

bills for energy independence and to end the Biden push for Chinese batteries.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism moves from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. We do not need new border laws. We need to enforce existing laws. Biden shamefully opens borders for dictators as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as warned by the FBI.

Our prayers for the family of the late Richard Quinn.

#### PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, Americans are feeling the harsh impact of President Biden's assault on domestic energy production when they fill their gas tanks or pay their electricity bills.

Instead of relieving these costs and unleashing domestic energy production, President Biden is choosing to push the Green New Deal again by threatening to place a moratorium on fracking. Since 1947, fracking has been instrumental in safely unlocking vast reservoirs of oil and natural gas, lowering energy costs, providing jobs for hardworking Americans, and propelling our Nation toward energy independence.

Permitting the use of this technology is detrimental to our energy security and represents a significant Federal overreach of State sovereignty by undermining their authority to regulate production within their own borders.

It is time we put an end to President Biden's anti-American energy policy and pass legislation, such as H.R. 1121, to protect American energy production, preserve State regulatory authority, and lower energy costs for families around the country.

#### RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE MARCIA FUDGE

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Marcia Fudge, my friend, former colleague, and the current and soon-to-be-former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. I recognize Secretary Fudge for her service to our Nation, to our great State of Ohio, and to her local community.

I had the privilege of working alongside Representative Fudge for 9 years in this Chamber, working together to tackle the issues that matter the most to Ohioans. She has been a tireless advocate for Ohioans, willing to reach across the aisle to find common ground on key issues, like advancing access to affordable housing.

While we, of course, didn't always see eye to eye on everything, Marcia and I shared the important goal of helping Americans have the opportunities and resources needed to achieve the American Dream.

I am grateful to have had a fellow Ohioan working as Secretary on behalf of so many of my constituents. Public servants like Secretary Fudge, always willing to roll up her sleeves and get to the business of the American people, are a credit to our community.

I wish Marcia the best on the next stage of her journey.

#### GETTING GOOD VALUE FOR TAX DOLLARS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, when people earn their paycheck, their wages, money off of stocks, whatever it is, they are going to spend their money on things that are a good value for them. Why isn't government, when they take their tax dollars involuntarily, getting a good value for them?

I am speaking, in California, of the high-speed rail system. I call it high-cost rail. The price has quadrupled over what the voters were sold back about 15 years ago when they were told a high-speed train from Los Angeles to San Francisco could be built for \$33 billion. The price tag is well over \$125 billion, and it is many years behind as well.

They are still about \$100 billion short of the funding it would take to complete this project. They don't even have the route mapped out.

Instead, why don't we invest tax dollars that are taken from the people involuntarily in things that can really benefit them, such as a water supply, a stable water supply, better communication systems, more rural broadband, things that can help people be connected in more ways besides a silly train, which is deemed the biggest boondoggle in a long time, connecting L.A. to San Francisco? Instead, it is connecting an orchard in Bakersfield to a place called Merced—not a good deal for taxpayers.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mr. SUOZZI, New York

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1085, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 86

Whereas a carbon tax is a Federal tax on carbon released from fossil fuels;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase energy prices, including the price of gasoline, electricity, natural gas, and home heating oil;

Whereas a carbon tax will mean that families and consumers will pay more for essentials like food, gasoline, and electricity;

Whereas a carbon tax will fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to more jobs and businesses moving overseas;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to less economic growth;

Whereas American families will be harmed the most from a carbon tax;

Whereas, according to the Energy Information Administration, the share of energy consumption during 2023 in the United States that was derived from fossil fuels was approximately 80 percent;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax will impose disproportionate burdens on certain industries, jobs, States, and geographic regions and would further restrict the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas American ingenuity has led to innovations in energy exploration and development and has increased production of domestic energy resources on private and State-owned land which has created significant job growth and private capital investment;

Whereas the energy policy of the United States should encourage continued private sector innovation and development and not increase the existing tax burden on manufacturers;

Whereas the production of American energy resources increases the ability of the United States to maintain a competitive advantage in today's global economy;

Whereas a carbon tax would reduce America's global competitiveness and would encourage development abroad in countries that do not impose this exorbitant tax burden; and

Whereas the Congress and the President should focus on pro-growth solutions that encourage increased development of domestic resources: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways

and Means or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, working families are struggling to make ends meet, to afford to put food on their table, clothes on their backs, and gasoline in their cars, all because of the inflation crisis that has been fueled by Washington Democrats' runaway spending and President Biden's failed economic policies.

The last thing America needs is a carbon tax. It would raise energy prices and harm American competitiveness. It would put American workers and job creators at a disadvantage to appease the President's wealthy environmentalist donors and their far-left agenda.

The Biden administration is already giving billion-dollar corporations and big banks massive tax breaks under the so-called Inflation Reduction Act. This is the same administration that is celebrating spending over a trillion dollars and counting on special interest green energy handouts, including electric vehicle tax credits for wealthy households, while funneling American tax dollars to countries like China.

For working families, a carbon tax would not only raise prices at the pump but also at the grocery store. It would raise the cost of doing business on Main Street at a time when America's small businesses are struggling under the highest interest rates in over two decades. Those who can least afford to pay more, like seniors on fixed incomes, would suffer the most.

Today, Congress can send a loud and clear message to the American people and the Biden administration that says: Not on our watch. Not on our watch will there be an anti-American family, anti-American worker, pro-China carbon tax, while trillions of those same hardworking Americans' tax dollars go to line the pockets of the wealthy and well connected.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am listening to my dear friend from Missouri, and it is an

example of sort of being disconnected from reality.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, for instance, refuse to accept a compromise that is on a bipartisan basis that would make a difference in dealing with immigration. I think that will rank along with Speaker Boehner's refusal to accept the bipartisan Senate compromise for immigration and not even allow it to come to the floor to be voted on.

Today, we are having an exercise in futility. There is no carbon tax pending, and Republicans have nothing here that would be significant. It is a non-binding resolution, and as I say, it is disconnected from the reality.

The reality, for example, for those of us on the West Coast, is that the climate crisis is real. It becomes more apparent and urgent every day. This winter was the warmest winter on record in the United States, 5.4 degrees higher. 2023 was the world's warmest year on record. In fact, the 10 warmest years have occurred in the last 10 years.

What is the response from our Republican friends? They make stuff up and move away from solutions that would make a difference.

Every independent analyst, Republican and Democrat alike, agrees that the way that we are going to deal with carbon pollution, notwithstanding some of the climate deniers on the other side of the aisle, is a carbon tax. The rest of the world is moving in this direction.

Having a price on carbon is the most efficient, cost-effective, and fair way to deal with this crisis. However, the majority is having none of it. As I say, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are making stuff up in the face of things that have real consequences.

There are people dying in the Pacific Northwest from the unprecedented heat wave. We have had unprecedented events in California, extreme weather events. The costs of those extreme weather events dwarf the costs that my Republican colleagues are dreaming up in fantasy.

In 2022, the climate disasters totaled more than \$165 billion. The United States needs to double down on our investments in the Inflation Reduction Act to halt the worst and most expensive consequences of the climate crisis.

Instead, my Republican colleagues put forth a nonbinding resolution that doubles as a love letter to Big Oil. It paints a grim picture of the impacts of a tax on carbon, a picture that is, in fact, completely divorced from reality. Areas that have placed taxes on carbon have fostered innovation, and it is a preferred approach for most of the thoughtful business community.

The global cost of climate change is estimated to be over \$3 trillion per year by 2050. Further investments in oil and gas without accounting for the true costs of carbon will overly drag down our economy and increase this sum.

Moreover, this resolution purports to show concern about the costs to Amer-

ican families associated with a carbon tax, particularly the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes. Those are the people who are going to pay the cost most dramatically from continued efforts to allow the climate crisis to move forward.

Every single Republican voted against the Inflation Reduction Act, a bill that has already saved households hundreds of dollars in energy costs, not to mention hundreds more on prescription drugs. The Republicans all voted against it, yet the majority's constituents are benefiting. My colleagues didn't care about reducing the costs back then, and we shouldn't fall victim to Republicans' attempts to pretend about reducing costs now.

The longer we fail to deal meaningfully with the climate crisis, the defining question of the 21st century, our answer will determine the lives of our children and grandchildren.

□ 1230

We have made already significant strides in lowering costs and investing in clean energy. This love letter to Big Oil is absolutely the wrong step, and it is one they will be unable to justify to their children and grandchildren. It is a wrongheaded, inaccurate approach, one that is sadly not where we should be now, not where they should be, and it defies reality.

I strongly urge—even though it is nonbinding and doesn't make a difference, we will go ahead and play this out—but I urge its rejection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to President Biden's planned carbon tax, which would, quite frankly, kill the American economy.

Now, nobody can dispute that America produces cleaner energy than our adversaries or allies. That is not a dispute.

When I was Secretary of the Interior, we were producing 8.3 million barrels a day and declining.

After 2 years of President Trump, we were the world's largest exporter of energy and, by the way, we reduced emissions. We had the record in safety because nobody produces energy more cost-effective and cleaner than we do.

So the answer is not to punish American producers or Americans for having a resource and using it wisely, but there are three absolutes on the carbon tax: first, the environment.

It is undisputed that it is better to produce energy in this country under reasonable regulation than watch it get produced overseas with no regulation. That is not in dispute.

Second: manufacturing and economy. My good friend from Oregon reminds us that perhaps hundreds have saved on their electric bills. I can tell you that millions have not.

When I was Secretary, gas was about \$2 a gallon. I think it is a little over

that. If anyone looked at their last year's heating bills or around the kitchen table at Thanksgiving, I think we have paid a price.

On our economy: What drives manufacturing? First of all, it is labor. We are not going to be competitive paying wages that China or India can pay. Second of all, it is resources. The cost of steel is about the same in South Korea as it is in Pittsburgh.

Where America has the edge are two things: innovation and energy. Today's energy is going to be different than tomorrow's energy needs. Data storage, robotics, all require more and more energy, and that energy is not going to come from pixie dust and hope.

National security is an area I am familiar with. I have lost a lot of friends and colleagues overseas, primarily fighting for other people's oil and energy. I think it is immoral to send our troops overseas to fight for a resource we have here.

A carbon tax makes America less competitive. It forces families to pay more for groceries that they are already struggling with. It also forces our allies, who now depend on low-cost American energy to do a transition, to where? EV in Chinaland?

Does anyone realize that 85 percent of the critical minerals that power EV—such as lithium and nickel—and the processing are all in China?

The very idea that we would make ourselves less competitive and give the advantage to our adversaries—and who is going to produce energy if it is not us? Who will? I can make a list: perhaps Iran, perhaps Venezuela, perhaps Russia.

We either produce the energy in this country under our regulations for the environment, for national security to run our country, or we cede. We retreat.

This carbon tax is a terrible idea.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am listening to my dear friend from Montana and the University of Oregon, and I couldn't disagree more.

We have the opportunity to produce clean energy in the United States. The cost today of alternatives with wind and solar is cheaper than fossil fuel, and this is where the world is going. Having our technological edge to produce cleaner energy and not be susceptible to those international forces is absolutely essential.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in strong opposition to this foolish and useless resolution while my Republican colleagues rush to support Big Oil instead of America's seniors, children, and workers.

It is not rocket science. We all know that carbon-intensive industries harm our planet. It is also clear from air and water pollution, to floods, to wildfires that lower income communities face the greatest risks tied to climate change.

Families of color often have access to the fewest resources to prepare for or recover from extreme weather events and other environmental emergencies. So much for looking out for the costs of the little people.

As a mom and as a legislator, I will never stop fighting to help ensure that our Nation's children inherit a greener and healthier world.

My Republican colleagues want to choke this planet in carbon dioxide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this GOP effort to prop up oil and gas companies who, by the way, make record profits year after year while American families continue to struggle.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 86, which would express the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

This resolution makes it clear to the American people that we oppose policies that would drive up energy prices for families, businesses, and undermine U.S. energy security, and make Americans more dependent upon China.

A carbon tax would be a gift to our adversaries. It would restrict U.S. energy producers' ability to provide reliable energy to the grid and reduce exports to our allies. It further supports China's goal of dominating and profiting from Biden's green technologies and radical climate agenda.

In addition, the cost of this tax would be borne by the most vulnerable: the poor, the elderly, and those who are living on a fixed income.

Americans are already suffering from the effects of Bidenflation and the President's attack on U.S. energy. If this carbon tax took effect, Americans would feel the pain when they buy their gas for their cars, turn on their lights, or adjust the thermostats in their home.

The burden of a carbon tax would increase the price of everyday necessities, consumer goods, and anything that requires energy resources in their production, manufacturing, transport, or distribution.

This resolution makes it clear that we oppose policies that would drive up energy prices, damage the United States' economy, reduce the American GDP, and hurt American jobs.

I will fight tooth and nail to make sure that our God-given natural resources remain the foundation of America's energy economy, while promoting innovation and an all-of-the-above energy policy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this love letter to Big Oil.

The Republicans' myopic focus on extreme policies has undermined our

ability to enact broader tax reforms to support Americans.

Rather than pushing this propaganda against green energy and climate change, Congress should be focused on advancing tax policies that support children, families, workers, and businesses.

Above all, Congress should be focused on restoring the 2021 child tax credit that halved child poverty in 1 year. The progress we made in 2021 shows that we can slash child poverty when we have the political will to do so.

Congress should restore the 2021 child and dependent care tax credit that gave up to \$8,000 to working parents for childcare costs for two or more children, which was much better than the current maximum of 2,100.

Congress should restore the 2021 earned income tax credit that helped foster and homeless youth, as well as single workers from being taxed into poverty.

Congress should remove income as a barrier to adoption, restore the above-the-line charitable deduction to help nonitemizers and support the amazing charities that support our communities, enact critical improvements to the low-income housing tax credit, and help cost-burdened renters by implementing a refundable renter's tax credit.

Workers, families, and businesses need our help. Today's resolution represents hollow extremist talking points and lacks the political will to cut child poverty in half. Every day we delay action, poverty poisons the futures of millions of children.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I just have to note that my dear friend from West Virginia, a woman I deeply respect, would have reliance on fossil fuel for energy security.

In her own State of West Virginia, the cheapest sources of power are renewable energy sources like wind and solar, which we incentivized with our policies and all of our Republican friends voted against.

The market has made a judgment that these are the most cost-effective ways to generate energy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 86, a disingenuous resolution that wastes our time while it misleadingly attacks a carbon tax.

Continuing with yesterday's shameless giveaways to Big Oil and Gas, Republicans' next energy week bill asserts that a carbon tax would raise food prices and the cost of every good in America, while ignoring the cost of climate change to communities hit hardest by flooding, wildfires, and other climate catastrophes, all while oil and gas executives maximize their profits. This is unacceptable.

The reality is that when Democrats controlled the House, Senate, and

White House, we did not pursue a carbon tax. Instead, we passed historic tax credits that are incentivizing and fueling the clean energy transition.

The Inflation Reduction Act was the largest climate investment in history and through it, we are powering economic growth, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs, and advancing environmental justice.

□ 1245

While asserting a carbon tax would raise food prices, Republican leadership refuses to disavow their own Members' proposals, like the FairTax Act, which would actually be a 30 percent sales tax on everything, including groceries, medical bills, tuition, insurance, and, yes, fossil fuel products like gas that you buy at the pump, hurting the very same people they are purporting to help.

Ultimately, this resolution represents yet another attempt by House Republicans to favor corporate interests, including Big Oil, over job-creating clean energy policies and climate solutions that benefit American families and our planet. They are trying to distract from the reality that the U.S. is hitting record levels of domestic energy production under President Biden.

We welcome Republican support in facilitating the transition to clean energy. Instead, they remain focused on doing everything they can do to undo this progress. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Republicans used to believe in market forces. They were part of a bipartisan effort to reduce acid rain, which had a cap, which in the short term increased price, but drove innovation. We solved that problem for a fraction of the alternative costs.

Denying the ability to price carbon is turning our back on innovation, turning our back on what the rest of the world is doing, and providing more opportunities for Americans.

I hope at some point they will rediscover the power of market forces and join us in efforts with the legislation that we have passed to harness those market forces and promote American innovation, as we are seeing now under the Inflation Reduction Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out just how out of step this House Republican majority is; not just with the American people, but with their own party.

This resolution denounces the free market, capitalist solution to lower carbon pollution that originally was introduced by Republicans. That is right, Republicans, the GOP.

Are we not for a free market anymore?

I am old enough to remember when it was Republicans in this Chamber who

came to the well, as I am doing today, to speak in support of carbon pricing, but now it is a radical idea.

Even today, there are bipartisan bills, including some that I am co-leading, that would put a price on carbon, protect our markets from pollution-intensive foreign goods, and put money back in the American people's pockets.

Americans support putting a price on carbon by a 3-1 margin, with twice as many Republicans supporting the idea than opposing it.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, do not just take my word for it. Take the word of the vast majority of the American people. Hundreds of mayors from all over America, every single former Federal Reserve Chair, 28 Nobel Prize-winning economists, Republican Members of Congress, and veterans of the Ronald Reagan administration. If that is not enough, take Elon Musk's word for it: Carbon pricing is "the obvious move" and worthy of consideration, not condemnation.

What has happened to the Republican Party? I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman's tutorial on economics and history, and I could not agree with him more. I hope at some point our Republican colleagues rediscover the power of the market, like what would happen with the carbon tax, which we are seeing around the world moving in this direction.

There are two basic approaches we can take. One is to use market forces, like putting a price on carbon, or simply being the handmaiden to Big Oil.

I can't think of a more dramatic example of the fallacy of that approach than to look at the home State of our Speaker that has done the bidding of Big Oil for decades.

What is the result of that impact in Louisiana? It hasn't been a hotbed of economic development. To the contrary. But there are other consequences that are serious.

A recent study by the Environmental Integrity Project found that Louisiana is home to eight of the worst polluting refineries in the entire country. Their refineries make up half of the top 10 ammonia polluters. A region on the banks of the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Baton Rouge is known as Cancer Alley because of the negative consequences of the petroleum industry and the refusal of the State to provide regulation.

The untrammelled growth of the fossil fuel industry has resulted in cutting up the landscape, the loss of about one football field a day into the Gulf of Mexico. Parts of the State are sinking. Their low birth rates and preterm births are double the national average, and respiratory ailments are nearly triple. The vast majority of the residents who suffer are Black.

Look at New Orleans and the consequences of Louisiana to what hap-

pens when you just do the bidding of the oil companies. It is not better environmentally and it is not better economically. It has been, pure and simply, a disaster.

An alternative is to use market forces, to tax what we would like least of. A carbon tax would raise prices for some, but it would foster innovation. That is exactly what we did with our approach to acid rain. It sparked innovation and cured that problem much more cost effectively than other solutions.

It is time for the Republican Party to rediscover market forces and be able to do what the vast majority of economic experts—Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal—agree is the best solution. Rather than lots of rules and regulations, use market forces. We have done that with our Inflation Reduction Act, sparking innovation and investment, even though all my Republican friends voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, there are two approaches: Give in to Big Oil, abandon your principles for environmental protection, market forces for innovation, or look at alternatives that will help us deal with the crisis of our age, the climate crisis.

I appreciate the opportunity to share those observations with you, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would hope at a time when it looks like we are starting to see some adjustment on the other side of the aisle, we are starting to see some of the people in the governing wing of the Republican Party moving forward to try and rein in some of their more extreme elements, we may actually deal with what we should have done months ago, which is fund the government according to the agreement that 149 Republicans signed onto last spring.

I have had a little fun tweaking some of my Republican friends, but we know how this is ending up, and that is exactly what is happening. Some people in the more extreme elements of the Republican Party may feel a little pinched, but this is what we agreed to.

This is an approach that solves the problem. It is not a good solution. It is not the solution we would have done, but it is the only one that the extreme elements of the Republican Party will allow us to move forward with. It is better than having a collapse of the economy, our agreements moving forward.

I hope that we will have the governing wing of the Republican Party moving forward and that this might be a path forward because there are so many things that we ought to be able to agree upon: innovation; protecting the American public; lowering costs,

like we did with our legislation for prescription drugs, like we are doing now in terms of energy innovation.

The record is pretty strong. We have the lowest rate of inflation of any developed economy in the world. We have watched the inflation rate, which my Republican friends are focused on, and I think it is okay, but they deny reality. No major country has done a better job of controlling inflation.

It was 6 percent in 2021. It dropped to 5.6 percent, and this last year, 3.1 percent. Those are the facts; the best performance in the world. All the railing, yelling, and finger pointing don't change those facts.

We have opportunities that we could do on a bipartisan basis to help solve the immigration problem that was worked out on a bipartisan basis in the other Chamber. In fact, we were moving toward an agreement that would put more investment in border security, beefing up opportunities that could have bipartisan support that would help the public. It is not our solution. We would like to do better, but we thought it was the best we could do with our Republican allies.

As it was moving toward enactment, Donald Trump went gunnysack: We can't do that. It would not help my reelection campaign. Afterwards, we have seen Republicans retreat from a bipartisan solution on immigration.

I think this will be as shameful as my friend John Boehner's refusal to allow us to vote on a bipartisan solution from the Senate on immigration back in 2012. We can do better than that if the other side of the aisle will listen to some of the governing wing of the Republican Party, not be held hostage by the most extreme, and work with us on these elements that are already bearing fruit.

What will not bear fruit is tilting at an imaginary windmill of a carbon tax, misrelating what it is, and denying the reality of the costs for failure to deal with the climate crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge rejection of this proposal. It is not going anywhere. It is not real. It is a sad distraction and an opportunity to misrepresent what we could do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, America's working families have paid more than their fair share for the failed economic policies of Washington Democrats and the Biden administration. Prices are up over 18 percent since President Biden took office.

Why is that?

I say it is because the President is willing to sacrifice the well-being of working families to reward the wealthy and well connected.

In the very first month of President Biden's term, inflation was 1.4 percent, and then Washington Democrats, under one-party control of the White House,

the House, and the Senate, added more than \$10 trillion of new spending, which fueled the inflation fire that has now caused inflation to rise almost 20 percent since Joe Biden took the oath of office.

That is why every American is paying more to put food on their table, clothes on their backs, and gasoline in their car, because of the failed economic policies of the Washington Democrats and the Biden administration.

This, a carbon tax, would simply add insult to that injury for so many Americans. It would raise the cost of raising a family and the cost of doing business. It would dull America's competitive edge and penalize American job creators and innovators against China.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford, nor should they be forced to pay for, a liberal agenda that imposes a carbon tax on American families and American small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak in opposition to the proposed legislation, H. Con. Res. 86—Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

Days away from a shutdown of their own making, my Republican colleagues are focused on their political agenda over the needs of the American people.

It is important for the American people to know and to be reminded that Democrats made significant strides in unlocking the clean energy economy with the Inflation Reduction Act, while House Republicans are only concerned with undoing that progress and blocking those achievements.

Year after year, research comes out supporting what we have known for years:

Climate change is one of the biggest threats to the survival of our nation and the welfare of our people.

Scientists have warned us about the devastating reality that would follow if we failed to act as a nation.

It is clear that some of us have heeded these warnings with great concern while others have taken them lightly.

My colleagues on the other side insist that a carbon tax would harm American families, specifically the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes.

But what do they have to say about the impacts of emissions on those groups?

We know that the effects of climate change are not equally distributed, instead affecting the elderly, low-income communities, and people of color the most.

Climate change is no longer a distant threat—we are seeing the direct impacts of our inaction right now across the United States.

In countless neighborhoods throughout Texas and across the country we are already seeing the devastating effects of climate change on our coasts, our forests, our farmland, and through extreme weather patterns and ever-more destructive natural disasters.

Just last summer, Texas had the second hottest summer on record, with Texans being

asked to conserve power as the state grid struggled to keep up with the demand for air conditioning due to scorching temperatures.

Heat is deadly, often killing more people each year than hurricanes, tornadoes, or floods.

Last summer, at least 97 Texans died from heat-related illness, according to the Texas Department of State Health Services.

These record-breaking temperatures put the lives and livelihoods of Texans at risk.

As a representative from Houston, where millions of jobs are created from the fossil fuel industry, I understand the concerns my colleagues on the other side have about the economy.

However, I assure them that the economy will not be spared if we fail to act.

According to a 2023 study, the summer heat cost the Texas economy about \$24 billion dollars.

Texas is twice as vulnerable to heat-related economic slowdowns than the rest of the country.

Studies using data from the last two decades found that for every degree of higher temperature in summer, Texas sees a slowdown of 0.4 percent in economic growth.

Extreme heat hurts businesses as customers stay home rather than going out to shop or dine.

According to the Texas Tribune, industries whose workers are frequently outdoors—including the oil and gas industry and construction—I saw a notable slowdown in employment growth related to the heat, as construction projects became delayed.

When considering national disasters, the monetary burden grows even larger.

According to the Houston Chronicle, Texas has felt some of the most severe consequences of climate change than any U.S. state or territory, costing the state at least \$401 billion in hazard-related damage.

The cost estimates account for more than a dozen factors, including physical damage to buildings and infrastructure, decreases in earnings from interruptions to businesses and loss of agricultural assets.

Climate change is expected to impede the rate of economic growth of our Nation over this century.

To do absolutely nothing to counter climate change would have damning consequences for my district, my state, and the Nation.

Tackling climate change is looking out for wellbeing of our most vulnerable communities and our economy.

To do this, we must reduce carbon emissions in our atmosphere.

Carbon dioxide is the primary greenhouse gas contributing to this most recent climate change.

When large amounts of carbon dioxide are released into the air from man-made sources, our planet grows warmer, affecting the quality of every species on the planet, including us.

A carbon tax price provides the economic incentive for the quickest and most comprehensive emission reductions across the entire economy.

Democrats have continuously fought for climate solutions that would put our nation in the path of energy security, lower energy costs for Americans, and thousands of clean jobs.

It is time my Republican colleagues put political games aside and join Democrats in supporting environmentally conscious solutions.

The time calls for fresh determination and urgency.

We must work side-by-side with the American people to create a future of sustainability for our children and grandchildren, and prosperity and opportunity for our families and communities, for generations to come.

□ 1300

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 are postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

#### DENOUNCING THE HARMFUL, ANTI-AMERICAN ENERGY POLICIES OF THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1085, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 987) denouncing the harmful, anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 987

Whereas President Joe Biden and his administration have proposed and finalized regulations that increase the cost of energy for domestic consumers, hamper domestic production of energy, and increase reliance on foreign adversaries for energy needs;

Whereas then-candidate Joe Biden is quoted as saying, "I will end fossil fuels.";

Whereas decreasing domestic production of fossil fuels does not prevent the fuels from being produced globally, but instead increases the United States reliance on other countries for its energy needs;

Whereas the United States is reliant on China and other foreign adversaries for many of the minerals necessary for renewable energy development;

Whereas the Biden administration has blocked domestic mineral development despite the massive increase in demand for these minerals;

Whereas the United States became the global leader in liquified natural gas exports for the first time in 2023;

Whereas, on January 26, 2024, the Biden administration announced guidance that would

prohibit liquified natural gas exports and permitting for export facilities under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b);

Whereas, under President Biden, gasoline prices reached a record-breaking high in 2022, with prices soaring to a nationwide average of over \$4 a gallon and nearly \$5 for diesel;

Whereas gas prices have increased due to President Biden's policies, affecting families and small businesses who struggle to make ends meet;

Whereas, in May 2023, it was calculated that nearly 20,000,000 households in the United States were behind on their utility bills because of rising energy prices;

Whereas energy prices increased roughly 37.2 percent in President Biden's first 26 months in office, which is the largest increase of any of the last 7 Presidents;

Whereas President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline on his first day in office, preventing over 11,000 jobs, hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil per day, and millions in revenue;

Whereas the Biden administration illegally canceled leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, even though the leases were mandated under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act;

Whereas the Biden administration added extraction restrictions to 13,000,000 acres of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska;

Whereas the Biden administration canceled 3 proposed lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico;

Whereas President Trump held 9 offshore lease sales and President Obama held 20;

Whereas the Biden administration has proposed numerous antifossil fuel policies that restrict Federal land development causing companies to cease investment in research, development, and exploration;

Whereas the Biden administration implemented a 20-year mining moratorium on 225,000 acres of the Superior National Forest in northern Minnesota;

Whereas the Biden administration continues to restrict mineral extraction in areas including Chaco Canyon, Black Hills National Forest, and the Thompson Divide;

Whereas, in 2022, more than one-third of Americans say they reduced or skipped basic expenses, such as medicine or food, to pay an energy bill;

Whereas President Biden issued Executive Order 14008 on his first day in office, which halted all new oil and natural gas leasing on Federal lands, violating the Mineral Leasing Act, which requires the Department of the Interior to hold quarterly lease sales;

Whereas the Biden administration did not hold an onshore lease sale until June 2022, and the first sale excluded nearly 80 percent of eligible lands while instituting a 50-percent royalty increase;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2022, the first full fiscal year of the Biden administration, the Bureau of Land Management approved an average of 233 drilling permits per month;

Whereas, in contrast, the Bureau of Land Management was approving nearly 400 drilling permits monthly in fiscal year 2020;

Whereas the Biden administration has held only 18 lease sales over 36 months in office;

Whereas the Biden administration has leased roughly 232,000 acres bringing in roughly \$180,000,000 in Federal funding, approximately one-tenth of the acreage and revenue secured by the Trump administration;

Whereas, over the same time period, the Trump administration had held 82 lease sales, leasing 3,700,000 acres and bringing in over \$1,700,000,000 for taxpayers.

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management proposed a rule titled "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation" (87 Fed. Reg. 73588) which aims to further regulate natural gas

emissions from oil and natural gas production on Federal lands;

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management issued Instructional Memoranda that restrict the rights of existing leaseholders, ignore statutory mandates, and will limit acreage in future sales;

Whereas the Biden administration proposed the rule titled "Conservation and Landscape Health" (88 Fed. Reg. 19583) that would illegally elevate conservation as a multiple use under the Federal Land Management Policy Act of 1976;

Whereas the Biden administration has proposed a rule titled "Fluid Mineral Leases and Leasing Process" (88. Fed. Reg. 47562) that would establish preference criteria to limit oil and gas leasing on Federal lands, while increasing royalty and bonding rates for oil and gas producers on Federal lands; and

Whereas the Biden administration proposed numerous supplemental environmental impact statements for resource management plans across Western States that would lock up millions of acres of Federal lands from resource development: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) denounces the harmful anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration;

(2) denounces the irrational and unpredictable Federal lands policies of the Biden administration;

(3) condemns the energy crisis plaguing families, businesses, and Americans around the country that has been caused by the Biden administration; and

(4) encourages the domestic production of reliable and affordable energy generation sources.

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

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 987.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 987 to denounce the harmful anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, led by Congressional Western Caucus Chairman DAN NEWHOUSE.

From day one, the Biden administration has waged war on American energy. Their actions and policies have jeopardized our grid security, caused America to become more dependent on foreign adversaries like Iran, Russia, China, Venezuela, and others, and increased energy costs for everyday Americans.

Energy is foundational to everything in American life. American energy