

One of my constituents, battling stage IV breast cancer, said that without these credits, she can't afford insurance or the lifesaving medicine that she needs.

For her and millions more, this isn't about partisan politics. It is literally about life or death.

Donald Trump's latest idea is to give money directly to the people to pick their health insurance, but that is exactly how these ACA subsidies worked.

Since he can only make concepts of a plan for our healthcare system, I have a plan. Let's fix it, let's invest in it, and let's make our government actually work for the people, not just the ultrawealthy. I believe healthcare in this country should be a human right.

#### NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate National Adoption Month this November, I find myself reflecting on the profound impact adoption has had on my life.

When I was born, my birth mother made the courageous decision to place me up for adoption, and I spent my first few months in the loving care of the Children's Home Society of Virginia in downtown Richmond.

At just 8 months old, I was blessed to be adopted by extraordinary parents who taught me the values of resilience and community service, shaping who I am today.

This year, the Children's Home Society of Virginia proudly celebrates its 125th anniversary of dedicated service and commitment to finding families for children in need.

Adoption is a powerful act of love that provides children with the opportunity to grow up in a supportive environment where they can thrive much like I did.

National Adoption Month serves as a reminder of the importance of raising awareness about the needs of children in the foster care system and the families who open their hearts and homes to them.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the gift of adoption.

□ 1220

#### INCREASING COSTS OF THANKSGIVING

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

Mr. AMO. Mr. Speaker, Thanksgiving is next week, and this year, families are paying more because of the President.

The staple items for this classic American holiday cost, on average, 7 percent more than last year.

Take my favorite side, stuffing. A box of stuffing mix has soared by dou-

ble digits. The centerpiece of many tables, turkey, is up 7 percent.

It is not just Thanksgiving food. Grocery prices are up. Families of four are spending more than \$1,000 on groceries each month.

Americans simply cannot afford to live in Trump's economy—not my constituents expecting their healthcare costs to more than double next year, and not small business owners and consumers alike hit hard by tariffs.

Americans are hurting because my colleagues across the aisle would rather give tax breaks to billionaires than lower costs for working families. Americans and their families deserve better.

Whether someone calls it stuffing or dressing, cranberry relish or sauce, I will keep working for them to lower their costs and make life affordable.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF LOUIS PATE, JR.

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I honor the life and legacy of Louis Pate, Jr., a former North Carolina senator from Mount Olive who passed on August 29 at 88 years old.

Louis' journey began in Duplin County. He would later serve 20 years in the United States Air Force, including time as a navigator on a B-57 during Vietnam.

After his military career, Louis returned home to continue serving. He served as the mayor of Mount Olive, in the North Carolina House of Representatives, and later in the State senate, serving as deputy president pro tem.

Louis' greatest accomplishment above all was being a devoted husband for 59 years to Joyce and being a loving father to their children, Lisa, Chip, and Frances.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to have had the opportunity to serve alongside Louis, and I extend my heartfelt condolences to Joyce and the Pate family.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF) at 1 p.m.

#### RESEARCHING EFFICIENT FEDERAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR NECESSARY ENERGY REFINING ACT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 879, I call up

the bill (H.R. 3109) to require the Secretary of Energy to direct the National Petroleum Council to issue a report with respect to petrochemical refineries in the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3109

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Researching Efficient Federal Improvements for Necessary Energy Refining Act" or the "REFINER Act".

#### SEC. 2. REPORT ON PETROCHEMICAL REFINERIES.

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).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3109.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the American economy is fueled by petrochemical refineries

providing affordable diesel and gasoline to families, critical inputs for our manufacturers, and products imperative for the maintenance of our defense systems.

The national security component of a viable refining industry cannot be overstated, and we must not forfeit these essential supply chains.

Under the previous administration, we saw the impact of an energy retreat: higher prices for families and businesses, emboldened adversaries, sluggish economies, and increasing reliance on other nations.

Unfortunately, this is still the case in States like California, where a hostile regulatory environment has forced refineries to reduce operations. In fact, the Golden State is expected to lose 17 percent of its capacity in the next year. This has led to an average gasoline price of nearly \$5 per gallon, an increased fuel dependence on Asian producers, and jeopardizing the fuel supply chain of military installations in their State.

We must not let this become status quo across the country. H.R. 3109 requires the National Petroleum Council to collect and examine information regarding the role of petrochemical refineries in the United States and their contributions to affordability, security, and reliability. The report will assess opportunities to expand capacity as well as current risks to refineries.

H.R. 3109 will provide the Committee on Energy and Commerce the information we need to enact policies to deliver affordable, reliable, and clean energy to all Americans.

I thank Representative LATTA, the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, for his leadership on this issue.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3109, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which is a complete and utter waste of the House of Representatives' time.

It asks the National Petroleum Council to do a study, and that is it. That is the entire bill. In my opinion, to ask the National Petroleum Council to do something it can already do on its own makes absolutely no sense.

The House was out of session for over 50 days because Speaker JOHNSON refused to bring Congress back to resolve the healthcare crisis created by Republicans and to reopen the government. Now, Speaker JOHNSON claims we will be working day and night on important problems. I certainly agree that we should be doing that. We should be working on problems that Americans care about, but millions of Americans are seeing their healthcare costs skyrocket because the President and Republicans refuse to extend critical tax credits that make healthcare more affordable for millions of Americans.

Millions more are paying thousands of dollars more a year for everyday

goods because of the President's tariffs. These tariffs are attacks on the American people, and they are expected to cost families more than \$2,000 each year when they take full effect.

Meanwhile, prices on everything from utilities to food to energy, even prices for Thanksgiving dinner next week, are going up.

You would think that House Republicans would be doing something, anything, anything at all to fight these high prices. Instead, we are here talking about a bill that requires a Big Oil and Gas lobby group to put together a report. That is it.

I cannot stress enough that this report is simply not needed, regardless of who does it. In fact, it is almost an insult, particularly to refinery workers on the East Coast, including my State of New Jersey, who don't need a study to tell them why refining capacity here has dropped by over one third in the last decade. It all goes back to the repeal of the crude oil export ban in 2015.

You don't have to take my word for it. The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office found in a 2020 report—that was a report—that domestic refinery margins suffered in the wake of the repeal. This bill only asks for the report to assess executive actions, regulations, or policies that have impacted refineries, not a change in the law. If it were dealing with a change in the law, I think that would make sense.

It is a massive, massive oversight to not talk about the law and what happened when the crude oil export ban was lifted 10 years ago. That is what caused the problem with refineries.

The most ridiculous part of this bill is that it demands the study not be done by the Department of Energy but by the National Petroleum Council, an industry advisory body for Big Oil and Gas. I have no doubt that the National Petroleum Council will produce a biased report that will likely complain about every environmental regulation that they don't like, but that protects the American people. That is what Republicans have been doing: repealing all the environmental regulations.

If Republicans wanted an unbiased view of domestic refining challenges, they would have asked the Department of Energy to craft a report. That is not what they are looking for because Republicans just want to sanction fossil fuel propaganda. That is what they are doing with this bill.

It is a waste of everyone's time, Mr. Speaker. It is just another example of how Republicans have absolutely no ideas to help American families lower everyday costs.

We need to be working on real solutions, Democrats and Republicans, to address the affordability crisis. That is what the American people want, not this report.

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

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

When I was a young man in the 1970s—when I was a kid, I guess, in the 1970s—I remember gas lines and having to push my father's car to get gasoline. At the time, everybody said we were going to run out of crude oil. That was the thing, running out of crude oil.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the crude oil issue. It is actually because of the ingenuity of the American people that we have an abundance of crude oil. The issue isn't crude oil. It is the refining capacity.

Since I was a kid, we found this abundance of crude oil in the Permian Basin, North Dakota, and all the places I can name. We have more oil than they have in the Middle East, which, when I was a kid, a lot of it was coming from the Middle East.

Then, you have this chokepoint of refining capacity. We haven't built a new refinery in the United States since I was a kid, so that is the thing that we want to address. That is the issue we want to address. We do want prices to go down. We don't want it to be \$5 a gallon.

I was putting gas in a rental car in California, and I looked over at the guy next to me. I paid probably \$2.60 a gallon in Kentucky, and I think it was \$4.80 there. I said: Do you guys have any idea what the rest of America is paying for gasoline?

We are here to address it, and we are addressing it by a bill authored by my good friend, the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a leader in this arena.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

□ 1310

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the chairman of the full committee of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 3109, the REFINER Act. This legislation will direct the National Petroleum Council to report to Congress and the Department of Energy on petrochemical refiners in the United States.

This legislation is essential to ensuring that the U.S. can reliably produce enough refined products domestically. The Energy Information Administration projects global demand for liquid fuels to increase by about 20 million barrels per day by 2050. Alarming, over the last several years, North America has lost an estimated 1 million barrels of fuel per day due to low refining capacity.

The last report from the National Petroleum Council on refining was completed over 20 years ago.

The report must include information concerning the contribution of refineries to U.S. energy security; capacity projections of U.S. petrochemical refineries; opportunities for expanding capacities and risks to those refineries; an assessment of any State or Federal executive actions, regulations, or policies that have caused or contributed to

a decline in U.S. petrochemical refinery capacity; and recommendations for how to increase refinery capacity.

American refineries have played a crucial role in providing secure, affordable, and high-value petroleum products to global customers. Importantly, this legislation would help identify States that have caused or contributed to a decline in U.S. petrochemical refinery capacity.

Hostile regulatory environments, like in California, have led to the shuttering of several refineries. California used to be home to over 40 refineries in the 1980s. This number has now decreased to 14 as of last year, with two additional refineries slated to close in early 2026.

These anticipated closures will disrupt fuel supplies and increase energy prices for consumers, businesses, and farmers.

An analysis by the University of Southern California anticipates retail gas prices in the State could increase by as much as 75 percent under certain conditions. The bottom line: Fewer refineries result in supply disruptions and higher fuel prices for Americans.

The REFINER Act seeks to produce a detailed roadmap to strengthen and expand refinery capacity to increase American energy security and economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, my point is that this report does not ask the people that are doing it to look into the change of law that would be necessary in order to bring refineries back.

The reason why we lost so many refineries, particularly on the East Coast and New Jersey, was because the ban on the export of crude oil was lifted 10 years ago. You don't need a refinery if you can export the crude, but this report doesn't address that at all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Energy Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3109.

I know my Republican colleagues want to pretend that this is a simple, unbiased study bill, but it is not. The bill asks the National Petroleum Council, a council that is made up of members from the oil and gas industry, to create a report that says that the United States needs more oil and gas. I fear that what this is a recipe for is higher electric bills and higher costs for hardworking Americans who already are being crushed by higher bills.

There are unbiased public servants who could write this report—for example, at the Department of Energy—but, of course, Elon Musk and the Trump administration have pushed out more than 3,500 public servants there. As a

result, the Department of Energy is in trouble. The Department has even had to ask external lawyers for things like defending against challenges relating to their illegal cancelations of projects across the country.

To bring this bill at a time when people really want to see the Congress work to solve problems, I think, demonstrates that Members are out of touch. It is part of a very disturbing Republican trend, led by the President, to purge the government of real experts and to slash and burn, like medical research, finding the cures and treatments that we need to survive and thrive; trying to illegally dismantle the Department of Education; and going after public health and really ruining a lot of the expert public health advice that helps keep our neighbors healthy and safe.

Then, here, when we are talking about oil and gas and their lobbyists, they are so firmly in control of the agenda here in the United States Congress. I just think my colleagues are not solving problems. Watching the President just remain out of touch is so painful to people back home that they feel betrayed.

Even during the Republican shutdown, was the President focused on trying to negotiate a solution there or trying to take us out of the healthcare crisis? No. He was giving the White House a makeover. He tore down the entire East Wing to make way for a 90,000-square-foot, \$300 million ballroom, funded by corporations that have a lot to gain monetarily; and he had "Great Gatsby" parties at Mar-a-Lago with dancing girls. It is just mind-boggling.

Back to electric bills. Let's not forget that President Trump convened oil industry executives and lobbyists at his home last year to ask for \$1 billion for his Presidential campaign. Well, now they are coming to collect.

Even after almost 2 months, when Speaker JOHNSON had the House of Representatives shut down because he didn't want to find a solution to rising healthcare costs and he wanted to avoid a vote to release the Epstein files, we could have been focusing on, behind the scenes, some ways to lower costs and solve real problems, but they continue to bring bills like this: a study on how we produce more oil and gas.

Here is the connection to higher bills. While they want to pad the profits of oil and gas companies, what they are doing to sabotage jobs and cleaner, cheaper energy now is showing up in people's electric bills, and they are angry.

I was with neighbors a couple of weeks ago who were burning their electric bills because costs are increasing so dramatically.

Why? On January 20, the President froze Federal leasing for wind projects and blocked permits for projects that had already been approved.

On February 5, the Army Corps of Engineers halted permits for 168 renewable energy projects on private lands.

In March, as part of his tariff war, he imposed a 10 percent tax on energy imported from Canada, hitting Midwestern States with higher gas prices.

In April, the Trump administration abruptly fired the entire staff overseeing the low-income Home Energy Assistance Program, which helps working families afford their utility bills. Weeks later, the White House proposed cutting it entirely.

In May, the Secretary of Energy ordered an old Michigan coal plant to stay online, forcing the company to spend nearly \$1 million a day. These are costs that are passed on to families across the Midwest.

In June, the Trump administration's EPA proposed a rule to allow coal and gas power plants to emit unlimited amounts of climate pollution, locking us into a dirtier and more expensive future.

In July, Republicans passed their big, ugly bill, which will saddle American families with price hikes of at least \$110 next year and up to \$4,000 annually within a decade.

In August, EPA announced an illegal cancellation of the \$7 billion Solar for All Grant Initiative, which was intended to bring affordable energy to more than 900,000 hardworking American households.

In September, the Trump administration unveiled a more than \$600 million bailout for coal plants to keep them online.

In October, while shutting down the government to deny Americans access to affordable healthcare, the White House tried to claw back billions in clean energy funds.

These actions are costly, and American families deserve better. We should be working together to solve problems and not wasting time on trying to figure out how we pad the profits of industries. Instead, we should be looking out for the pocketbooks of the people who sent us here. People deserve better. Hardworking Americans expect better of this Congress.

I hope that we can send a message on this bill and the next one that we are not going to put up with it anymore. We want real solutions to lower the cost of living.

□ 1320

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

It is frustrating that we lost 42 days because our side of the aisle wanted to open the government and wanted to have the government operating. We

wanted to sit down and work through the issues before us, not choosing to not fund the government.

I was always embarrassed to even look in the eye—I voted for all of it—to go see a TSA agent at the airport in Nashville in my home State of Tennessee where I fly out of, the FAA people going to work at the airport. I was embarrassed coming here and seeing the people sitting in front of us here, the people guarding the doors of the Capitol building, with no respect, having them come to work without respect and paying them. That was extremely frustrating to me. It is just beyond pale that that happened.

On the Epstein files, the Speaker tried to come and unanimous consent the Epstein files. Remember, last week he came down and said let's pass the Epstein files, and the other side of the aisle objected to it. I don't know why they would object to passing the files.

They held it up for several days. I know there were a few rallies that happened, and then we all voted. It was 427-1. Were they trying to get the Epstein files out, or were they trying to make sure people got in town for their rallies? That is what I would like to know.

The National Petroleum Council that we are referring to in this bill is a part of the Department of Energy. All through government, we have councils of people that are experts in their fields who come to D.C. The Department of Labor has them. People from the labor community come and have councils to give advice on bills.

We know we have ample crude. We know the ingenuity of the American people to have ample crude. What we are talking about today is where 40 refineries in California have gone to 14. If you want affordability, not only do you have to be able to get the crude out of the ground, you have to refine it to where we can use it.

As we are shrinking refining capacity in this country and increasing demand, if we don't increase supply, we are not going to have affordability. You can talk about affordability all you want, but you have got to have the supply to address it. That is what we are focused on doing today.

We want the experts to give us their information. We don't have to do what they say. We want to take their information, take the good ideas and try to implement them into where we can provide lower prices.

If you think this doesn't work, come buy gas in Kentucky. Then go to my good friends who are sitting here from California and buy gas in their State, then tell us what does efficient energy policy do for affordability. I will challenge them to do that. I will say you can buy the most expensive gas in Kentucky, and we will compare that to what is going on in California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my good friend and very important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3109, the REFINER Act.

For too long, America has fallen behind in refining capacity. In fact, we have lost an estimated 1 million barrels of fuel per day due to low refining capacity.

The Biden administration declared war on American energy by suspending oil and gas leasing on Federal lands, delaying permits for energy infrastructure, and canceling the Keystone XL pipeline.

With President Trump and House Republicans in charge, those days are over with now.

The REFINER Act offers a common-sense solution to this critical issue. This bill requires the National Petroleum Council to submit a report to Congress analyzing the capacity of American refining and recommending how we can increase our refining capacity.

The American people elected us to lower prices, especially prices at the pump. This bill will provide crucial data and guidance on how we can best reinforce our domestic energy infrastructure and help ensure fuel costs are low for Americans.

This bill is an important step toward delivering American energy dominance. It is something the President has worked on and is diligent about.

If we are going to power domestic manufacturing, if we are going to beat China in the AI race, and then deliver on affordable energy for all, we must ensure that domestic refining can keep up.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend Representative LATTA for introducing this important piece of legislation, and I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, this report obviously does absolutely nothing to address the prices of power and electricity that continues to go up.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a document from the Joint Economic Committee, as well as a link to the document located at: [https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/\\_cache/files/22e24fd6-4db7-44c6-93a9-9710c6f48b85/electricity-bills-report.pdf](https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/22e24fd6-4db7-44c6-93a9-9710c6f48b85/electricity-bills-report.pdf)

[From the Joint Economic Committee  
Minority, Nov. 2025]

#### STATE-BY-STATE DATA: ANNUAL ELECTRICITY BILLS UP \$100 PER FAMILY IN 2025

Last year, President Donald Trump repeatedly promised that energy bills across the country would be "cut in half" within 12 months. However, this new Joint Economic Committee—Minority analysis finds that electricity costs are increasing significantly, with households in nearly every state on track to pay more for electricity this year compared to last year.

The Committee estimated full-year 2025 electricity costs per state based on the monthly electricity bill data released by the federal Energy Information Administration (EIA) for January–August of 2025. The Committee projects that annual electricity costs will be at least 5 percent higher than last year in 37 states plus D.C., and at least 10

percent higher than last year in 10 states plus D.C. On average, the Committee projects that American households will pay approximately \$100 more per household in electricity costs this year.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last year, as I think everyone knows, President Donald Trump repeatedly promised that energy bills across the country would be cut in half within 12 months of his taking office. This shows a State-by-State analysis of how much electricity bills have gone up instead of being cut.

Just to mention to my two colleagues, here in Kentucky, it says that they have gone up 11.8 percent; in Ohio, 9.9 percent; in New Jersey, 13.6 percent. Certainly nothing like the cut in half that President Donald Trump promised. This report projects that American households will pay approximately \$100 more per household in electricity costs this year.

We are going to deal with this pricing issue when we get to the next bill about LNG, which, again, is only going to increase prices. It is clear that the Republicans have no intention of dealing with this crisis of affordability with electric or power bills, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend from Kentucky that it has been a long time since you have been to the Bay Area, so I will take you up on your offer.

One of the reasons I wanted to come down and speak to this is because I represent an area in the Bay Area that has five refineries in it. They have been valuable tax providers and employers for many years. One of them is about to close and another one is in the process of closing. Two others have spent billions of dollars to work on transitional fuels, to put investment into those refineries to produce biofuels that are part of the transition to cleaner, safer, more economical energy sources. The last one, Chevron, is doing both.

I must say I am reminded, as I sit here, to the same arguments 30 years ago having been involved at the local level in California about secondhand smoke and tobacco when the tobacco industry was insisting that the Tobacco Institute do studies about the cost to smokers by passing secondhand smoke ordinances that figured out the full cost to consumers for people who didn't smoke.

As a former restaurant owner, who didn't allow people to smoke, it just reminds me of the same thing. I believe in research because I have worked with a refinery and oil companies for many years. I was one of those regulators. I represented the Bay Area on the California Air Resources Board for 10 years. I was appointed by two Republicans, by the way, and one Democrat.

What we have done is, we are transitioning. Twenty-five percent of the cars in northern California last

year were EVs. They were alternative fuels. We knew this was coming. We have tried to work and invest in the refinery community on how we transition for the local government, who required those taxes, and for the employers-employees who need those jobs.

Let's do research on how we transition and give States the ability to transition, if they choose, and local governments to transition. While I value the research, let's be honest about having more research that is more objective and consider the full cost to changing our energy.

Almost 50 million Americans live within a mile of a refinery or a heavy processing plant. Their public health costs are disproportionately affected by what we know from traditional pollutants, particulate matter, and smog. Then when you add carbon into it, the economic model changes completely.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to Mr. GUTHRIE, before he comes out to the Bay Area, we have a collegial conversation and we can go to those refineries. I would particularly like to take him to the ones that have invested on the transition because we know we need a transition for those of us who want to go to as near-zero emissions as possible, and we are succeeding.

I will remind my colleagues, too, across the aisle that the Chinese are our global competition. The Chinese auto manufacturing industry is about to become the largest auto manufacturer in the world. They are all EVs.

They are moving to this. While we try to protect traditional energy sources, let's be smart about the transition economically for American consumers and taxpayers.

I don't disagree with looking at capacity, but let's do it in a broader and more objective way that tells the full story as truthfully as possible, so we as policymakers can be more thoughtful about the short-term impacts of our policy decisions, as well as in the mid-term and long term.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from California, and I actually do love going to California. I haven't been in the bay area in a couple of years, and we will figure out an opportunity to come there. My family tries to go to California as much as we can. I know he is from the beautiful bay area. Actually, when I was talking about the high price of gas, it was down in southern California, which has its own beauty, as well.

I am a fan of California. Other than Kentucky, I think California is one of the prettiest States we have in the Union. From the redwoods to the Yosemite Valley, it is absolutely stunning. I absolutely would love to come back out to the bay area because it is beautiful, as well.

In this bill, we are talking about electricity prices. China is building the

electric car industry, but they are also building the power generation, like a coal plant a week, I think, to provide the energy for that.

This bill we are talking about is on gasoline and diesel. Remember, everything that arrives to a store comes on a truck. Sometimes they come on a train, but the last mile is almost always or is always a truck. Diesel prices, fuel prices, matter in terms of food prices and about everything else that we consume.

This is important to do. Electric affordability is also important to do, and we are committed. We will work together to get our prices down, but we have to produce more.

That is what we are wondering. How do we efficiently, effectively, safely, and cleanly produce more gasoline and diesel? You can't do it without more refining capacity unless you decrease demand for it. That is not the avenue we have to go, either.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my good friend and the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that our friends across the aisle say that we already have enough oil. It is also interesting that President Obama, when he—the gentleman from Georgia, BUDDY CARTER, mentioned the Keystone pipeline. It would have come into my district in Texas, 830,000 barrels of oil a day. That is what we are talking about refining on the Gulf Coast of Texas. If you transfer that to 18-wheelers, it is about 5,253 18-wheeler tankers on the road every day. The pipeline is the best way to do this.

Mr. Speaker, in Texas, we understand better than anyone else that America's energy strength depends on what happens to the oil after it comes out of the ground. The Keystone pipeline is a good example.

Mr. Speaker, it is our refineries, the men and women who run them, and the communities built around those businesses that turn our resources into fuels and products that power everyday life.

The REFINER Act takes on a question that Washington has ignored for far too long: Are we doing enough to protect and expand America's ability to refine the energy we produce? Right now, unfortunately, the answer is no, we are not.

Over the last several years, America's refining capacity has gone backward. We have lost more than a million barrels of capacity per day, and several facilities have shut down altogether. The gentleman from California mentioned one of them.

In several States, hostile policies are pushing refineries out so fast that families are now facing higher prices and increased dependence on foreign fuel.

That is not how you build energy security, Mr. Speaker. That is how you weaken it.

Meanwhile, global demand for fuels is still rising and is expected to grow as much as 20 million barrels a day by 2050.

The world isn't slowing down, Mr. Speaker, and neither should American energy.

The REFINER Act takes a serious look at that situation, directs the National Petroleum Council to review our refining capacity, identify where we are vulnerable, and highlight opportunities for us to expand. In other words, it gives us the facts we need to strengthen a critical part of our energy supply chain.

When refineries close, families suffer; small businesses suffer; transportation costs rise; and prices jump at the pump. The whole region becomes dependent on foreign suppliers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the opposite of the energy dominance vision that we are working toward under President Trump.

Let me tell you this, Mr. Speaker—you know this—in Texas, we know what happens when refineries thrive. We fuel the Nation. We even supply our allies. We make money doing this, and we support thousands of good-paying jobs.

The REFINER Act recognizes that refining isn't an afterthought. It is a foundational piece of our national security, as well as our economic strength.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3109.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, other than the Commonwealth of Kentucky, California is one of those beautiful States in our—they are all beautiful, actually. We live in a wonderful country. There is nothing prettier than the tunnel view from Yosemite Valley.

I don't know, with your lines changing so much, but I know my good friend from California used to represent our beautiful natural resources in the National Park of Yosemite Valley. He still does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my good friend and a classmate elected the same year.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, no one has suffered more than Californians because of the left's war on fossil fuels. Forty years of folly are now driving energy prices out of reach for working families and driving those working families out of California.

In 1980, 40 refineries served the California market, producing abundant gasoline at easily affordable prices. Mr. LATTA said 14 refineries were left. His numbers are old. We are now down to

nine refineries, and two more of those, Phillips in southern California and Valero in northern California, are closing by April. That will leave us just seven refineries to serve the State.

Californians already pay the highest gasoline prices in the United States, averaging \$4.64 a gallon as of yesterday. The same gallon costs only \$2.56 in Oklahoma.

When we lose these next two refineries, economists at UC Berkeley predict Californians will be paying more than \$8 a gallon by the summer. Left-wing zealots like Gavin Newsom obsess over a 1-degree rise in global temperatures over the next century, but they couldn't care less that they are making it impossible for growing numbers of Californians to heat their homes or get to work.

This is not only a quality-of-life issue for Californians and a cautionary tale for the rest of the country. It is a national security risk, as well. Forty military bases depend on these dwindling West Coast refineries. As California strangles production, we must increasingly rely on foreign imports from our enemies.

H.R. 3109 requires the National Petroleum Council to report on ways to reverse such foolish and self-destructive policies. What has happened to California is the predictable result of bad policy made by fools.

I hope the REFINER Act will shine a light on their folly and recommend ways to reverse the damage that they have caused before they can do any more harm to our Nation's prosperity and security.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FONG), who is from Bakersfield, California, and was elected just recently to Congress.

Mr. FONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3109, the REFINER Act.

This legislation is critical to unleashing our energy potential, lowering costs for hardworking families, and protecting our national security.

U.S. refineries are vital to our energy ecosystem. They convert crude oil into fuels and countless products, ranging from shoes and plastics to cell phones, computers, solar panels, medical devices, and even space suits. They make gasoline and diesel for our cars and trucks, and they make jet fuel for our planes.

Yet, over the past few years, our refining capacity has declined due to burdensome Federal and State policies.

I know this bitter reality all too well in my home State of California.

□ 1340

From 2020 to 2022, we lost more than 1 million barrels of production capacity per day, and refinery closures are projected to slash that capacity by 20 percent over the next year. Twenty percent of our refining capacity is going to disappear overnight.

Since 2018, over 360 energy companies have left California. Oil production has dropped by 47 million barrels over the past 5 years, and foreign imports now account for over 60 percent of our crude supply in California.

Californians pay nearly \$5 a gallon. In fact, Californians are paying the highest gas and electricity prices in the Nation, thanks to Governor Gavin Newsom's radical-left failed energy policies. California has an affordability crisis that Governor Gavin Newsom created, but this crisis also goes well beyond the pump.

As California fuel production declines, it jeopardizes our national security and undermines our military readiness, as multiple strategic military bases rely on California fuel. With threats from our foreign adversaries, like China, only continuing to grow, we cannot risk leaving our defenses weakened.

The REFINER Act is common sense. It will help identify ways to expand refining capacity, protect our energy infrastructure, and strengthen our national security.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now to restore American energy dominance, secure affordable fuel for families, and protect our Nation's military defense. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3109.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I urge President Trump and my Republican colleagues to start taking the American affordability crisis seriously. President Trump is simply out of touch with the reality that American families are facing.

Earlier this week, he seemed to mockingly suggest that "affordability" is a word the Democrats made up to attack him. Well, that is rich coming from a man who has declared bankruptcy six times. The American people are hurting because of President Trump and the Republican policies, and they should not be mocked for that. Even FOX News reported last night that 76 percent of Americans view the economy negatively.

Americans are struggling to afford basic necessities. A new report from The Century Foundation found that utility prices are up 32 percent since 2022. That is nearly three times the rate of inflation. Nearly a quarter of that jump occurred just this year alone. These rising costs are debilitating to the middle class. Nearly 1 in 20 households are in severe utility debt.

Roughly 4 million Americans are at risk of having their utility bills sent to collections. It is an incredible number. They have done nothing wrong. They just can't afford to keep up with the exponential rise in electricity prices. They can't afford to pay the bill.

Now, the two bills that are on the floor today, in my opinion, will only increase the average utility bill even further. Just last week, the U.S. Energy Information Association found that natural gas prices will rise by 16

percent in 2026, primarily due to increased LNG exports amid flat production growth.

Secretary Chris Wright promised to double LNG exports to countries like China within 5 years. The next bill that we are going to consider is all about giving more LNG to China, to Beijing, to Communist China. Why are we helping them?

The American people desperately need a solution to lower energy costs at home. Why does the President or the Secretary refuse to take care of the American people that the Trump administration is supposed to represent?

Now, I have said it before, but it bears repeating: The Trump administration only cares about bailing out themselves and their fossil fuel friends.

It is time for Republicans to come to the table to work with Democrats on a solution to this affordability crisis, and it can begin here with the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about rising prices. My friend from New Jersey talked about since 2022, and he said the emphasis is on what has happened in the first few months of this year.

The decisions were made prior to the present Trump administration to take power offline. I know in my community down in Bowling Green, Kentucky, a few years ago with the polar vortex, we actually had blackouts, we had to have rolling blackouts because of taking power offline.

We all want to address it. The way we address this is not taking power offline, not building new, safer—my good friend from California talked about what they are doing in California to make refineries cleaner and safer, and that is what we want. We want refineries to refine in a safe, responsible, and sustainable way. We can work together to do that.

On the LNG we are going to talk about in just a few minutes, we do have the gas in our country. We have people who can develop, particularly in your home State, Mr. Speaker. The problem is, can we move it to where it needs to go. We know the challenge isn't the access to gas, it is actually moving it to where it needs to be.

We need to work together. I think Natural Resources today had a markup, T&I is working on a markup, and we hopefully can work together as Members across the aisle in the Energy and Commerce Committee to do our share to make sure this explosive growth of energy is not just in gas and diesel but also in electricity. We need every electron we can produce to beat China.

Talking about China, China is struggling and working as hard as they can to beat us to control the data that flows around the world through AI. It



is our job on this committee to see that that doesn't happen for this country, and that is because we have to have enough energy.

Again, this is a Department of Energy council, made up of people in the industry, to give us a report to see where we should go in making sure that America has proper refining. It is not a report that is going to produce what we do. It is the kind of report that informs us in what we do. I know on our side of the aisle—I think on both sides of the aisle—we try to take as much information as we can to make a reasonable decision to make sure we have clean, sustainable, but ample and safe fuel for this country in order to get groceries to the grocery store, either through diesel or gasoline.

Prices matter. It hurts families when their electric bills are high and when their grocery bills are high because people have to eat and they have to have a safe and clean place to live. This is what this is about. This is what our struggle is over, and this is what we are going to accomplish as a committee.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yes” vote on H.R. 3109, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Ferrari, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2741. An Act to establish within the Environmental Protection Agency the Office of Mountains, Deserts, and Plains, and for other purposes.

S. 2878. An Act to reauthorize funding to monitor, assess, and research the Great Lakes Basin, and for other purposes.

S. 3022. An Act to amend the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act to reauthorize certain Environmental Protection Agency programs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the request of the House of Representatives that the Senate return to the House the bill (H.R. 3426) entitled “An Act to amend title 40, United States Code, to limit the

construction of new courthouses under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.”.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, and further amended by Public Law 106-292, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senator to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 119th Congress:

The Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

#### UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL ACT OF 2025

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 879, I call up the bill (H.R. 1949) to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1949

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2025”.

##### SEC. 2. ADVANCING UNITED STATES GLOBAL LEADERSHIP.

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 trans-

action 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.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1350

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1949.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in February 2016, the first cargo of U.S. LNG set sail from the lower 48, making the United States a natural gas exporter for the first time since the 1960s.

Since then, exports have increased from 5 billion cubic feet per day in 2016 to nearly 12 billion cubic feet per day in 2024, making the U.S. the global leader in LNG in less than a decade.

U.S. LNG has played an undeniably important role in providing affordable, abundant, and clean energy to the world. This could not have been more evident than in 2022, when Russia invaded Ukraine, disrupting global commodity markets and leaving Europe without secure access to energy.

Immediately, for our friends in Europe, U.S. producers began sending cargoes of American gas to the Continent to fuel their economies and heat their homes, helping some of our most important global allies and friends.

However, in January 2024, the Biden-Harris administration announced an illegal and indefinite ban on new export authorizations, all in the name of vaguely stated climate change goals. Current law is clear. Requiring a statutory presumption in favor of exports are in the public interest.

Plus, the vast majority of studies show that not only do LNG exports boost our energy security but they also help maintain low domestic natural gas prices for Americans.