hand, doing it with the best environmental standards and the best labor standards.

We can't allow China to dominate in our critical minerals with zero environmental standards and zero labor standards. The Communist country of China owns 15 of the 19 industrial mines in the Congo that use child slave labor, and this administration just entered into a memorandum of understanding to allow child slaves to mine the minerals that we need.

We can't do this anymore as the United States of America. We should never allow or purchase minerals mined by child slave labor. Again, this is the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America. She has no idea what is happening with the withdrawal.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, there is a strategy for critical minerals, but whatever we do going forward, the essential protections that are in place for communities, the requirement of the Tribal consultation and being at the table, that is our obligation—our constitutional obligation. Those need to be followed.

The reason they need to be followed is the energy strategy that I am hearing from the Republicans is just going back to the good old days. The good old days created these laws, these protections.

I use the example of Navajo Nation and uranium contamination. The list can go on and on and on. If we are saying that that collateral damage, those bad health impacts, that destruction of a community, that toxic cleanup left to local taxpayers, that that is okay because that is part of the past and that is part of the mining history of the past under the 1872 law, that we should replicate that now? No.

This amendment is wrong-headed. It takes us in a different direction. It cuts the public out of the process. It violates our nation-to-nation consultation responsibility.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II of division B the following:

SEC. 20221. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FROM CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Wildfire mitigation activities of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may be carried out without regard to the provisions of law specified in subsection (b).

(b) PROVISIONS OF LAW SPECIFIED.—The provisions of law specified in this section are all Federal, State, or other laws, regulations, and legal requirements of, deriving from, or related to the subject of, the following laws:

(1) Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(2) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(c) WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACTIVITY.—For purposes of this section, the term ''wildfire mitigation activity''—

(1) is an activity conducted on Federal land that is—

(A) under the administration of the Director of the National Park System, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or the Chief of the Forest Service; and

(B) within 300 feet of any permanent or temporary road, as measured from the center of such road; and

(2) includes forest thinning, hazardous fuel reduction, prescribed burning, and vegetation management.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I thank our chairman for his diligent work on H.R. 1 and the amendments that are going with it. I appreciate it.

Madam Chair, I rise today not only to support H.R. 1, that will make long overdue changes to our permitting system and allow time-sensitive projects to be considered and approved in a reasonable timeframe, but I am also in support of two amendments that I am very pleased to see included.

The first amendment is No. 23, otherwise known as the Combustion Avoidance along Rural Roads Act, or the CARR Act. The CARR Act is named after the 2018 devastating wildfire that occurred in Redding, California, that started from a flat trailer tire igniting roadside vegetation. This fire coined the term ''firenado'' as it occurred there with the deadly winds that whipped that fire into what became a 230,000-acre blaze that also took eight lives.

This bill would waive time-consuming requirements under NEPA and the ESA for wildfire mitigation activities conducted within 300 feet of a roadway. These wildfire mitigation activities would include thinning, hazardous fuels reduction, prescribed burning, and vegetation management, and be overseen by the Department of the Interior or USDA, and be conducted on Federal land as administered by the National Park system, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Forest Service.

Roadways, of course, can be a higher risk area for combustion. It only makes sense to do the type of thinning and management along roadways to vastly reduce that risk. Had this been in practice already, the Carr fire likely would not have happened.

I hope we can have this kind of common sense be applied toward our roadsides under the CARR Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, once again, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, which would unnecessarily waive fundamental environmental laws for wildfire mitigation activity adjacent to roads.

Madam Chair, the underlying bill we are considering today is a polluter wish list of environmental shortcuts designed to open our public lands to more and more extraction while cutting the public out of the decisionmaking process.

The bottom line is, I simply do not think that Congress should be in the business of waiving requirements outlined in the Endangered Species Act or the National Environmental Protection Act.

These laws provide critical protections that guide the management of our public lands and waters—critical protections that do not hinder efforts to mitigate wildfire risk or manage our forests.

In fact, many of the activities contemplated by the amendment are covered under existing categorical exclusions, which allow land management

agencies to carry out routine projects in a fast, efficient, and flexible manner.

I will not deny that carrying out wildfire mitigation projects across our national forest and public land is a critical priority. However, we do not have to cast aside environmental standards to get it done.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I am disappointed that this would be deemed a wish list item, indeed, when the eight lives lost and the families affected in the Redding area would look at this as something critical.

The categorical exclusions do not go far enough, obviously, or they would have been utilized in a fashion that would be making a wide enough swath around our roadways to make them safe from fire and our forests safe from fire.

Madam Chair, I urge, please, an ''aye'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. The provisions of this bill, such as Representative GRAVES' BUILDER Act, would streamline the inefficient and costly NEPA process. It is costly in more than just dollars. It is costly to our environment. It is costly in human lives.

As the gentleman explained, we can do better managing our forests. When we keep these forests healthy, we are protecting human life. We are protecting property. We are also protecting the very, very thing that does more to support and help the environment than anything else, and it is our forest.

It is a tragedy that we send up so much of our forest in smoke. This NEPA process, although it is streamlining, will help to produce more domestic energy. It will also help to build infrastructure. It will help to take care of our national forest and Federal lands.

Madam Chair, this is a good amendment. I support it, and I encourage others to support it.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I conclude by asking that we not have more scenes that look like this—similar to this—that happened in Redding, and that we be allowed to do the work effectively along our roadways, which are risk zones with traffic, et cetera.

Madam Chair, I ask for an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II of division B the following:

SEC. 20221. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE RELATING TO ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY RIGHTS OF WAY.

(a) HAZARD TREES WITHIN 50 FEET OF ELECTRIC POWER LINE.—Section 512(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(a)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''10'' and inserting ''50''.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.—Section 512(c)(3)(E) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(c)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) consulting with private landowners with respect to any hazard trees identified for removal from land owned by such private landowners.''.

(c) REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—Clause (iv) of section 512(c)(4)(A) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(c)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(iv) ensures that—

''(I) a plan submitted without a modification under clause (iii) shall be automatically approved 60 days after review; and

''(II) a plan submitted with a modification under clause (iii) shall be automatically approved 67 days after review.''.

SEC. 20222. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR ELECTRIC UTILITY LINES RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System lands; and

(2) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands.

(b) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION ESTABLISHED.—Forest management activities described in subsection (c) are a category of activities designated as being categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES DESIGNATED FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The forest management activities designated as being categorically excluded under subsection (b) are—

(1) the development and approval of a vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan submitted under section 512(c)(1) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(c)(1)) by the Secretary concerned; and

(2) the implementation of routine activities conducted under the plan referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) AVAILABILITY OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned may use the categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) in accordance with this section.

(e) EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Use of the categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) shall not be subject to the extraordinary circumstances procedures in section 220.6, title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, or section 1508.4, title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(f) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AREAS.—The categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) shall not apply to any forest management activity conducted—

(1) in a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

(2) on National Forest System lands on which, by Act of Congress, the removal of vegetation is restricted or prohibited.

(g) PERMANENT ROADS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON ESTABLISHMENT.—A forest management activity designated under subsection (c) shall not include the establishment of a permanent road.

(2) EXISTING ROADS.—The Secretary concerned may carry out necessary maintenance and repair on an existing permanent road for the purposes of conducting a forest management activity designated under subsection (c).

(3) TEMPORARY ROADS.—The Secretary concerned shall decommission any temporary road constructed for a forest management activity designated under subsection (c) not later than 3 years after the date on which the action is completed.

(h) APPLICABLE LAWS.—A forest management activity designated under subsection (c) shall not be subject to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536), section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, or any other applicable law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, amendment No. 24, also known also the CLEAR Zones Act, is an enhancement of the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act. This amendment would extend the hazard zone around power lines to allow utility companies to clear trees that pose a danger to transmission infrastructure.

It also gives automatic approval of vegetation management plans after 60 days, which keeps these plans moving forward while still giving adequate time for reasonable review instead of needless delays in these critical fire risk zones.

During debate, I have heard some of my colleagues refer to this amendment and other proposals in H.R. 1 as a giveaway, in this case, to utility companies, or a trashing of the environment. That is offensively untrue. Indeed, the environment suffers much more by the massive amount of fire we are talking about.

Both of my amendments are a direct response to wildfires that have already occurred in my district. Had they been in place, largely, the Camp fire that destroyed the town of Paradise, 153,000 acres and took 85 lives, would not have happened, as a fire caught from foliage that was underneath a power line.

Also, the million-acre Dixie fire that occurred in my district from what looked like a healthy tree falling into

a power line, destroyed two towns additionally, Greenville and Canyondam. I was there at Canyondam 5 minutes before it was lost completely.

Unlike most environmental regulations, this policy is not just about potential future effects, it is also about the fires that have already happened. They have already destroyed homes, already taken lives. This is a message to those folks that your suffering was not needless.

It is about stopping these wildfires from happening again by having wise management around our power lines so that the odds of fire occurring from these power lines existing in our rural areas is reduced greatly.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, which would change existing guidelines and create a new categorical exclusion for managing vegetation along transmission lines that run across national forests and public lands.

In order to advance the renewable energy future that the underlying bill moves us away from, we do need to prioritize transmission.

That is why House Democrats worked tirelessly to invest billions in new opportunities that the Biden administration is currently delivering across America.

□ 1945

These investments are building out rural electrical infrastructure and will expand access to renewable energy to more and more Americans.

Confronting the climate crisis also means reducing risk associated with transmission infrastructure, which certainly includes wildfire. However, this amendment is a bridge too far.

There is an administrative process to establish categorical exclusions. That is the right way to get them done, not through a fly-by-night amendment on a largely unrelated piece of legislation.

The amendment also sets up unrealistic approval timelines, deeming a permit approved if an agency has not responded within 60 days. We all know that Federal land management agencies are understaffed and underresourced.

The solution is investing in the workforce and building out agency capacity, not creating unworkable timelines designed to ultimately be ignored.

This amendment, however, is not the answer.

Madam Chair, I urge a vote ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman not only for yielding me time but for bringing another commonsense and good amendment that makes H.R. 1 even a better bill.

As he mentioned, similar provisions were enacted in 2018 to allow electric transmission or distribution facility operators to remove hazard trees that can threaten infrastructure and start a catastrophic wildfire. That is what this amendment was built on.

Madam Chair, I have been to California. I have been to South Lake Tahoe. I have seen the efforts and the fruits of the labor in the field from the work of my colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and our colleague Mr. MCCLINTOCK, who worked so hard to be able to get this provision in previous legislation.

This has been used to thin the timber on power lines. Actually, these provisions have helped stop wildfires from spreading. This works. This should be added to, and we should be doing it everywhere we can to prevent these catastrophic wildfires like the folks in California and other parts of the West see all too often.

Madam Chair, I support this amendment, and I encourage everyone else to support it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I ask that people really stop and think about what we are asking here. This is not unreasonable where power lines interface with forested areas. Precautions like we are talking about would have directly, in these two cases, saved three towns, over 1.1 million acres, and at least 85 lives had they had the ability to thin properly around power lines. It is that basic.

As long as we are going to have electricity come from rural areas, we are going to have these needs to be able to have safety around our power lines by doing commonsense management around them.

Madam Chair, I ask Members to vote ''aye'' on amendment No. 24, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 20220 the following:

SEC. 20221. STAFFING PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each local unit of the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service shall conduct an outreach plan for disseminating and advertising open civil service positions with functions relating to permitting or natural resources in their offices. Each such plan shall include outreach to local high schools, community colleges, institutions of higher education, and any other relevant institutions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture (as the case may be).

(b) COLLABORATION PERMITTED.—Such local units of the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service located in reasonably close geographic areas may collaborate to produce a joint outreach plan that meets the requirements of subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to debate and consider my amendment to encourage local hiring and recruitment, but I also want to note my disappointment that my friends across the aisle rejected any consideration of my other two amendments on this floor.

One of those amendments would allow the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to prevent exploratory mining from taking place on Federal land if it would negatively impact our water, farmers, Tribes, or local communities.

In New Mexico, ''agua es vida''; ''water is life.'' It shouldn't be controversial to protect our waters from mining contamination for our people, farmers, and environment.

My other amendment would have simply stated that this bill would not go into effect until the Federal Government certified that it would lower costs for American consumers and save taxpayers money. If this bill is really designed to lower energy costs for American consumers and taxpayers, let's verify that before putting polluters over people.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to consider my amendment, which would require local units of the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and National Park Service to conduct an outreach plan to disseminate and advertise local civil service positions with functions relating to permitting and natural resources in their offices. Each plan must include outreach to local high schools, community colleges, institutions of higher education, and other relevant institutions.

The BLM, the Forest Service, and the National Park Service field offices, and

ranger districts and sites are stewards of our lands and waters, but they also operate within communities within which they are located, whether it is Cuba or Farmington or Roswell, New Mexico.

Adequate staffing at these offices and their headquarters, and our Federal agencies more broadly, is critical to our ability to effectively steward our natural resources and environment and move projects through the permitting process efficiently, responsibly, and with an ear tuned in to what the local communities need.

Unfortunately, we are seeing many of our agencies struggle to fill vacancies and staff up. For example, an E&E News article from last year said there are vacancy counts for all BLM State offices; the National Interagency Fire Center in Boise, Idaho; the Bureau's National Operations Center in Denver; and the other directorates.

To be clear, I know BLM and other Federal agencies are working hard to address these challenges. My amendment would take another step to help address the staffing challenges by making sure local offices are communicating with the local communities about open positions.

Whether it is New Mexico Highlands University, Eastern New Mexico University, or Navajo Tech, I believe we should be taking advantage of talent in the communities where these offices are located.

To be clear, once again, we must also provide our Federal agencies with the resources and tools they need and support our Federal workforce along the way.

The investments made last Congress to increase capacity at our Federal permitting offices were a downpayment, but we need to continue to invest in agency capability.

Again, this amendment simply makes sure that our local agencies are thinking about communicating with our local talent when trying to fill those hiring challenges.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment requires local units of the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service to open job positions related to permitting or natural resources, including at local high schools, community colleges, universities, and other institutions.

Madam Chair, I just have to commend the gentlewoman's district. I was recently in the town of Hobbs, New Mexico, and I got to visit an amazing facility called CTECH that is used to educate future workers in that area. I have seen a lot of career and technical education facilities, and this one is second to none.

It was funded by the industry in the oil and gas business. They gave back to the community and built this remarkable facility. I believe they said over 1,000 high school students per year are using this facility. These are the places that are educating these future workers, and these jobs should be advertised there.

We have heard from multiple sectors, including in the energy, mining, and renewable energy spaces, about the permitting challenges they face, and those challenges are magnified by a lack of sufficient qualified personnel in State and local land management offices.

This amendment tasks the administration with performing outreach to local schools and other institutions to help fill open positions in their local offices.

While it is far from a total solution to the permitting challenges in our country, this amendment could help improve permitting backlogs and provide employment opportunities at the local level, including in rural areas.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his visit to my district. I also invite the gentleman to the northern part because, at New Mexico Highlands University, we have an excellent forestry department where we are looking at the center of excellence. I know the gentleman's interest in forestry.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title V of division B.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, my first amendment will strike title V of division B of this bill.

Throughout this debate, I have heard my friends across the aisle argue that the bill before us today is a reasonable attempt to reform our permitting system. Unfortunately, this bill closely resembles a wish list for Big Oil and their lobbyists.

This amendment would strike one of the most egregious portions of the bill that would undo many of the reforms we made last Congress to ensure that the American people see a better return on our public lands and waters. We should all be able to agree that the American people deserve a fair deal when it comes to the use of our cherished public lands.

For far too long, our oil and gas leasing program has offered a sweetheart deal for the fossil fuel industry at the expense of taxpayers. One fossil fuel company even went so far as to outline in a press release the many benefits of extraction on public land compared to private land. Their release highlighted that leases on public lands are cheaper, last longer, and are more expansive.

While these statements may be music to the ears of those who care most about Big Oil interests, they represent a raw and an unfair deal for the American people.

Increasing the royalty rate to a fair level—that is all we are asking, a fair level—will generate billions of dollars in revenue for taxpayers. The Government Accountability Office and Congressional Budget Office both agree and have suggested that it is good policy.

That is why, last Congress, I introduced the Restoring Community Input and Public Protections in Oil and Gas Leasing Act to protect taxpayers by eliminating noncompetitive oil and gas leasing and raising the onshore oil and gas royalty rate, rental fee, and minimum bid amount.

I am proud that the Inflation Reduction Act includes significant provisions of that bill, including eliminating noncompetitive leasing for oil and gas sales, raising annual rental rates, and increasing the minimum bid for public lands. These commonsense reforms were simply long-overdue fixes to create more balanced fiscal terms and bring Federal lands in line with what States and private landowners already charge.

Before the IRA, the fiscal terms for public lands leasing and drilling were, in some cases, over 100 years old. For decades, these outdated rates and fees allowed oil CEOs to lease public lands for pennies on the dollar and unfairly increase their profits at the expense of taxpayers.

Even after the IRA, States like Texas and Oklahoma still charge higher royalty rates on their State lands than are charged on Federal public lands.

According to Taxpayers for Common Sense, these updated fiscal terms included in the IRA will not raise prices

at the pump or consumer energy prices, but they will raise billions of dollars in additional revenue that could go toward our funding education, healthcare, and infrastructure improvements that benefit everyone, not just oil and gas companies.

□ 2000

Unfortunately, the bill before us today would also reinstate noncompetitive leasing, an indefensible practice.

The Government Accountability Office also found that 99 percent of noncompetitive leases issued between 2003 and 2009 never produced oil and gas during their 10-year lease terms. The reason why these lands were not put into production is that they are leased in areas where there is virtually no likelihood of development.

At its core, noncompetitive leasing is a wasteful practice that forces the Bureau of Land Management to expend limited public agency time and resources administering leases that hardly ever generate returns for taxpayers. It encourages oil and gas companies to buy up lands they will never use to pad their portfolios and appease shareholders, contributing to the 12.3 million acres of leased public lands that these companies are currently sitting on and not using.

Instead of maintaining these commonsense reforms and protecting the interests of American taxpayers, title V of the bill before us today would undo all of these reforms and provide a gift to oil and gas interests. By rolling back these reforms, the majority is proposing policies that would only pad Big Oil's pocketbooks even further and increase our Federal deficit by $160 million over 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, even as companies like ExxonMobil and Shell are announcing record profits.

By striking this title, we can put these dollars back in the pockets of the American people and protect commonsense reforms that are finally ensuring that Federal taxpayers receive a fair return on any private profit that oil and gas companies extract from our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the American people and stand against our increasing national debt by supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, which would strike provisions in the bill to incentivize responsible domestic energy production, create jobs, and reduce energy costs for American families.

This amendment would preserve the higher royalty rates for oil and gas on Federal lands and waters that were just recently raised by my colleagues across the aisle.

Democrat talking points ignore the reality of what it takes to produce energy on Federal lands, while at the same time advocating for increased royalties that will be passed on to consumers in the form of higher energy costs.

The House Natural Resources Committee held a field hearing for H.R. 1 last month where we heard directly from operators that produce on Federal, State, and private lands. Unfortunately, none of our Democrat colleagues came with us to participate in that hearing or they would have heard the facts.

It takes less than a week to obtain a drilling permit from the States of Texas or New Mexico, and it takes over 180 days to obtain a permit from the BLM. That is just one drilling permit. Operators sometimes need 30 to 50 permits and right-of-ways from a Federal agency to develop a project on Federal lands.

It is these delays and inefficiencies that demonstrate why the royalty rate should be lower on Federal lands. The simple truth is, the lower the royalty rate, the more interest there will be in energy production, the greater our Nation's energy security, and the cheaper energy process will be for all Americans. The Democrats know this.

Earlier this month, the Biden administration confirmed this fact in a leaked Bureau of Ocean Energy Management memo on Cook Inlet lease sale 258. Their own memo noted that a lower ''16⅔ percent royalty may be more likely to facilitate expeditious and orderly development of OCS resources and potentially offer greater energy security to residents of the State of Alaska.'' That was from the Biden BOEM administration.

Madam Chair, because I believe in promoting American energy security and reducing our reliance on foreign adversaries for energy and mineral resources that we should be producing here in America, I oppose this amendment.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), my good friend.

The so-called Inflation Reduction Act actually inflated royalty rates to continue punishing energy developers and all downstream consumers, whether it be diesel used by farmers or gas at the pump for a family going on vacation or even just the daily commute. Therefore, Republicans in Congress again did the right thing by returning the royalty rate to the reasonable place prior to the Inflation Reduction Act.

By striking this provision, the Democrats once again want to increase the cost of energy on American families. This doesn't make sense. For one, it simply makes oil and gas more expensive and, therefore, all uses of oil and gas more expensive.

We think of gasoline and diesel, of course, but how about plastic for everyday use, ranging from eyeglasses to medical instruments or rubber tires for electric vehicles?

How about lubricants for wind turbines?

How about fertilizer?

Should we continue to drive the cost of all of these items through the roof?

It also doesn't make sense because it only punishes producers on Federal lands and waters. I have had the good fortune of being welcomed to southeast New Mexico and west Texas a handful of times to discuss these issues, and what I have learned is that it is significantly easier and cheaper to develop on private lands.

Producers will produce.

Do we want those returns from production to be realized by communities impacted by Federal land ownership at all?

This amendment was soundly defeated in committee. Let's keep energy and oil and gas applications cheap, and let's keep revenues flowing to areas impacted by Federal lands.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division B, insert the following:

TITLE VII—COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CERTIFICATION

SEC. 20701. FUNDING AND STAFFING CAPACITY.

This division and the amendments made by this division shall not take effect until the Council on Environmental Quality, in consultation with affected Federal agencies, certifies that all agencies have the funding and staffing capacity to meet the new timelines for environmental review associated with this division and the amendments made by this division without reducing the quality of review.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman

from California (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, this amendment simply requires Federal agencies to certify that they have the staffing capacity to meet the new environmental timelines established under this bill.

According to the Government Accountability Office, the main reason for project delays at the Federal level is a lack of agency resources and staff capacity. Thankfully, we helped address this challenge by securing $1 billion in the IRA to ensure Federal agencies have the resources and expertise to conduct efficient environmental reviews.

A trained, equipped workforce is essential to processing environmental reviews in a timely fashion in cases where there are delays. Increasing the funding and staff for Federal agencies' permitting offices and agency workforce training is already making the permitting process significantly more effective and efficient in a responsible way.

Unfortunately, instead of building on the progress we made in the Inflation Reduction Act and supporting agencies' capacity to conduct reviews by providing additional resources, H.R. 1 takes the more politically expedient but impractical approach of simply forcing agencies onto stricter timelines for reviews without providing additional resources for Federal agencies to conduct these reviews.

By instituting these strict deadlines and limiting opportunities for community input throughout this bill, I am worried that instead of leading to more efficient project reviews and approvals, H.R. 1 may actually lead to sloppier and rushed reviews. When environmental reviews are not thorough, projects often face a litany of time-consuming lawsuits and litigation.

As some may know, I used to work on clean energy projects before coming to Congress, and my own experience is that detailed environmental reviews and a thoughtful permitting process alongside early engagement with impacted communities can facilitate more efficient completion of projects and better overall outcomes.

This amendment would help support efficient reviews by requiring that the Council on Environmental Quality in consultation with affected Federal agencies certify that all agencies have the funding and staffing capacity to meet the new timelines for environmental review required under the bill.

It is common sense that we should not be instituting arbitrary timelines if agencies don't have the necessary resources to meet them. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that affected agencies have the resources needed to conduct high-quality reviews, which will lead to better overall project outcomes.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, as much as I appreciate Mr. LEVIN and his real sincerity and work on the committee, on this bill, and his expertise in this area, I must oppose this amendment tonight and hope to work with him on some additional legislation in the future.

This amendment would strike all of the provisions in division B that increase domestic energy production and reduce energy costs for American families. This amendment prevents division B from going into effect until all of the Federal agencies impacted certify that they have adequate funding and staffing to meet the timelines in the bill.

In response, I ask a simple question: When has a Federal bureaucracy ever felt it has enough staff on its payroll or enough taxpayer dollars to spend in its budget?

The answer is never, at least not as long as I have been in Congress and I have talked to Federal agencies.

Even with the spending push by the Democrats in the so-called Inflation Reduction Act—they have stated several times during the debate on H.R. 1 that they have put a billion dollars out there to speed up permitting—these Federal agencies are still asking for more money and more staff, and permitting timelines are still ballooning.

Why?

Because the issue is not an issue of staffing or budget alone. The underlying statutes and the processes are broken, and they must be fixed. That is what H.R. 1 does. It addresses the underlying issues, and it will expedite permitting for all kinds of projects.

This messaging amendment would prevent meaningful reforms in the name of growing the Federal bureaucracy. For these reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I, too, appreciate Mr. LEVIN's intent, but I rise today in opposition to his amendment. Democrats tout the ''historic investments'' in our agencies by the so-called Inflation Reduction Act and other deficit-ballooning bills passed when they were in complete control.

Madam Chair, I don't understand. How can the agencies be so chronically understaffed after passing all those ''historic investments''?

In fact, Democrats during committee markup touted these funding levels. In a nice little graphic, they had $1 billion from the so-called IRA alone, which includes $30 million for CEQ, $350 million for the Steering Council, and a whopping $625 million for other various agencies.

Madam Chair, have we completed the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line that is going on 7 years of permitting?

The answer is no.

Have we brought any new mines on line?

The answer is no.

Have we finished any water projects in California?

No.

Look at this chart behind me. This broken permitting system is the issue. It takes decades to get anything done. A mining project in my district alone is on year 20, going on year 21 of permitting and litigation.

The need here isn't to turbocharge more Federal bureaucrats in our agencies.

H.R. 1 solves this problem. Let's modernize the permitting process. Let's put time limits on litigation, limit review page numbers, and shorten timelines for America to remain competitive and lead in energy production.

H.R. 1 also allows project sponsors to conduct the review and then submit to the agency, who must give final sign-off. I repeat this. The agency must sign off.

This isn't just a Republican provision. Many Democrats who still serve in this Chamber or in the Senate have voted for that.

Fixing permitting requires real policy solutions, not just throwing money into endless pits of bureaucracy.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. LUNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 20114, add the following:

SEC. 20115. REQUIREMENT FOR GAO REPORT ON WIND ENERGY IMPACTS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not publish a notice for a wind lease sale or hold a lease sale for wind energy development in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area, the South Atlantic Planning Area, or the Straits of Florida Planning Area (as described in the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016)) until the Comptroller General of the United States publishes a report on all potential adverse effects of wind energy development in such areas, including associated infrastructure and vessel traffic, on—

(1) military readiness and training activities in the Planning Areas described in this section, including activities within or related to the Eglin Test and Training Complex and the Jacksonville Range Complex;

(2) marine environment and ecology, including species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or designated as depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) in the Planning Areas described in this section; and

(3) tourism, including the economic impacts that a decrease in tourism may have on the communities adjacent to the Planning Areas described in this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, the 2020 Trump moratorium banned all energy leasing off the coast of Florida until 2032.

President Trump recognized the natural beauty, tourism attractions, and unique wildlife, as well as one-of-a-kind military training and testing offered by Florida's coast.

It goes without saying that energy development threatens all of that, especially off the coast of Florida. I thank President Trump for his declaration.

However, President Biden and Democrats in Congress undercut the Trump moratorium in the Inflation Reduction Act by allowing offshore wind development off the coast of Florida.

This threatens our economy, ecosystem, and military readiness, as well as a number of endangered species in ways that were obvious to all except Democrats who voted to force this wind development on an unwilling public.

My amendment requires the GAO to conduct a study on how wind development would impact military readiness, marine life, tourism aspects, and prohibits offering leases for wind development until the study is complete.

I have confidence that the study conducted by our government experts will show what President Trump so easily understood—that wind is bad for Florida.

My Florida Republican colleagues and I are committed to ensuring that no wind turbines will ever be placed off the coast of Florida.

We will work with our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to block funding for this kind of development, and we will repeal the section of the Inflation Reduction Act that my Democrat colleagues voted for that want to build windmills on our beaches.

These very ugly and ineffective turbines pose untold dangers to Florida's thriving marine life and our precious natural resources.

Wind turbines also threaten our Nation's military readiness by interfering with radar detection, which can result in a complete loss of detection capabilities, according to an FAA and DOD report to Congress in 2016.

In my district, turbines are harmful to an already endangered species in the area, not to mention, there are the untold effects of turbines that will be had on the tourism economy. People travel from all around the world to our pristine beaches, not to see windmills.

I thank Chairman WESTERMAN and Whip EMMER for working with the Florida delegation on these amendments. On behalf of one of the biggest delegations in the country, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and protect Florida from Joe Biden's windmill fantasy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. This amendment stops any offshore wind lease sales in the waters around Florida until the Government Accountability Office publishes a report on the impacts of wind energy development on military readiness, the marine environment, and tourism.

I find the amendment somewhat ironic in that H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, guts the National Environmental Policy Act, which is the best tool for thoroughly studying the impacts of major projects like offshore wind.

A robust NEPA process will evaluate the potential impacts of offshore wind projects on military activities, fisheries, marine life, tourism, and coastal communities.

NEPA is the tool our government should use to help identify the best places for offshore wind and how to mitigate any potential impacts.

With all due respect to the GAO, a couple-page GAO study on the potential impacts of offshore wind doesn't make up for a thorough, robust NEPA review.

We need to make sure that coastal communities have the tools that NEPA offers to weigh in on projects that may affect their coastlines and their marine resources.

Speaking of NEPA, my colleague referenced a project. According to Politico, ''But look at the energy project that Republicans are citing as their poster child for the problem sheds light on where their push may or may not help speed project approvals.

''GOP lawmakers focused on delays to the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line during a legislative hearing last month, blaming the NEPA process for years of delay that have stymied a 102-mile power project from Wisconsin to Iowa. Yet, Republican's proposed changes 'would not impact' the project, said Rod Pritchard, a spokepersons for the power line's developer, ITC Midwest.''

H.R. 1 guts NEPA, begins dismantling it, weakens it, and cuts the public out of the process.

This amendment protects Florida and their coastline. There are other coastlines and other communities that don't want extraction such as gas and oil.

I mentioned California and States along the Atlantic, and they should be extended. They fight every day to preserve those areas.

Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I also thank her as a freshman Member for her proactive work on the committee.

Representative LUNA's amendment requires the Comptroller General to have a report on all potential adverse effects of wind energy development in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, the South Atlantic, and the Straits of Florida planning areas.

Until this report is published, the Secretary of the Interior is prohibited from publishing a notice or holding a lease sale for wind energy developments in the area.

As she stated, the report must evaluate the potential impacts of wind energy development on military readiness and training activities, on the marine environment, ecology and tourism, including the economic impacts on communities adjacent to the planning areas.

We cannot compromise our military readiness and training activities, which are crucial for national security.

By requiring a Comptroller General report, we can make informed decisions about the potential impacts of wind energy development on our national security, marine environment, and local economies.

Therefore, I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, a frustrated former Republican official who worked for the White House Council on Environmental Quality also said regarding NEPA and H.R. 1, ''. . . we are spending 99 percent of our political capital on a set of reforms that will be of no statistically significant consequence.''

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MRS. LUNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT SUPPLY CHAIN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) wind energy development on Federal lands and waters is a burgeoning industry in the United States;

(2) major components of wind infrastructure, including turbines, are imported in large quantities from other countries including countries that are national security threats, such as the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(3) it is in the best interest of the United States to foster and support domestic supply chains across sectors to promote American energy independence;

(4) the economic and manufacturing opportunities presented by wind turbine construction and component manufacturing should be met by American workers and materials that are sourced domestically to the greatest extent practicable; and

(5) infrastructure for wind energy development in the United States should be constructed with materials produced and manufactured in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, major components of wind infrastructure are imported from our enemies like China. We have seen how poorly President Biden has handled the energy crisis, and to make it worse, he is outsourcing our energy to foreign adversaries.

This threatens our national security, throws away American jobs, and increases our dependence on foreign energy.

Regardless of the energy source, we need to prioritize our domestic supply chain and support American energy independence.

American energy should come from America, not China—U.S. materials, U.S. jobs, U.S. energy independence.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I support this amendment. I am happy to support my colleague on the other side of the aisle who seems to be taking an interest in supporting our homegrown, clean energy economy.

Growing a wind industry with domestic supply chains will help us create family-sustaining, good union jobs, support local economies, and help fight the climate crisis.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I again thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding time.

I rise in support of this amendment. The renewable energy sector is a rapidly growing part of our Nation's energy mix.

We have seen positive growth in wind energy and we hope to see it evolve into a subsector of American energy exports one day.

To achieve this goal, we need to promote the development of a strong domestic supply chain for wind infrastructure.

This amendment is a constructive step in that direction and expresses the sense of Congress that we should develop our own domestic supply chains rather than import critical components from China.

This amendment aims to prioritize the development of related industries through port upgrades, cable manufacturing, and hiring of vessels and crews for wind energy operations in the United States.

By promoting domestic production and expanding our supply chain, we can create jobs, enhance our energy security, and strengthen our economy.

Representative LUNA's amendment will not only support our energy goals but also promote economic prosperity.

I support this amendment as this policy is a positive step toward the development of a strong and secure domestic supply chain for wind infrastructure. I also encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LEE of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mrs. KIM of California, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118–19)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2023.

The situation in and in relation to South Sudan, which has been marked by activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of South Sudan and the surrounding region, including widespread violence and atrocities, human rights abuses, recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks on peacekeepers, and obstruction of humanitarian operations, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 29, 2023.*

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118–20)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the