AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

# FUELING THE CLIMATE CRISIS: EXPOSING BIG OIL'S DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGN TO PREVENT CLIMATE ACTION

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

## COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 28, 2021

**Serial No. 117–50**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Reform

Available on: *govinfo.gov*,
*oversight.house.gov* or
*docs.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
46–026 PDF WASHINGTON : 2022

## COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York, *Chairwoman*

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland
RO KHANNA, California
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
KATIE PORTER, California
CORI BUSH, Missouri
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
PETER WELCH, Vermont
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
JOHN P. SARBANES, Maryland
JACKIE SPEIER, California
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois
BRENDA L. LAWRENCE, Michigan
MARK DESAULNIER, California
JIMMY GOMEZ, California
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, *Ranking Minority Member*
JIM JORDAN, Ohio
PAUL A. GOSAR, Arizona
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
JODY B. HICE, Georgia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
BOB GIBBS, Ohio
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
RALPH NORMAN, South Carolina
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
FRED KELLER, Pennsylvania
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
ANDREW CLYDE, Georgia
NANCY MACE, South Carolina
SCOTT FRANKLIN, Florida
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas
PAT FALLON, Texas
YVETTE HERRELL, New Mexico
BYRON DONALDS, Florida

RUSS ANELLO, *Staff Director*
GRETA GAO, *Team Lead*
ELISA LANIER, *Chief Clerk and Director of Operations*
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

MARK MARIN, *Minority Staff Director*

# C O N T E N T S


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Hearing held on October 28, 2021 | 1 |

WITNESSES

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. Darren Woods, Chief Executive Officer, ExxonMobil Corporation<br>Oral Statement | 7 |
| Mr. Michael K. Wirth, Chief Executive Officer, Chevron Corporation<br>Oral Statement | 9 |
| Mr. David Lawler, Chief Executive Officer, BP America Inc.<br>Oral Statement | 10 |
| Ms. Gretchen Watkins, President, Shell Oil Company<br>Oral Statement | 12 |
| Mr. Mike Sommers, President, American Petroleum Institute<br>Oral Statement | 13 |
| Ms. Suzanne Clark, President and Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Chamber of Commerce<br>Oral Statement | 14 |
| Mr. Neal Crabtree (Minority witness), Former Welding Foreman, Keystone XL Pipeline<br>Oral Statement | 16 |

*Opening statements and the prepared statements for the witnesses are available in the U.S. House of Representatives Repository at: docs.house.gov.*


INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

*The documents entered into the record during this hearing, and Questions for the Record (QFR's) for this hearing are listed below.*


* Opinion by New York District Court Judge Valerie Caproni regarding San Francisco *v.* Exxon; submitted by Rep. Raskin.

* Article on oil companies fund to defeat Alaska's tax proposal; submitted by Rep. Tlaib.

* Ad campaign by Michigan group Energy Citizens ahead of energy vote legislation; submitted by Rep. Tlaib.

* Articles, *L.A. Times*; submitted by Rep. DeSaulnier.

* Articles, *Climate Action News*; submitted by Rep. DeSaulnier.

* Correspondence between Reps. DeSaulnier, Lieu, and Welch with Exxon Mobile; submitted by Rep. DeSaulnier.

* Article, "With a Pen Stroke, President Joe Biden Cancels the Keystone XL Pipeline Project"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Biden Lifts U.S. Sanctions on Major Russian Pipeline"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "While Western Nations Kill Energy, China Builds Coal Plants by the Dozen"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "China is Planning to Build 43 New Coal-Fired Power Plants"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Russia Projects Oil Output Near Post-Soviet Highs in 2022"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Europe Has Become a Hostage to Russia Over Energy, Analysts Warn"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Europe Warns Its Gas Prices Surge Will Drive Up Food Costs"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Biden Asks OPEC to Up Oil Production While Limiting U.S. Energy Production"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Qatar Petroleum Signs a 15-Year LNG Supply Deal with China"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Qatar Petroleum Boosts LNG Production"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Articles, "Qatar Places a $760 Million Order with China for Liquid Gas Ships;" "Energy Costs are Stoking Inflation. Just Look at U.S. Gas Prices"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Home Heating Sticker Shock: The Cost of Natural Gas is Up by 180 Percent"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Article, "Food Prices Poised to Surge with Fertilizer Prices at the Highest in Years"; submitted by Rep. Cloud.

* Letter from Ranking Member Comer; submitted by Rep. Donalds.

* Report, US Energy Information, "Winter Fuels Outlook"; submitted by Rep. Keller.

* Statement for the Record from Lee Raymond in 1996 regarding the human impact on the climate crisis; submitted by Chairwoman Maloney.

* Statement from James Black, Exxon scientist, regarding the impact of burning fossil fuels on climate change; submitted by Chairwoman Maloney.

* Statement from Mr. Glaser, Exxon manager of environmental affairs, about the impacts of climate change; submitted by Chairwoman Maloney.

* Statement for the Record, quote from letter regarding OPEC and world oil supplies by Maria Cantwell, Senator Menendez, Senator Schumer, and Senator Markey from 2018; submitted by Rep. Graves.

* Questions for the Record:to all witnesses; submitted by Rep. Bush

* Questions for the Record: to Mr. Michael K. Wirth, CEO, Chevron Corp; submitted by Rep. Tlaib.

# FUELING THE CLIMATE CRISIS: EXPOSING BIG OIL'S DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGN TO PREVENT CLIMATE ACTION

**Thursday, October 28, 2021**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:44 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, and via Zoom. The Hon. Carolyn Maloney [chairwoman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Maloney, Norton, Lynch, Cooper, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Raskin, Khanna, Mfume, Ocasio-Cortez, Tlaib, Porter, Bush, Davis, Wasserman Schultz, Welch, Johnson, Sarbanes, Kelly, DeSaulnier, Gomez, Pressley, Quigley, Comer, Jordan, Foxx, Hice, Grothman, Cloud, Gibbs, Higgins, Norman, Sessions, Keller, Biggs, Clyde, Franklin, LaTurner, Fallon, Herrell, and Donalds.

Also present: Representatives Casten, Levin, Jones, Omar, Brady, and Graves.

Chairwoman MALONEY. [Presiding.] The committee will come to order.

This is a historic hearing. For the first time, top fossil fuel executives are testifying together before Congress under oath about the industry's role in causing climate change and their efforts to cover it up. For far too long, Big Oil has escaped accountability for its central role in bringing our planet to the brink of a climate catastrophe. That ends today.

Big Oil has known the truth about climate change for decades. In the 1970's and 80's, Exxon's own scientists privately told top executives that burning fossil fuel was changing the global climate. Exxon and other Big Oil companies had the opportunity to tell the truth and lead the way to find alternative energy sources, but instead, Big Oil doubled down on fossil fuels. Working with the American Petroleum Institute, and the Chamber of Commerce, and other front groups and PR firms, the industry ran a coordinated campaign to mislead the public, hide the dangers of its own product, and derail global efforts to reduce greenhouse emissions.

At the same time, they were lining their own pockets. Between 1990 and 2019, the four oil companies here today reported nearly $2 trillion in profits, but the costs of inaction on climate have been far higher. The American people lost more than 30 years when we could have curbed climate change. Today we face stronger hurricanes, dangerous wildfires, and destructive floods. As the effects of

climate change have become undeniable, Big Oil has changed its record and its rhetoric. Now they say they believe in climate change and they support the Paris Agreement and a price on carbon. They promise they will reduce their carbon emissions and even aspire to net zero emissions, and they have spent billions of dollars on PR firms to paint themselves as climate champions, but Big Oil's actions tell a different story.

These companies not only continue to sell millions of barrels of oil every day. They are also investing in new oil fields. Their lobbying also tells a different story. Today the committee is releasing a new staff analysis showing that over the past 10 years, these four companies have dedicated only a very tiny fraction of their immense lobbying resources to enact the policies they publicly claim are key to address climate change, while spending tens of millions to protect their profits from oil and gas.

Earlier this year, a senior lobbyist at Exxon admitted the truth. He was caught on video saying that Exxon's support for a carbon tax was merely a "talking point" which would never become reality. And even today, lobbyists from American Petroleum Institute and other industry groups are fighting tooth and nail against key climate provisions in the Build Back Better Act. But we must act. Just this week, the United Nations released a new report stating that nations' current pledges fall far short of what is necessary to avert catastrophe. These experts agree that we will still have a narrow and fast disappearing window to prevent the worst outcomes from climate change. To do that, we need to immediately cut fossil fuel emissions by 3 to 4 percent each year and rapidly transition to net zero carbon emissions.

Twenty-seven years ago, seven tobacco executives appeared in this room before Congress. Rather than admitting the truth about their product, the executives lied. This was a watershed moment in the public's understanding of Big Tobacco. I hope that today's hearing represents a turning point for Big Oil. I hope that today the witnesses will finally own up to the industry's central role in this crisis and become part of the change we need. That also means cooperating with this committee's investigation. We asked each of these companies for documents six weeks ago, but they have not come close to producing the key internal documents about climate change and the money trail we asked for. So let me be clear. We are at the beginning of this investigation. I assure you we will not stop until we get to the truth, and if we need to call the CEOs back to testify again, we will.

After four decades of deception and delay, it is time for the fossil fuel industry to finally change its ways. Thousands of companies have already recognized the imminent threat of climate change and are working with community leaders and scientists to bring down emissions. It is time for Big Oil to finally join the rest of us in this fight. We can prevent a climate disaster while keeping energy costs low and creating good-paying jobs, but only if Big Oil acknowledges its central role in this crisis and commits to meaningful and immediate action.

I now recognize the distinguished ranking member, Mr. Comer, for an opening statement.

Mr. COMER. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney, and I want to thank the witnesses for their willingness to testify before the committee today. However, I have concerns about today's hearing and the legitimacy of Democrats' so-called investigation of America's oil and gas companies. First, let me remind Chairwoman Maloney and committee Democrats that the Oversight and Reform Committee exists to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal bureaucracy. When are we going to hold a hearing with a Biden Administration Cabinet member so we can hold the Federal Government accountable?

It is critical that this committee examine the pressing concerns of American citizens. Inflation caused by the Biden Administration's economic policies is sitting at 5.4 percent, gas prices are at a seven-year high, and heating bills are expected to rise as much as 54 percent this winter. The Biden Administration continues to allow illegal immigrants to pour over the southern border. Questions remain about the disastrous handling of the Afghanistan withdrawal, all while the White House fails to manage the COVID–19 pandemic they said would be over by July 4.

Instead of convening hearings on any of these topics and holding the Biden Administration accountable for its actions, committee Democrats have called this hearing because they watched a deceptively recorded and edited eight-minute video clip of an Exxon lobbyist. Committee Democrats won't tell the American people that the basis of their misguided inquiry appears to be a multi-month operation launched by activist group, Green Peace UK, involving fake websites and LinkedIn profiles, false job opportunities, and deceptive emails and interviews. Given the questionable activities undertaken by Green Peace U.K. to obtain the so-called information at the heart of this investigation, the American people must question the legitimacy of the Democrats' actions.

When committee Republicans asked Chairwoman Maloney to join us in requesting the full video back on August 12, 2021, they refused. Ironically, just yesterday, over two months later, the Democrats wrote saying they now would like to join our request. I don't know what took so long, but they apparently didn't want the full video to be shown at today's hearing. In reality, they don't want to see it and they don't want the American people to see it. Democrats didn't invite the person who was secretly recording to the hearing today because they are more interested in a spectacle.

Instead, committee Democrats took this questionable information and wrote letters to the CEOs who are appearing today. They requested internal documents and communications that these entities had with the Federal Government and lawmakers. They struck at the very heart of the First Amendment protections that exist for these groups and any American to petition their government. We raised objections to Chairwoman Maloney about the protected nature of these communications and the chilling effect these requests would have on the ability of entities to petition their government. However, Democrats have not bothered to respond to our concerns. The purpose of this hearing is clear: to deliver partisan theater for prime-time news. Subcommittee Chairman Khanna went to the media threatening subpoenas months before any of the witnesses were even invited to testify. Now, despite receiving well over

100,000 pages of documents from today's witnesses, Democrats are complaining that no one is cooperating with them.

Chairwoman Maloney, this hearing is simply a distraction from the crises that the Biden Administration's policies have caused for the American people. Just last week, President Biden admitted that he had no solution for the skyrocketing gas prices. He said prices will not go down until 2022. That is a problem for all Americans, especially low-income households. Meanwhile, hours after President Biden took office, he canceled the Keystone Pipeline and put 11,000 workers out of a job overnight, including the Republican witness, Neal Crabtree, who is still looking for work.

I look forward to hearing from the witnesses today, and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back. I now recognize Chairman Rho Khanna for his opening statement.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, Madam Chair. Representative Comer and I have a good relationship. This isn't about partisanship. This is about getting at the truth. Today, the CEOs of the largest oil companies in the world have a choice. You can either come clean, admit your misrepresentations and ongoing inconsistencies and stop supporting climate disinformation, or you can sit there in front of the American public and lie under oath.

Now, let me remind you of a fact that I am sure your many lawyers have brought to your attention. In 1994, the CEOs of the seven largest tobacco companies appeared right here before our committee. They, too, faced a choice. They chose to lie under oath, denying that nicotine was addictive. As I am sure you realize, that didn't turn out too well for them. I hope Big Oil will not follow the same playbook as Big Tobacco. You are powerful leaders at the top of the corporate world at a turning point for our planet. Be better.

Spare us the spin today. Really, we have no interest in it. Spin doesn't work under oath. We have all heard your spokespeople's talking points. Speak from the heart today. You will tell us your companies have contributed to academic research on climate science. That is true, but that is not the issue at hand. Despite your early knowledge of climate science, your companies and the trade associations you fund chose time and again to loudly raise doubts about the science and downplay the severity of the crisis. In short, the question is not did you prevent academic research on climate science—no one says you prevented that—but did any of your executives at any point mislead the American public?

You will say you have now seen the light. You will say you are for a carbon tax to have a "talking point," even though the former Exxon lobbyist, Keith McCoy tells us you believe "it is not going to happen." You will say you are for the Paris Accords, of course. Most of you will say you are working to reduce emissions, though, notably, one of you will say not the 80 to 90 percent of emissions that actually come from the gas you sell, just the 10 percent arising from your own operations. You will tout carbon capture and storage even though all of the carbon capture—and I want to make this point clearly—all of the captured carbon is being used to enhance oil extraction and actually increasing CO2 emissions in the world, even though there is no economically proven way to store CO2 indefinitely.

Here is the problem. This hearing will show that your actions continue to be inconsistent with the climate goals you now espouse. I wish they were consistent. My goal honestly is not to embarrass you. It is not to have a "gotcha" moment. That doesn't help any of us. You actually have a moment to shine today. You could commit to changing course and taking actions that would avert a climate catastrophe, or you could continue to deny and deceive out of a sense of institutional loyalty to your companies' past. The choice is really yours. As you make it, think of the indigenous-led demonstrations last week and the five young activists from the Sunrise Movement who have been outside the White House on a hunger strike for nine days and counting. They are putting their lives on the line because they know that countless thousands will suffer and die if we continue on our current path.

Just today, don't think of yourselves as the CEOs. Just think of yourselves as human beings. And I have this question: what will you do to end the hunger strike? What do you have to say to America's children born into a burning world? Find it in yourself today to tell the truth. It will be better for your companies' futures, and it will be better for humanity's future. Thank you.

Chairwoman MALONEY. And I now recognize Congressman Norman for an opening statement.

Mr. NORMAN. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney, and I want to thank the witnesses for their willingness to testify before the committee today.

Today, committee Democrats have contrived yet another hearing to demonize the oil and gas industry. The folks represented before us today run organizations that are providing good-paying jobs and secure, affordable, and clean energy for all Americans, something this Administration is attempting to dismantle. Instead of conducting actual oversight, as Congressman Comer mentioned, oversight that shows the disastrous decisions the Biden Administration has made this year, the Democrats are focused on destroying an industry and the jobs it provides to distract us from the fact that they have no plan to recoup our energy work force or energy independence. I assume that is why they canceled the Keystone Pipeline. I assume that is how they justify buying gas and oil from countries that don't like us. I assume they do not understand the effects of the Colonial Pipeline shutdown, what it had on this country. Now we are begging OPEC to make more oil and make it affordable.

Members of this committee need to start focusing on the issues that are impacting everyday Americans and the consequences of an overly ambitious and unrealistic climate agenda. I don't know about the rest of you all on this committee, but the people of South Carolina did not send me to Washington to bankrupt our country. And even the phrase, "Build Back Better," needs to be changed to "bankrupt America quicker." We should have a hearing about some of the proposals by Democrats to spend hardworking American taxpayers' money on liberal pipe dreams.

I would love to learn more about the proposal to spend $3.5 billion for the Green New Deal youth patrol aimed at helping jobless climate activists. Does anyone really believe the youth patrol will reduce the impacts of climate change? Will the youth patrol make

China and India less of a polluter than they are now? China continues to pollute at record levels while the United States continues to reduce emissions. Do Democrats really believe that putting the oil and gas industry out of business will suddenly make China less of a polluter? I am afraid extreme proposals by Democrats will do nothing but destroy good-paying American jobs and ruin our economy.

What Democrats will not discuss is how President Biden and his Administration's policies have caused a litany of issues for the American people. This Administration's out-of-control spending is causing inflation to skyrocket. As a result, Americans are now paying more for goods and services while taking home less money in their paychecks. Everyone can see that. Look on your screen. The price of gasoline today is $1.22 more per gallon than it was this time last year under the Trump Administration. As we enter the upcoming holiday season, the price of a Thanksgiving dinner will be a minimum of five percent more expensive than it was last year. Americans are feeling the effects of inflation in their wallets, and I fear it will only get worse.

Chairwoman Maloney, we will be getting you a letter to hopefully have the Democrats' expert, John Kerry, fly over here, I assume in his private jet on fossil fuel, to participate in a debate with him as the expert for the Democrat side, and let us have another expert that would contradict many of his statements. Mr. Kerry has a large contingent from the Biden Administration, and I am sure he can bring them in to help him out.

The Biden Administration is headed to attend this conference this year on climate change without a clear mandate from the U.S. Congress to make vague commitments that will never be met, while the top leaders from the largest polluters in the world, as I mentioned—China—President Xi refused to participate. While the Biden Administration is in the United Kingdom, back here in America, our constituents are dealing with the growing crisis related to supply chain, gasoline prices, the rising prices at every level. It is truly sad that the American people are being abandoned by their leaders at such a critical moment. This crisis is not Democrat, it is not Republican, but it is intentionally caused by the Democratic Party of today. The oil and gas industry provides good-paying jobs that help Americans reliably heat their houses, power their cars, and keep the lights on through the storm when the sun doesn't shine.

Folks, we are heading down a dangerous path with the Biden Administration's policies. I fear this winter and going into 2022 will only continue to get worse. It was recently reported that the home heating costs this winter would rise as much as 54 percent. The Biden Administration, as it has done on all the crises it has had over the last nine months, has no plan to confront these mounting problems, especially that affect everyone, but especially low-income Americans. The United States has abundant clean energy natural resources. We must use these resources to advance America's interests while continuing to lead the world in emission reductions. This is the path forward, but the Democrats want to block it every chance they get.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Now I would like to introduce our witnesses. Our first witness today is Mr. Darren Woods, who is the CEO of ExxonMobil. Then we will hear from Michael Wirth, who is the CEO of Chevron. Next we will hear from David Lawler, who is the CEO of BP America. Next we will hear from Ms. Gretchen Watkins, who is the president of Shell Oil. Next we will hear from Mr. Mike Sommers, who is the president of the American Petroleum Institute. Next we will hear from Ms. Suzanne Clark, who is the president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Next we will hear from Neal Crabtree, a former welder. Thank you.

The witnesses will be unmuted so we can swear them in. Please raise your right hands.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[A chorus of ayes.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. Let the record show that the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Chair?

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you, and without objection, your written statements will be made part of the record.

And with that, Mr. Woods, you are now recognized for your testimony.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

Chairwoman MALONEY. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. MFUME. Right here. I have a question. I am curious. Is there a reason why none of the witnesses traveled here to Washington today to represent their respective companies?

Chairwoman MALONEY. They elected to appear remotely, and they have that right.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Mr. Woods, you are now recognized.

## STATEMENT OF DARREN WOODS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, EXXONMOBIL CORPORATION

Mr. WOODS. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney, Ranking Member Comer, Chairman Khanna, Ranking Member Norman, and members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. My name is Darren Woods. I am the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of ExxonMobil Corporation. On behalf of the company, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this important discussion today. ExxonMobil provides an essential component of modern society: affordable, reliable, and abundant energy. For more than 150 years, oil and gas has played a critical role in our society, improving human lives, raising standards of living, and enabling unprecedented economic growth. Without them, the living standards that we enjoy today would not be possible.

Those of us fortunate enough to live and work in the United States and other developed countries often take for granted our ready access to energy. That is not the case for billions of people around the world. Many still lack basic electricity or clean cooking facilities for their homes. Access to reliable and affordable energy is more than a convenience. Energy delivers longer, healthier lives,

better education, greater mobility, and improved living conditions. It's one of the basic requirements that power economies and societal progress.

ExxonMobil and its roughly 70,000 employees are proud of the contributions we make every day to improving the lives of people all around the world. It is vitally important work. We also recognize that society must continue to diversify our energy mix to address climate change. ExxonMobil has long recognized that climate change is real and poses serious risks, but there are no easy answers. As the International Energy Agency has said, oil and gas will continue to be necessary for the foreseeable future. We currently do not have the adequate alternative energy sources. At the same time, we know the combustion of oil and gas releases greenhouse gases, and that United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has concluded that increased greenhouse gases can contribute to the effects of climate change. That is one of the issues we must address and one that we are well positioned to continue our work on: reducing the emissions that result from the combustion of oil and gas.

This hearing comes at an important time as the world is challenged with how to meet the growing need for energy while reducing emissions to mitigate climate change. The recent disruption of energy supplies in parts of the world has resulted in outages, fuel lines, and manufacturing shutdowns. The very real impact on families and businesses demonstrates how critical it is to thoughtfully manage the transition to a lower emissions future. ExxonMobil is committed to being part of the solution. Our scientists and engineers are applying their expertise to help responsibly meet the world's need for energy while working to find ways to accelerate the transition to a world with fewer emissions, starting with our own operations.

We reduced emissions by 11 percent between 2016 and 2020. Our plans through 2025 are consistent with the goals of the Paris Agreement. They are expected to deliver significant additional reductions in both emissions' intensity and absolute emissions. We launched a low-carbon solutions business to commercialize carbon capture and other technologies, such as hydrogen and biofuels, to reduce emissions in the parts of the economy that are the hardest to de-carbonize. As the International Energy Agency recognized this year, carbon capture contributes to the transition to net zero in multiple ways, and it represents one of the biggest opportunities for innovation to address emissions.

ExxonMobil is the world leader in this technology as a share of approximately one-fifth of global CCS capacity and is responsible for approximately 40 percent of all the captured anthropogenic CO2 in the world. We are pursuing several projects that can deliver large-scale emission reductions in hard-to-decarbonize sectors, like heavy industry and power generation. In addition, we are investing in breakthrough research to develop the next generation of lower emission fuels and fuels technologies, including advanced biofuels. We do that through research and development by our scientists and by collaborating with leading universities, governments, and private companies around the world.

Finally, ExxonMobil has been engaged in policy discussions related to the energy and environment for years. Our views on policies and its implications have been guided by our understanding of the science. We have been vocal and transparent in our support for governments to implement policies that are cost-effective and achieve the greatest emissions reductions at the lowest overall cost to society. We have advocated for an economy-wide revenue-neutral price on carbon for more than a decade and have publicly supported the Paris Agreement since its inception. I hope that today's hearing stimulates thoughtful discussion and a greater understanding of the need for meaningful action from all of us—governments, businesses, and individuals.

All of us use and depend on today's energy system. We all have a role to play in finding solutions to climate change that will reduce emissions while meeting the growing need for energy in order to improve lives around the world. I welcome your questions.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Mr. Wirth, you are now recognized for your testimony. Mr. Wirth.

**STATEMENT OF MICHAEL K. WIRTH, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CHEVRON CORPORATION**

Mr. WIRTH. Chairwoman Maloney and Ranking Member Comer, Subcommittee Chairman Khanna and Ranking Member Norman, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Michael Wirth, and I am the chair and CEO of Chevron.

For more than 140 years, Chevron has proudly delivered energy that drives the world forward: light, heat, mobility, mechanized agriculture, modern medicine. Quite literally the food we eat, the clothes we wear, and the standard of living we enjoy are made possible by affordable, reliable, and ever-cleaner energy. In many ways our story and that of our industry tracks the history of human progress. These are stories of extraordinary achievements over the past century plus, achievements that were once believed impossible.

Today we are one of the world's leading integrated energy companies. We contribute to the communities where we operate by creating jobs, sourcing from local suppliers, and giving back to the community. Just as when we were founded in 1879, we continue to believe in the power of human ingenuity to overcome obstacles and find responsible solutions for meeting the world's growing energy needs to deliver a better future for all. The issue we are here to discuss today, climate change, is one of the biggest challenges of our time. At Chevron, we've been very clear about where we stand. We accept the scientific consensus. Climate change is real, and the use of fossil fuels contributes to it. We are committed to helping address this challenge.

I also want to address directly a concern expressed by some of those calling for today's hearing. While our views on climate change have developed over time, any suggestion that Chevron is engaged in an effort to spread disinformation and mislead the public on these complex issues is simply wrong. In recent years, conversations about climate have intensified, innovation and technology have accelerated, and the energy system that underpins our

global economy has continued to evolve. So has Chevron. We believe the future of energy is lower carbon, and we're committed to being a leader in making that future a reality.

We have set ambitious targets for our own greenhouse emissions. We've announced a net zero aspiration for our upstream Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, and we intend to invest more than $10 billion to reduce emissions and grow new energy businesses. Our strategy is straightforward. We'll continue to be a leader in efficient and lower carbon production of the traditional energy the world uses today while growing new lower-carbon businesses that will be a bigger part of the future. I look forward to sharing the action we're taking, and more details about those actions are included in my written testimony.

We welcome a thoughtful discussion about the path ahead and how we can achieve a lower-carbon energy future, while at the same avoiding supply disruptions and preserving American leadership in energy. As part of this discussion, the undeniable reality is that oil and gas remain an important part of the energy equation. Honest, thoughtful climate policy discussions should account for that.

Chevron is a proud American company. The affordable, reliable energy that the more than 35,000 women and men of our company produce every day has improved the quality of life and enabled a higher standard of living for people around the world. Our products fuel hospitals, schools, offices, restaurants, stores, and homes. They enable the movement of goods around the world and right to our very doorsteps. They create good-paying jobs that support families across the country, and they enhance our national security by reducing dependence on foreign energy. This should all be part of the conversation as we seek an orderly and predictable energy future that works for everyone.

Confronting the climate challenge requires critical thinking about investment, technology, pace, goals, and timetables. This must be a comprehensive effort. No one company, no one industry, and no one country can meet this global challenge alone. This is a conversation necessarily about both supply, which Chevron helps to provide, and demand driven by consumers worldwide. At Chevron, we believe government action, in partnership with the private sector, is essential to enable evolution of the energy system, and we stand ready to work with you.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Mr. Lawler, you are now recognized for your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID LAWLER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, BP AMERICA INC.**

Mr. LAWLER. Chairwoman Maloney, Ranking Member Comer, Chairman Khanna, Ranking Member Norman, and members of the committee, I'm Dave Lawler. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today about BP's low carbon transformation and our ambition to get to net zero by 2050 or sooner, and to help the world get there, too.

I first joined BP in 2014 as head of our oil and gas operations in the Continental United States. I was named chairman and

present of BP America last year. Our U.S. operations are part of the economic fabric of this country. We directly employ some 10,000 people, support nearly a quarter million jobs, and contributed $60 billion to the national economy last year. Almost a quarter century ago, BP was among the first major companies in our industry to recognize publicly the scientific consensus about the human contribution to climate change and supported policies to address it. That recognition has guided many of our decisions since then. These decisions include launching a separate low-carbon energy business in 2005, which invested more than $8 billion over 10 years. By 2007, BP publicly supported carbon pricing.

When we announced our net zero ambition in February 2020, we recognized it wouldn't be easy, but we believed it was vital for both society and the success of our business. We know that the world's carbon budget is finite, and we've set clear, verifiable short-and longer-term targets on our path to net zero. By 2025, we aim to grow our low-carbon investments to $3 to $4 billion per year, and then to $5 billion per year in 2030. This would represent nearly a third of our projected capital expenditures. At the same time, by 2030, we expect to reduce our global oil and gas production by 40 percent from a 2019 baseline. Beyond capital investment and reduced production, we plan to eliminate routine flaring in our U.S. onshore operations by 2025. We also have an ambitious global methane intensity target of .02 percent based on our industry-leading measurement approach.

I recognize that some may doubt how serious we are about our net zero ambition. I get it. Our progress hasn't always been a straight line, but we've learned a great deal and we view the path we're on as a business imperative. That's one reason we continue to report regularly on our progress, and we've already taken concrete steps to meet our targets. Through the first half of 2021, we more than doubled our 2019 low-carbon investments to $1.1 billion, undertaking transformative offshore wind and solar energy power generation projects in the United States. This doesn't mean BP is getting out of the oil and gas business. As we transition, our oil and gas business will continue providing the energy the world needs while funding our investments in wind, solar, and other renewable energy sources.

As we work to make BP a net zero company, we are trying to help the world get there, too. We've redoubled our advocacy in support of policies to address climate change. We've advocated directly and with a range of partners to advance carbon pricing at the state and Federal level. We're advocating for the direct regulation of methane emissions from the oil and gas industry. We aim for alignment between our positions and those of the trade associations to which we belong. We recognize that associations' positions are often a compromise of various perspectives, and we advocate within them for our views on climate change.

With world leaders on the verge of an important international climate gathering in Glasgow, it's more critical than ever that governments and industry work together to find solutions to this challenge. We know we have a hard road ahead, but it's also filled with opportunities. Along the way, we welcome debate and public scru-

tiny because succeeding in the energy transition is critical both for BP and for the world.

Thank you for this opportunity. I look forward to your questions.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Ms. Watkins, you are now recognized for your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF GRETCHEN WATKINS, PRESIDENT, SHELL OIL COMPANY**

Ms. WATKINS. Chairwoman Maloney, Chairman Khanna, Ranking Member Comer, Ranking Member Norman, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to be here today to discuss the urgent need for action on climate change and Shell's effort to advance society's transition to a lower-carbon future.

Through Shell's Global Power and Progress Strategy, we are working with our customers across sectors to accelerate our own progress and support the transition to net zero emissions in the United States and globally in step with society. Shell has been and remains vocal about the needed energy transition, and we continue to advocate for sound carbon policies that support the transition to renewables and lower carbon energy sources, including seeking to ensure a transition that is fair and equitable. This kind of challenge is not new to Americans. We have tackled enormous challenges before, and we can do it again.

I lead Shell Oil Company, the U.S. subsidiary of Royal Dutch Shell in the Netherlands. Shell's position on climate change has been publicly documented for nearly three decades. As early as 1991, our annual reports discussed concerns about climate change. Our first sustainability report in 1998 noted that human activity and the use of fossil fuels could affect the climate. Shell has issued a sustainability report every year since, and the subsequent reports have discussed climate change and the challenges that it poses. Shell has long advocated for governmental policies that will reduce fossil fuel demand, stimulate innovation and cleaner energy technologies, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and ensure access to reliable and affordable energy.

Shell strongly advocated for the United States to remain in the Paris Climate Agreement and later to rejoin it. Shell has a long history of advocating for carbon pricing, such as Waxman-Markey, which passed the House in 2009. Shell supports a number of provisions in the pending infrastructure legislation related to climate change, and we support climate provisions in budget reconciliation, including electric vehicle infrastructure, hydrogen production, carbon capture and storage, and a well-constructed methane fee.

In 2017, Shell was the first energy business to announce an ambition for reducing net carbon intensity, and in the years since, Shell's ambitions have progressively developed. In 2020, we announced our intention to be a net zero by 2050 company in step with society. We have short-, medium-, and long-term intensity-based reduction targets, and today, in announcements made early this morning in Europe, we've announced our intent to reduce our Scope 1 and 2 absolute emissions by 50 percent by 2030 on a net basis.

Shell companies have invested billions in lower carbon energy, including solar and wind, electric vehicle charging, and infrastruc-

ture. For example, we've purchased a large stake in Silicon Ranch, a leading solar farm developer in Nashville, Tennessee with more than 145 operating facilities coast to coast, and we acquired Green Lots, a California-based company that provides electric vehicle charging solutions.

Meeting the demand for reliable energy while simultaneously addressing climate change is a huge undertaking and one of the defining challenges of our time. Fuel is needed to power trucks, airplanes, and ships that move people and commerce around the globe. Petrochemicals are needed for everything from clothing to cellphones, from hand sanitizer to the fibers in the masks we have all become accustomed to wearing. For this reason, Shell will continue to develop fossil fuel energy sources, yet even here we are seeing an energy transition. For example, Shell's production in the Gulf of Mexico is among the lowest in the world in greenhouse gas intensity, and we do not anticipate frontier exploration for new oil and gas repositories after 2025.

We are committed to a leadership role in the energy transition and continuing to provide the life-sustaining and life-enabling products that Americans need. Shell is proud of its history providing energy to consumers in the United States and around the world, and we look forward to enabling a future where we all move to net zero emissions.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here, and I would be happy to answer your questions.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Mr. Sommers, you are now recognized for your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF MIKE SOMMERS, PRESIDENT AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE**

Mr. SOMMERS. Chairwoman Maloney, Ranking Member Comer, Chairman Khanna, Ranking Member Norman, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. My name is Mike Sommers, and I am president and chief executive officer of the American Petroleum Institute. API is the national trade association representing all segments of America's oil and natural gas industry. Our nearly 600 members, from large integrated companies to small independent operators, provide much of our Nation's energy, and develop safe, responsible operational standards. API's mission is to promote safety across the industry globally and to advocate for public policy in support of a strong, viable U.S. oil and natural gas sector.

I would like to focus on three points. First, our member companies make products that enable modern life. Every day, the men and women of America's oil and natural gas industry provide the energy to maintain our quality of life, power our economy, and improve the condition of people here at home and around the globe. This industry meets Americans' needs with a strong commitment to safety, reliability, and environmental performance, and it is my high honor to work in this essential industry.

Second, we meet today at a defining moment, one where energy demands are rising, and the focus on a cleaner environment has never been greater. Climate change is real, industrial activity contributes to it, and the challenges of ushering in a lower-carbon fu-

ture are massive and intertwined, yet fundamental. It is the opportunity of our time to address climate change while meeting the world's growing need for energy.

API released a series of policy proposals, industry actions, and initiatives in our Climate Action Framework to make a measurable difference in advancing energy and environmental progress. This plan is centered around advancing innovation and technology to tackle this challenge. The five main actions are, one, accelerating technology and innovation to reduce emissions while meeting growing energy needs; two, further mitigating emissions from operations to advance additional environmental progress; three, endorsing a carbon price policy by government to drive economy-wide market-based solutions; four, advancing cleaner fuels to provide lower carbon choices for consumers; five, driving climate reporting to provide consistency and transparency.

In the meantime, API and its members are not waiting for a government mandate to address the real and serious challenge of climate change. Our view is that innovation is the foundation of meaningful action and, as such, our industry is making significant investments in carbon capture, hydrogen, and cleaner fuels. API companies are actively reducing methane emissions from their operations through technologies and other solutions. More work remains, but one area where experts agree is that oil and natural gas will continue to be the leading energy sources for decades to come, and it is important that we take action to reduce emissions while providing that energy.

In closing, API supports climate action. Governments, industries, and consumers must accelerate policy and technology solutions together. Yet legislative proposals that punitively target American industry will reverse our Nation's energy leadership, harm our economy and American workers, and weaken our national security. We look forward to continuing to work with Congress and others to shape and advance effective energy and climate policy.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I look forward to your questions.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Ms. Clark, you are now recognized for your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF SUZANNE CLARK, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

Ms. CLARK. Chairwoman Maloney, Ranking Member Comer, Chairman Khanna, Ranking Member Norman, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to testify today.

Since March, I've had the privilege to serve as the president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and I appreciate this opportunity to discuss our efforts to address climate change. The Chamber's position is clear: the climate is changing, and humans are contributing to these changes. Addressing the climate challenge with old solutions and advancing economic prosperity are not mutually exclusive. We can achieve both goals, and the Chamber is dedicated to doing so. The Chamber's message on climate is also clear: inaction is not an option. We advocate for market-based solutions to reduce emissions plus supporting U.S. competitiveness, national security, and working people across America. We have fo-

cused on effective climate solutions, and we see ample common ground for all sides to come together to advance policies that are practical, predictable, and durable.

The American business community is essential to developing, financing, building, and operating the solutions needed to effectively combat climate change and meet our energy needs. Businesses are already taking action by investing in technology and enhancing their efficiency. Their actions are good for business, the economy, and our planet. The government also plays a critical role in our country's efforts to address climate change. We believe Congress must enact durable climate policy with bipartisan support. This will help ensure that policies withstand the changing priorities of different Administrations and reduce uncertainty for businesses.

The Chamber supports policies that encourage innovation and investment in market-based climate solutions. We believe in transparent, well-designed market mechanisms that reduce emissions while supporting economic growth and job creation. Our implementation of these principles has led to meaningful progress over the past few years. Let me share a few examples.

The Chamber played a leading role in the 2020 passage of the Energy Act, the most significant climate and energy legislation adopted in more than a decade. Over several years, we've mobilized business community support and partnered with NGO's and others to get the bill enacted. We worked closely with policymakers on both sides of the aisle to ensure that it contained innovation-focused measures that addressed climate change, promoted American technological leadership, and fostered economic growth. The Chamber also played a leading role in bipartisan legislation to implement a phase down of hydrofluorocarbons, which will significantly reduce emissions that contribute to global warming. We have called for direct regulations on methane emissions from oil and gas operations and worked with Congress to improve pre-disaster mitigation in its science policies. We also strongly supported the Biden Administration's decision to rejoin the Paris Climate Agreement, and we engaged early with this Administration and provided principles for its consideration as it revised the U.S. emission reduction commitments.

Finally, this year, we organized a coalition in support of bipartisan infrastructure legislation that would advance efforts to decarbonize the economy. Building smart, modern, resilient infrastructure has long been a priority at the Chamber. The bipartisan infrastructure framework is exactly the type of bold, economy-growing action needed to address climate change. The Chamber and its members are proud to support it as standalone legislation.

Our country has made positive strides forward and could build greater momentum with bipartisan cooperation on the solutions before us, and we must. More needs to be done to protect our planet for future generations. Earlier this year, President Biden's climate envoy, former Secretary of State, John Kerry, stated that 50 percent of the reductions we have to make to get to net zero are going to come from technologies we don't yet have. Whether or not 50 percent is the right figure, Secretary Kerry's central point is correct. We must take urgent action now to develop the technologies

necessary to meet our climate goals. I'll say it again: inaction is not an option.

For more than 100 years, the Chamber has advocated for pro-growth policies that help businesses of all sizes create jobs, strengthen communities, and grow our economy. There is broad consensus across our membership and the business community that combatting climate change is an urgent issue requiring citizens, government, and business to work together. The Chamber remains dedicated to working with Congress to identify solutions that improve our environment.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Mr. Crabtree, you are now recognized for your testimony. Mr. Crabtree.

**STATEMENT OF NEAL CRABTREE, FORMER WELDING FOREMAN, KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE**

Mr. CRABTREE. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney, and Ranking Member, and all the distinguished committee members. It's definitely not something that I'm proud of, but I may have been the first casualty of the Build Back Better plan. Three hours after President Biden's inauguration, I lost my job on the construction of the Keystone pipeline. Now, I realize this was only one project, but what I really feared was the consequences the decision would have on my future, and now I see those fears being realized. Not only did I lose an opportunity for employment on the Keystone, but I'm losing employment opportunities because energy companies seem to be hesitant to plan other needed projects that we need in this country. And all this is happening while the demand for energy is rising.

The Build Back Better shouldn't mean the total neglect and destruction of our energy infrastructure as we know it. People from coast to coast are feeling the pain of rising energy prices, and there seems to be no thought given to the hundreds of thousands of workers in this industry or the millions of products that we use every single day that, you know, are provided by fossil fuels. And there shouldn't be a fear of a heating shortage in the Northeast this coming winter, yet here we are.

And Americans need to know that there isn't a fuel shortage. That's not the cause of the rising prices. Rising prices are a direct result of the lack of infrastructure that it takes to get the products moved to where they are needed mostly, and it's mainly pipeline construction. The construction of the Atlantic Coast pipeline, the Constitution, the Penn East would've all taken much-needed energy to the Northeast this year. Instead of being built and being in service, they're now canceled, and they were canceled because of overregulation and a push for a green new energy sector that just isn't capable or reliable enough to provide the energy that we need right now. Every penny in the increase of energy takes roughly a billion dollars out of the pockets of Americans over a year's time. These can't be popular decisions, and I believe elections in the years to come will prove that.

The CEOs and the presidents of the companies that are gathered here today have provided this country with something that we've all demanded, and that's clean, affordable, reliable energy. We've

built military bases in other countries to protect resources. Our government has contributed to this, and to treat these CEOs as villains, I don't agree with it. The disruption of the Colonial pipeline earlier this year should've proven just how important the work that myself and these companies do really is. I mean, we took one pipeline that was down for one week, and we seemed to panic at the cost. I was hoping it would shed light on a bigger problem, and that is why we only have one pipeline servicing such an important part of this country. And the answer is simple. It's because it costs right now more to permit and plan a new pipeline than it does to actually build one and neglecting to add to the capacity with new pipelines is a dangerous thing for our country, just like neglecting roads and bridges.

Now, I believe it's going to take an all-of-the-above approach for our energy future. Renewables are going to play a part. They will need to be developed, carbon technology needs to be developed, but we can't demonize the fossil fuel industry. It's only going to hurt the economy and the country. Now, I belong to a union that specializes in pipeline construction, and I've spent over 25 years, you know, developing the skills that I have, and I'm compensated well for it. And the government's idea of shutting down my industry and retraining me in another career is not realistic. I'm too far in life to be starting over in an entry-level position. It's just not realistic for me. Now, there's a whole generation of workers coming up, and if they want to pursue careers in the green energy, then I support that, just like I support private companies' rights to develop green energy. What I don't support is the government limiting my employment opportunities in my chosen field, especially when the product is in huge demand.

To sum this up, the Administration is having a direct negative impact on energy prices in this country. They're having an impact on my ability to find work right now. My crisis right now isn't the climate. My crisis is the mortgage payments I have due every month, it's the food I need to put on my table, and it's the healthcare I need to provide to my family. And instead of demonizing these CEOs and presidents that are here today, I would like to thank them for the opportunities they've provided me and my family and my union to work in these past few decades. And I look forward to any questions you might have.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you so much.

Pursuant to Rule 9(c), the chair authorizes an hour of extended questioning to be equally divided between the majority and the minority for this hearing. I have consulted with the ranking member and we have agreed to divide up the hour of extended questioning in four 15-minute blocks. First, the chair will ask questions, then the ranking member, then Mr. Khanna, and then Mr. Norman. The ranking member intends to yield a portion of his time to Mr. Brady and Mr. Graves.

And without objection, both members are authorized to participate in today's hearing.

With that, I now recognize myself for 15 minutes, and I want to start with a few simple questions, and I would appreciate a "yes" or "no" answer on each of them.

Mr. Woods, CEO of Exxon, do you agree that climate change is real?

Mr. WOODS. Yes.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Mr. Lawler, CEO of BP America, do you agree that climate change is caused by human activities?

Mr. LAWLER. Yes.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Mr. Wirth, CEO of Chevron, do you agree that burning fossil fuels is a significant cause of climate change?

Mr. WIRTH. Chairwoman, we have been clear on where we stand, and we accept the scientific consensus that the use of fossil fuels contributes to climate change.

Chairwoman MALONEY. So that I am taking as a "yes." Ms. Watkins, president of Shell, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a new report in August concluding that climate change is widespread, rapid, and intensifying. The Secretary General of the United Nations called the report, and I am quoting, "a Code Red for humanity," and said, "The alarm bells are deafening, and the evidence is irrefutable." Ms. Watkins, do you agree that addressing climate change is now a Code Red for humanity? "Yes" or "no," please.

Ms. WATKINS. Chairwoman, Shell agrees that this is an urgent issue that needs addressing by companies, governments, and society.

Chairwoman MALONEY. And it is not just the United Nations that called it a Code Red. Last week, the Defense Department issued a report calling climate change "an existential threat to our Nation and the world." Ms. Watkins, do you agree climate change is a threat to our existence?

Ms. WATKINS. Chairwoman, I agree that climate change is one of the biggest challenges that we have in the world today, which is why, at Shell, we are in action on providing lower and no carbon products to our customers. We believe this is something we are all in together. We need to work in collaboration with society, with governments, with other companies, and other industries.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Well, do you agree that it is an existential threat?

Ms. WATKINS. I agree.

Chairwoman MALONEY. "Yes" or "no."

Ms. WATKINS. I agree that this is a defining challenge for our generation, absolutely.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Well, let me put it another way. Does anyone on the panel disagree with the statement from the United States and the Defense Department that climate change is an existential threat to our existence? Does anyone disagree?

[No response.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. So the truth is clear. Climate change is real, burning fossil fuels is the primary cause of this crisis, and it is urgent that we fix it. This is the first time each of you has told Congress this and the companies that you represent, and it is significant and important. Thank you. But it is also true that if it weren't for the actions of the Big Oil companies, we might have taken action to fix this problem decades ago.

Mr. Woods, I want to ask you about some public statements that your predecessor, Lee Raymond, made in 1996 and 1997 as the world was debating an agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions known as the Kyoto Protocol. Here is what Mr. Raymond said in 1996, and I quote: "Currently, the scientific evidence is inconclusive as to whether human activities are having a significant effect on the global climate." And I would like to place his statement in the record, without objection.

Chairwoman MALONEY. And this was no slip of the tongue. In 1997, he gave another speech where he denounced the effects in Kyoto and said, "The case for global warming is far from airtight." Mr. Woods, when Exxon CEO made these remarks about the inconclusive nature of the scientific evidence, were they consistent with the views of Exxon's own scientists?

Mr. WOODS. Yes. Chairman, thank you for the question. I appreciate the opportunity to address that. Our understanding of the science has been aligned with the consensus of the scientific community as far back as 20 years ago when you referenced our chairman at that time's comments. And as science has evolved and developed, our understanding has evolved and developed as has our work and position on the statement.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Well, as you make your statement, I am reminded of another hearing that we had with the tobacco industry. And we had all the executives seated in this room, and they were asked about their statements from their companies that the science was uncertain, and they said they did not believe that nicotine was addictive. Well, it came out that they lied. Tobacco nicotine was very addictive, and now I am hearing from you that the science that was reported publicly where your executives were denying climate change, we know that your scientists internally were saying that it is a reality. So I was hoping that you would not be like the tobacco industry was and lie about this, and I was hoping that you would be better than the tobacco industry and that you would have come out with the truth, and I am disappointed with the statement that you made.

James Black was an Exxon scientist, and I would like to put up on the screen what he told the company's top executives in a secret briefing back in 1978, more than 40 years ago. And he said, and I quote, "There is a general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels." And Mr. Black was not the only Exxon scientist to recognize that burning fossil fuels would cause dangerous climate change. In 1982, Roger Cohen, one of Exxon's most senior scientists, wrote a private letter to Exxon's management, and I am putting it the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. He said there was a "scientific consensus about the impact of increased carbon dioxide on the climate," and there was "unanimous agreement in the scientific community" that doubling carbon dioxide levels would lead to significant climate change. So I am asking you, Mr. Woods, do you agree there is an inconsistency between what Mr. Raymond, the Exxon CEO, told the public and what Mr. Black and Mr. Cohen, both Exxon scientists, told top executives?

Mr. WOODS. Chairman, no, I do not agree that there was an inconsistency. If you look at the full extent of that report, you will find that the comments in the report and that briefing to our management committee, which was not a secret meeting, was entirely consistent with where the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was and the general consensus of the scientific community. And I think our position on that has continued to evolve with the scientific community. I think our messaging has been that this is a complex problem that is going to require thoughtful, practical solutions, and that has been something that we have continued to emphasize over time.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Reclaiming my time, I think the quotes speak for themselves. I am putting them in the record. There is a clear conflict between what the Exxon CEO told the public and what Exxon scientists were warning privately for years, but you don't need to take my word for it. In 2019, two former Exxon scientists testified in this very hearing room. They were here with the tobacco executives, and they testified before Representative Raskin's subcommittee. They said Mr. Raymond's statements were just plain wrong. One former Exxon scientist, Dr. Martin Hoffert, testified, and I quote, "Exxon was publicly promoting views that its own scientists knew were wrong, and we know that because we were the major groups working on this."

And the disinformation from Exxon did not end there. In 2000, Exxon ran an advertisement in The New York Times entitled, "Unsettled Science." And it said, and I quote, "Even less is known about the potential positive or negative impacts of climate change. In fact, many academic studies and field experiments have demonstrated that increased levels of carbon dioxide can promote crop and forest growth." So

Mr. Woods, was this statement that climate change could actually be positive for our planet consistent with the private views of Exxon's scientists?

Mr. WOODS. Chairwoman, if you read the full article that was advertised that you reference there, it concludes with the statement that says we know enough now that governments, people, and companies should be taking reasonable action to address the risk of climate change. So again, I would come back and say that our position in this space has been consistent with the general consensus in the scientific community. Our research was in line with that. It was a small portion——

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you so much. Reclaiming my time. The documents tell a different story. Let me read you an excerpt from a 1982 memo which I would like to place in the record that M.B. Glaser, Exxon's manager of environmental affairs, sent to Exxon management about the potential impacts of climate change. And he wrote, "There are some potentially catastrophic events that should be considered." He said, "Those events could include melting ice caps and flooding along the East Coast, including in Florida and Washington." And another private memo from 1981 issued similar warnings. Mr. Cohen, a top Exxon scientist, wrote that it was distinctly possible that climate change would "produce effects which will indeed be catastrophic, at least for a substantial

fraction of the earth's population." And that also, unanimous consent to place in the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Mr. Woods, given these grave warnings from Exxon's own scientists over and over and over again, do you believe that it was ethical for Exxon to run a New York Times advertisement that downplayed—downplayed—the risk and instead highlighted the potential positive impact of climate change?

Mr. WOODS. Chairman, I would again say if you look at the full context of the memos that you are referencing, the messaging that came across in those full memos is very consistent with what the general consensus of the scientific community was. And our advertorial that you mentioned again concluded that there is enough knowledge to know that we should be taking action, that people, governments, and companies should respond and take practical reasonable action. And that was consistent with where the scientific community was at the time, and as time has progressed, we have continued to maintain a position that has evolved with science and is today consistent with the science.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Our witnesses today would like you to think that their actions that I have laid out and put in the record are ancient history, but they are not. Just this year, an Exxon senior lobbyist, Keith McCoy, was caught on a video boasting about these efforts, these efforts that deceived. Let's play that clip now, please.

[Video shown.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. And how did Exxon respond? Did they come clean about this shocking conduct? No. Mr. Woods called Mr. McCoy's comments inaccurate and then they fired him, and they are obviously lying like the tobacco executives were. So I want to ask each of the witnesses here today representing fossil fuel companies and trade associations to take a simple pledge. I want each of you to affirm that your organization will no longer spend any money, either directly or indirectly, to oppose efforts to reduce emissions and address climate change. Ms. Watkins, will you take that pledge on behalf of Shell?

Ms. WATKINS. Chairwoman Maloney, we spend a lot of money in lobbying for climate policy right now, and I can pledge that we——

Chairwoman MALONEY. Will you take that pledge? "Yes" or "no." If you just want to filibuster, I will take it as a "no." "Yes" or "no," will you take that pledge that you will stop spending money with dishonest——

Ms. WATKINS. I will pledge that we will continue to spend our money on climate policy advocacy as we have for many years now.

Chairwoman MALONEY. So in the interest of time, let me ask the rest of the industry representatives on this panel, do any of you refuse to take this pledge? If you refuse to take this pledge, will you please just raise your hand?

Mr. LAWLER. Chairwoman Maloney, what I would say is that we have stopped all reputational advertising at BP, but we do advocate——

Chairwoman MALONEY. But will you take the pledge? I know that you have taken steps in the right direction. I heard that in your testimony. Thank you. Will you take the pledge? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. LAWLER. Well, for your specific pledge, what we are pledging to do is advocate for low carbon policies that do, in fact, take the company and the world to net zero. That is the pledge I am willing to commit to.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Well, I am asking is——

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair?

Chairwoman MALONEY.—if you will stop spending money either directly or indirectly to oppose efforts to reduce emissions and address climate change. Just stop spending money.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair?

Chairwoman MALONEY. That is all lies. OK. I take it that you don't want to take the pledge. All right. I hope that——

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair?

Chairwoman MALONEY. I hope that after——

Mr. COMER. We are nearly two minutes over.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK. May I just close for one second? I hope that after 40 years of misleading the public to block climate action, our Nation's oil and gas industry will finally change its behavior and join the many good corporate citizens, community leaders, and scientists who are working together to save our planet and our children.

I now yield to my good friend and colleague, Ranking Member Comer.

Mr. COMER. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crabtree, thank you for appearing here before the committee today, and I would like to ask you what it is like to be a worker in this Biden economy. How long had Joe Biden been President before you were fired from your position working for the Keystone pipeline?

Mr. CRABTREE. Thank you for the question, but I think I made that clear in my opening statement that it was three hours after I lost my job. Now, I have got to be truthful, and I have got to be fair. I have got to work since then, but most of the work that we are doing now is kind of maintaining the aging infrastructure of the pipeline systems that we have in this country now. And like I said in my testimony, not adding additional capacity when there is still such a great demand for it is causing these fuel prices to rise, and to me, it is a serious national security issue when we have to write letters to OPEC asking for more oil. It is a serious issue when we——

Mr. COMER. I couldn't agree more.

Mr. CRABTREE [continuing]. Consider drawing oil out of the strategic petroleum reserve. The strategic petroleum reserve wasn't put in place to bail out incompetent decisions——

Mr. COMER. Let me say. We are going to talk a lot about that during this hearing, and I appreciate that. But my next question, did President Biden or anyone from the White House ever apologize to you for creating a situation where you lost your job immediately upon his taking office?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, of course not. I am just a simple welder. I wouldn't expect an apology. It probably wouldn't have been meant much to me, you know. An apology isn't going to put food on my table. An apology doesn't pay my bills. Being able to work is what I need.

Mr. COMER. Absolutely. Absolutely. Now, last week, President Biden said that gas prices won't go down until 2022, and he said during his town hall when asked what he was going to do to reduce gas prices, he didn't have an answer on that. What, in your opinion, impact does shutting down one pipeline, in this case, Keystone, have on energy prices?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, I can give you a number. No. 1 is transportation costs. This pipeline was going to replace the transportation. This oil has already been coming to the country. We are using it, and it is coming in by rail, and when you can build a pipeline, you can cut transportation costs by nearly a third.

Mr. COMER. And probably reduce your carbon footprint at the same time, right?

Mr. CRABTREE. Exactly. This was a pipeline that was going to run off of green energy. A lot of people don't know that. And No. 2 is market speculation. You know, the country has seen what was happening, you know, the very first thing that President Biden done. And when you see an attack on the industry like that, you know, some of the prices, you know, on the markets, a lot of it is speculation. They see this attack on it, and you get people buying up contracts because they are worried about not being able to have any.

Mr. COMER. Well, I tell you, I hate to see what has happened to you and so many other union workers in America with the disastrous Biden energy policies. It has just been a terrible time in America to be a worker in this Biden economy. It has been a good time to be on welfare and someone who doesn't work or works from home, but a terrible time to be a worker.

I want to shift gears and ask quick questions to the oil and gas CEOs. I am going to start with Mr. Woods, and we are going to try to run down these real quick because I am going to yield to Kevin Brady momentarily. But, Mr. Woods, how long have you been CEO of Exxon?

Mr. WOODS. Since 2017.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Woods, in your time as CEO, have you ever approved a climate disinformation campaign?

Mr. WOODS. I have not.

Mr. COMER. Ms. Watkins, how long have you been president of Shell?

Ms. WATKINS. For three years.

Mr. COMER. Ms. Watkins, in your time as CEO, have you ever approved a disinformation campaign?

Ms. WATKINS. No, I have not.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Wirth, how long have you been CEO of Chevron?

Mr. WIRTH. For almost four years, Congressman.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Wirth, in your time as CEO, have you ever approved a disinformation campaign?

Mr. WIRTH. I have never approved a disinformation campaign.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Lawler, how long have you been CEO of BP America?

Mr. LAWLER. About a year and a half.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Lawler, in your time as CEO, have you ever approved a disinformation campaign?

Mr. LAWLER. No, I have not.

Mr. COMER. Well, thank you all for being here and answering my questions. We are going to have a lot of questions throughout the day. I look forward to working with the oil and gas industry to create more jobs here in America. I would now like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Brady, the ranking member on the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Ranking Member Comer, for having me this morning, and to Chairwoman Maloney. Thank you to America's affordable energy leaders for joining us today.

American-made energy boasts an enviable track record of hiring, training, promoting, and empowering all Americans. I have seen this firsthand where our energy companies are providing good-paying jobs, quality healthcare, and secure retirement for workers from the lowest skills to the brightest researchers in the world with remarkable opportunities for women and people of color. The success of this industry isn't just important to my state of Texas, but important to the success of our Nation where we recognize good-paying jobs and rising paychecks do so much more to lift Americans out of poverty than the promise of never-ending government checks.

Today's disappointing economic report points out why good-paying energy jobs should be protected. Today's report was awful, and if you take out the inventories, America's growth last quarter was zero. The President is a disturbing 0 for 3 in meeting quarterly projections for growth this year, even with expectations dumbed down in some cases by 80 percent or more. The President's best economic growth peaked last spring, and he remains nearly a million jobs short of his promises. He is making an alarming labor shortage worse for Main Street businesses and is demanding more government stimulus that will drive prices up higher and longer.

Too many Americans have lost faith, and the President now faces serious questions about his competency to heal our economy. Part of that is due to a relentless attack on American energy workers by the Administration and this Democratic Congress, a taxation and regulatory attack that could kill over a million-and-a-half good-paying American energy jobs over time and drive prices even higher for struggling families and Main Street businesses. Ironically, for an Administration that has made climate change a central focus, these attacks damage the very industry that holds the key to addressing greenhouse gas emissions around the world in a smart way, that raises the standard of living here in America and our poorer nations as friends.

The solution to climate change isn't to drive energy prices up higher for everyone and kill off American energy jobs. That is flat earth thinking. The smart solution is to make affordable energy cleaner through technology, and then American technology, tax and tariff free, to help the entire world solve our climate challenges. This industry has already proven it can increase production of American energy to meet our growing demand while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This industry continues to invest more in research, innovation, and technology to make affordable energy cleaner than any other industry. Instead of vilifying them and trying to end their existence, Congress should be working with them

to accelerate this biology and clear the path for sharing it with the world.

Renewables do play a big role in reducing emissions, but natural gas is the real bridge to the future. Since the major shift away from coal and natural gas, the U.S. has reduced carbon dioxide emissions by 32 percent more. Affordable energy is the way to lift Americans out of poverty. It is the key to ensuring that low-and middle-income Americans can grow and thrive. And instead of demonizing the very industry whose success has made our country independent and secure, instead of raising energy prices on those who can least afford it, let's empower America's innovators. Let's rebuild the momentum we made in unleashing LNG and crude oil exports and use that success to make America a leader in discovering new clean energy technology. There is a smart way to transition to a cleaner energy future, and it is time both political parties in Congress joined forces with these energy leaders to achieve it.

With that, Ranking Member Comer, I yield back.

Mr. COMER. Thank you. Now I would like to yield the balance of my time to Garret Graves from Louisiana, the ranking member on the Select Committee on Climate Crisis.

Mr. GRAVES. Thank you, Ranking Member Comer, and I want to thank the chair for allowing us to participate today.

I want to first just point out, Madam Chair, that I am going to take a guess that every single person that came to Washington this week, that they came here using some form of fossil fuel. Everybody. Madam Chair, I actually have two electric vehicles, and I have actually rigged up a solar generator to charge them, the most ridiculous and cost-prohibitive thing I have ever seen in my life, but it is fun anyway. I am from South Louisiana. If projections are correct, then we are at absolutely ground zero—ground zero—for what is going to happen moving forward. We have some of the fastest subsiding straits in the world, so with sea rise, it means the fastest relative sea rise in the world. We also are home to some of the most robust oil and gas production in North America, and at the same time, we have one of the most productive ecosystems on the North American continent right there where all this energy production is occurring.

Madam Chair, I also want you to know that when the Deepwater Horizon accident happened, I ended up being the lead trustee and the negotiator for the state of Louisiana. And in that settlement, I will tell you we reached the largest settlement in U.S. history from a single company, and I am proud of that because, you know what? There were actions that were wrong, and we held them accountable.

I want to ask the witnesses a question. Maybe Mr. Sommers. If we stopped producing energy today, stopped producing oil and gas in the United States, "yes" or "no," would there be a stoppage, or would folks cease to use oil and gas across the world? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. SOMMERS. No, Congressman.

Mr. GRAVES. No.

Mr. SOMMERS. In fact, as you know, the world consumes about 100 million barrels of oil every single day, and even during the worst part of the pandemic, the world was still consuming about 81 million barrels of oil every single day. So the world is going to

continue to consume a lot of oil and natural gas from now and very long into the future.

Mr. GRAVES. Great. Thank you. I want to go back, and I apologize. I was in and out because we had another hearing going on. I believe it was Shell, but I may be mistaken, that noted in their testimony that the most efficient energy production in terms of emissions on the globe, some of the most efficient on the globe, is actually offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. Could any of you confirm that, whoever noted it in your opening testimony, to make sure I heard that correctly?

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, Congressman. Hi, it is me, Gretchen Watkins from Shell. That is a fact. We are the largest operator in the Gulf of Mexico, and we are really proud that the oil and gas that we provide to the country from the U.S. Gulf of Mexico is the lowest greenhouse gas that we can possibly——

Mr. GRAVES. So putting these two things together, if there is clearly going to be continued demand for energy, because there will because oil and gas has 32 times the energy density of the next closest renewable 32 times—so there is going to continue to be demand. We produce it most efficiently in the United States. Why would we stop? Everybody on this committee used it to get to work this week. Everybody did.

You know, something else that is really interesting as we sit here and demonize the United States and these very people that are here today on the witness panel, is the United States has led the world. We have reduced emissions more than the next 12 emissions-reducing countries combined. I am going to paraphrase a quote of the executive director of the International Energy Administration who said, "The United States' progress on reducing emissions associated with energy is the most historic in world history." Madam Chair, these people on the panel, these are the people that did that.

Mr. Sommers, could you tell me what primary source of energy resulted in this decrease in emissions?

Mr. SOMMERS. It was natural gas, Congressman.

Mr. GRAVES. Thank you very much. So natural gas, the very thing that we are talking about banning here. Madam Chair, I would like to read you a quote from a letter. "Today we call on you to use all your authority to take timely action to pressure OPEC and cooperating countries to increase world oil supplies," OK? I will say it again. Asking OPEC to increase world oil supplies. You know which awful Republican Members of Congress or people asked for this? That would be Maria Cantwell, Senator Menendez, Senator Schumer, and Senator Markey, quote, May 18, 2018. And I would like to ask that this be included in the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Chair, more recently, on August 12 of this year, a number of Democrat Members of Congress effectively asked the same thing. And as I heard noted earlier today, Jake Sullivan as well as other White House officials asked OPEC to increase oil production. If we produce it most efficiently, what are we doing by stopping it? Why? Clearly, we are going to see a 60-percent increase in global demand for energy. A 60-percent increase. the strategy right now by throwing out all conventional energy produc-

tion, OK, so we are going to move to solar. Guess who makes 90 percent of the solar panels? It is China. Guess who has 80 percent roughly of the rare earth and critical minerals in the world cornered? It is China. And by the way, they use slave and child labor to produce that.

It simply doesn't make sense. These are the innovators. We have watched our own President, Madam Chair, shut down the Keystone pipeline, open up the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, shut down domestic energy production, asked Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Iran, Nigeria, and others to produce more energy to address the growing demand in the United States and globally. I am just asking our own President to treat the United States like you are treating other countries.

Last, Madam Chair, U.S. natural gas, as a result of the efficiency of these very people, we have a 42-47-percent lower emissions profile—lower emissions profile—than Russian gas being delivered to Europe or Asia. This is part of the solution as we move forward meeting this growing energy demand with solar, with wind, with geothermal, with nuclear, with oil and gas, and other efficient energy streams. It is against our interest to shut these things down. We need to be focused on the innovation, carbon capture storage, carbon capture utilization, and other complementary strategies to meet this growing demand. When the Clinton Administration stopped producing energy domestically, barrel for barrel, we imported more from Russia. It is a failed strategy which is not in the best interest of United States.

I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Comer, do you yield back?

Mr. COMER. I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK. I now recognize Mr. Khanna, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Environment, for 15 minutes.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, Madam Chair. First, let me thank the witnesses for appearing today voluntarily. I don't have any interest in being adversarial. I actually want to see if we can get some positive commitments.

Let me start out where I think we will agree. Mr. Woods, what is impressive is that in 1977, Exxon had a report that said, "There is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate change is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels." Mr. Woods, I assume you would agree with that Exxon conclusion, yes?

Mr. WOODS. Our work was consistent with what the scientific community was saying at the time, yes.

Mr. KHANNA. And in your role as CEO, as you told Representative Comer, you would never today endorse statements that blatantly contradict climate science, correct?

Mr. WOODS. Correct.

Mr. KHANNA. And so if an organization, for example, today were to say they do not believe in the linkage between fossil fuels and warming, I assume you would say that is false, correct?

Mr. WOODS. I wouldn't support that statement.

Mr. KHANNA. You would say it is false?

Mr. WOODS. In looking at the full context of the statement, I would make a judgment on that, but that is——

Mr. KHANNA. I mean, you would say it is false that there is no linkage between fossil fuels and warming, correct?

Mr. WOODS. The combustion of fossil fuels leads to emissions, which is linked to climate change, yes.

Mr. KHANNA. OK. And I assume you know that your former Exxon CEO, Lee Raymond, made exactly that statement in 2002, nearly 25 years after Exxon's report. He said he does not believe "that the science establishes the linkage between fossil fuels and warming." I am glad you admitted that that statement is false, and I really don't want to dwell on the past. But in the spirit of giving you the chance to turn the page for the company, I assume you would acknowledge that Mr. Raymond's statement was a mistake and the company regrets it, correct?

Mr. WOODS. I think Mr. Raymond's statement was consistent with the science at the time. We have evolved——

Mr. KHANNA. I don't want to even argue that. Mr. Woods, I don't even want to argue that. We could go back and forth. You said it is a false statement. You know, when I make a statement that is wrong, when most people make a statement that is wrong, they say, OK, it is a mistake, we regret it. I am just asking you for that. I assume now that it is a false statement, that the company regrets making it and would acknowledge that, right?

Mr. WOODS. I think the expectation would be that we would look at that, the time it was said, and years ago that was consistent at the time.

Mr. KHANNA. But forget whether it was consistent or not. Can you just acknowledge that it was a mistake to make? If someone makes a mistake, just say it was a mistake and you regret that that statement was out there. Would you say that if——

Mr. WOODS. I don't think it is fair to judge something 25 years ago with what we have learned since that time to today's standard.

Mr. KHANNA. Well, I am disappointed that you are not even willing to say that something is a mistake. It doesn't inspire a lot of confidence about, you know, introspection and going forward. I am surprised actually. I thought you would just say it is a mistake. It is not asking you much to say, yes, it is a mistake that someone put that out. Anyway, let me move on.

The United Nations 2021 Production Gap Report says, "To be consistent with the 1.5-degree pathway, oil and gas production would have to decline annually by four percent and three percent, respectively. The IEA's 2021 net zero roadmap calls for no new oil and gas developments." Mr. Lawler, BP has said that it supports economy-wide net zero greenhouse gas emission targets by 2050. You made a strong commitment actually to reduce oil and gas production by 40 percent by 2030. I assume you are doing this because you think it is important and part of the solution to the climate crisis. Is that correct?

Mr. LAWLER. That is correct, Mr. Khanna. What BP has aligned its strategy on is in accordance with the Paris Agreement. We have a new strategy. Just two years ago, just before COVID started, we put this new strategy into place.

Mr. KHANNA. Right. I don't want to cut you off. We have limited time. And so you believe that the oil and gas production must decline each year. Is that partly while you are doing this?

Mr. LAWLER. We think that is the best decision for BP and that is our contribution.

Mr. KHANNA. And, Ms. Watkins, Shell's Energy Transition Strategy says, "We have set our net zero target so it is fully consistent with the Paris Agreement." And you today actually announced this new thing where you are going to be having a 50-percent reduction on Scope 1 and 2, and you are also committed to a 1 to 2 percent year-end total oil production decline. Is that right?

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. KHANNA. Great. And I assume you are doing that that because you also believe, under the Paris Agreement, that it is important and that we need to have oil and gas production declining every year?

Ms. WATKINS. Congressman, what we do believe is that hydrocarbon demand needs to reduce if we are going to get to net zero by 2050, which is why we are also providing more and more low- and no-carbon energy——

Mr. KHANNA. Right, but you are committed to this 1 to 2 percent reduction every year, right? I mean, that is your policy, correct?

Ms. WATKINS. It is, and——

Mr. KHANNA. And let me just turn now to Mr. Wirth. Chevron announced, unlike BP and Shell, earlier this year that you plan to increase, by 3.5 percent on a compound basis, your production. Is that correct, Mr. Wirth?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, our forward guidance would show that we will grow lower carbon production of traditional——

Mr. KHANNA. I am just asking are you going to be increasing your oil and gas production by 3.5 percent on an annual basis?

Mr. WIRTH. Chairman, we will increase our oil and gas production and reduce the carbon——

Mr. KHANNA. OK. So you are going to be increasing the production. And, Mr. Woods, you have said that you want to keep the oil and gas production flat. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODS. We are focused on meeting the needs of society, and whatever that need requires——

Mr. KHANNA. I don't need the American apple pie speech. It is just a factual question. You are going to keep it flat, right?

Mr. WOODS. We don't have——

Mr. KHANNA. So 40 percent reduction BP, 1 to 2 percent annual Shell, the Europeans, the American companies. Chevron is increasing. Exxon is increasing. Mr. Lawler, BP has said it is——

Voice. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KHANNA. No, not right now. BP has said that it supports economy-wide net zero greenhouse gas emissions. BP, clearly you are only one member, so I assume when you are saying "economy-wide," you believe other companies need to follow your lead in decreasing production. Would that be fair, Mr. Lawler?

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, sir, I think what we offered up is just a suggestion. You know, there are many approaches to net zero, and we certainly wouldn't——

Mr. KHANNA. I guess my question is this, Mr. Lawler. Do you believe that the science says that companies should go down every year?

Mr. LAWLER. Well, I think what we would agree with is the IPC report, the scientific consensus that action needs to be taken to lower emissions is real, it is significant, and BP is in action on that. And one example——

Mr. KHANNA. Let me just ask a "yes" or "no" question on this, Mr. Wirth. Are you embarrassed as an American company that your production is going up while the European counterparts are going down?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, as we have already heard, demand for energy is going up in the world.

Mr. KHANNA. OK. You are not embarrassed. I am just asking an open question. It is not a "gotcha" question. Do you commit to do anything to matching your European counterparts to try to bring the actual demand of oil production down?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, with all due respect, I am very proud of our company and what we do. I am proud of the companies in this——

Mr. KHANNA. No, you won't reduce——

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. Pollution.

Mr. KHANNA. You won't. And, Mr. Woods, would you commit to matching your European counterparts to reducing the production of oil, like both Shell and BP are doing?

Mr. WOODS. We are committed to lowering our emissions, which——

Mr. KHANNA. No. Are you committed to lowering the production as the Paris Accords say or no? It is——

Mr. WOODS. The issue, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KHANNA. It is a "yes" or "no." You could explain why you are not, but are you committing? Could you commit to lowering production or not?

Mr. WOODS. We are going to lower emissions, which is the source of the issue that we are trying to address.

Mr. KHANNA. I will take that as a "no." Let me move to a new point. Ms. Watkins, you know, so far you seem like the star here. Do you agree that electric vehicles are vital to decarbonization? I assume you do because you said the rise of electric vehicles is vital to decarbonizing road transport.

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, we believe that to be the case.

Mr. KHANNA. Great. Mr. Lawler, I assume you agree with this because you say energy use in road transport is key. It needs to be dominated by electrification.

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, sir. We believe that EVs are significant.

Mr. KHANNA. Great. Both of your companies, along with Exxon and Shell, support the American Petroleum Institute, and, Mr. Sommers, you are here. You are the head of API, and you said, "The government efforts to promote electric vehicles would leave everyday drivers high and dry, unfairly burden non-EV drivers, and be costly for taxpayers and consumers." In fact, you have been participating in "state-by-state multimillion-dollar battles to squelch utilities' plans to build charging stations across the country." Ms. Watkins, on this panel, with you is Mr. Sommers, the

head of API. Will you take the opportunity today to tell him that his opposition to electric vehicles is wrong, and that instead of opposing tax credits for electric vehicles, he should support them?

Ms. WATKINS. Chairman Khanna, we are a member of the API for a number of reasons, and——

Mr. KHANNA. Yes, I know, and I respect that, but can you just tell him to stop the electric vehicle advertising? If you say that today, he will stop. You give them $10 million a year.

Ms. WATKINS. We have a number of ongoing conversations——

Mr. KHANNA. Would you just tell him that today? Just tell him please stop the electric vehicle advertising. It will help us in Congress. Just tell him to stop.

Ms. WATKINS. So I would like to speak on behalf of Shell, and here at Shell, we very much believe electric vehicles are part of the future, which is why we work with——

Mr. KHANNA. If you would tell him to stop, it would be really helpful, you know. It would help the President. He is really trying to do what you are asking the President to do. The other thing is I saw your positive statement today. I was really happy for a well-crafted methane fee. You know, who has been advertising against the methane fee? API. API. Half a million dollars in the last three months of Facebook advertising alone against the President's agenda on the methane fee that you supported this morning in your great statement. You added it. Your staff crafted the statement, and you said, no, we want to have a well-crafted methane fee. Can you please, please tell API to stop the advertising on the methane fee, against the methane fee?

Ms. WATKINS. There are several places where we are not fully aligned with the API. We have been——

Mr. KHANNA. Just tell him to stop. Mr. Lawler, anyone, will you tell them to stop? Mr. Lawler, will you tell him to stop the advertising?

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Khanna, we have been in active communications with API now from the time I joined, and whenever there is a——

Mr. KHANNA. He is sitting right next to you on the virtual screen. Just say stop, you know. Just speak plainly. Say stop the advertising against electric vehicles. Stop the advertising against methane.

Mr. LAWLER. Well, I speak for BP, Mr. Khanna, and we have been supportive of the green climate portions of the——

Mr. KHANNA. Let ask you this. Mr. Woods, Mr. Wirth, this is your chance to redeem yourselves. Will you tell them to stop, API? If you are not doing the production stuff, can you tell API to stop that advertising, either of you?

Mr. WIRTH. Chairman Khanna, we engage in discussions on many policy issues at API. There is a diverse set of members, as Mr. Sommers said, over 600 members in this association.

Mr. KHANNA. You won't tell him to stop?

Mr. WIRTH. The members don't always agree on everything.

Mr. KHANNA. Let me ask you this. Total, as you know, they pulled their commitment to API because they said they can't be part of an organization that is engaged against the fight for climate change. Will each of you commit to leaving API if they continue to

lobby against electric vehicles? Will any of you commit to leaving them if they are lobbying against electric vehicles?

[No response.]

Mr. KHANNA. Here is what is so frustrating because I really don't think you are as bad as the CEOs of the past. I don't. I think you have tough jobs. You got there. You got a horrible record on stuff. You are figuring out how you don't get into litigation trouble while really trying to tell the truth, and it is a tough act. I mean, I don't envy you, and I don't believe you purposely want to be out there spreading climate disinformation. But you are funding these groups, and they are really having an impact. You know, they are they are spending millions of dollars in Congress to kill electric vehicles, and they are spending millions of dollars against the methane gas, and you could do something here. You could tell them to knock it off for the sake of the planet. You could end it. You could end that lobby. Would any of you take the opportunity to look at API and say stop it? Any of you?

[No response.]

Mr. KHANNA. Could you commit, any of you? Ms. Watkins, come on. I mean, will you do something here? Would you commit to saying you are not going to fund any group that is going to engage in climate disinformation at least?

Ms. WATKINS. Chairman Khanna, what I will commit to is continuing to be an active member of the API. And we discuss many issues in API, some of which have to do with climate policy, and I am really pleased that——

Mr. KHANNA. Let me ask this. Would any of you commit to having an independent audit to verify that none of your funds are going for climate denial?

[No response.]

Mr. KHANNA. Let me ask this. Raise your hand if you think the climate crisis is one of the most important crises that humanity faces? Just raise your hand. I think all of you do.

[Hands raised.]

Mr. KHANNA. It is important? Yes. That is right. And, you know, I understand you fund things for a lot of reasons. You are the CEOs. You can't track all the details. But if your money is going to organizations that are against the fundamental values that you claim you stand for, don't you think you have some obligation to monitor where the money is going and to make some commitment today to the American people? Right now, your position to the American people, this is not "gotcha." This is like actually trying to understand what you said. You are saying we are just going to spend. We will have conversation. If they want to do false advertising, fine. We will talk to them behind the scenes. Are any of you today prepared to make any statement saying we are going to take accountability on something so important and stop funding groups that are actively engaged in any form of climate disinformation? I will give all of you the last word, so my time is up. Any form of commitment in any way, even with a bunch of weasel words, would be great. Please go. Everyone will have a chance to answer.

Ms. WATKINS. Chairman Khanna, I will start by saying that we have been issuing for the last several years trade association reports where we very clearly lay out with a great deal of trans-

parency where we are aligned and where we are somewhat misaligned with trade associations. In fact, we left a trade association because we were so misaligned that we didn't see a way of getting back in alignment. We have been transparent about that, and I will commit to you today that we will continue to drive increased scrutiny on a number of areas around climate policy in that arena.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Lawler?

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, sir. So BP has 7,000 Chargemaster stations in the U.K. on their way to 70,000 charging stations by the end of the decade. We are very much for EV use. We advocate that within API and other organizations, and we will continue to do that, sir.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, his time——

Mr. KHANNA. I just would ask that Mr. Wirth and Mr. Woods could just answer. I am not going to ask anything more. They went over a couple minutes.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Wirth and Mr. Woods, do you have anything?

Mr. WIRTH. Chairman Khanna——

Chairwoman MALONEY. Very quickly.

Mr. WIRTH. We engage with a number of organizations, and we don't control and may not always agree with the positions taken or statements made by industry groups and other organizations. We engage in constructive dialog. What I can tell you is our position is that climate change is real, the use of fossil fuels contributes to it, and we are committed to helping advance a lower carbon future.

Mr. WOODS. We make our positions very clear going into the trade associations and then we work with them to try to advance those positions, consistent with the broader view of the membership that each of the organization serves. And I would point out that API has evolved the climate position and supports carbon tax along with a number of other constructive climate policies.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back, and I now recognize for an equivalent amount of time, Mr. Norman, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Environment, for an equivalent amount of time.

Mr. NORMAN. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney. For my questions, I would like to yield to Jim Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. Oh, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The previous speaker used the word "frustrating." I will tell you what is frustrating is a Member of Congress telling American oil and gas companies to reduce production at the same time the President United States is begging OPEC to increase production. That may be the dumbest thing I have ever heard, but that is the scenario we are in. God bless Chevron for saying they are going to increase production. What does the gentleman want, $8 gasoline, $10 gasoline for the very families that we all represent? This is craziness what they are talking about. I yield back to the gentleman. Thank you for yielding me 30 seconds.

Mr. NORMAN. Thank you so much. Mr. Sommers, did you realize back several months ago at an Oversight hearing that I asked Ms. Greta Thunberg, who is a spokesman, you know, for the Green New Deal and other issues—she has 17.9 million followers. I asked

her with China and India, how are we going to get them to cut their emissions when they are the leaders in the world and America has come down on emissions. Do you realize she said they were going to ask them to? Is this a proper response, in your opinion?

Mr. SOMMERS. Thank you, Congressman, for your question. As you know, the United States accounts for about 12.6 percent of world emissions, and our emissions continue to go down year on year. China's emissions account for about 32.6 percent of world emissions, and their emissions continue to go up. The key point is that, yes, climate change is real and that we need to step up to the plate and do what we can to address the climate challenge, but at the same time, this is a global challenge. This isn't a challenge that can be taken on just by one company or by one country. We need a global solution to the climate challenge.

But this industry has not waited for others to step up to the plate to deal with that challenge. In fact, earlier this year, the American Petroleum Institute put forward a very forward-looking position on climate change in API's Climate Action Framework. The interesting thing about that framework, Congressman, is that it is not just about what we are asking the government to do, but what the industry is committing to do to reduce climate change over time. And we are proud of that forward-looking agenda.

But as you point out, this is a global challenge, and the world is going to continue to demand oil and gas for the future. The question I think lawmakers have to answer is whether the world is going to get that oil gas from the United States where it is produced cleaner, better, and safer, or whether they are going to get that oil and gas from countries that are hostile to American interests. I think the answer is clear, from our perspective.

Mr. NORMAN. And the Administration is content to get our natural gas and oil, as Mr. Jordan said, and paying ungodly amounts in the future, if we can get gas from countries that don't like us. Does that make sense to you?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank you again for your question.

Mr. NORMAN. Does that make sense?

Mr. SOMMERS. No, sir.

Mr. NORMAN. No, and nor does Greta Thunberg's answer, which was a Pollyannish answer saying, yes, we will ask them to be nice does not make sense. Mr. Sommers, isn't it true that most of the raw materials and manufacturing capacity for renewables necessary to execute Biden's zero-emissions goal comes from China?

Mr. SOMMERS. That is the case, Congressman.

Mr. NORMAN. And does China's ability to manufacture renewables cheaply have anything to do with the fact that their factories are powered by oil and gas or that their economy runs on 84-percent fossil fuels?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, the Chinese economy continues to expand not just oil and gas infrastructure, but, in fact, based on the data that we have seen, China is adding a coal plant a week. Their emissions continue to go up while American emissions continue to go down mainly because the United States has made a fuel switch from coal as the primary source of power to natural gas. And that is because natural gas prices have gotten lower as a consequence of the technological and innovative revolution that oc-

curred in this country over the course of the last decade. We are able to find more of this energy here at home, and as a consequence of that, we have been actually able to reduce emissions while our production is going up. In fact, no country—no country—in the world has reduced emissions more than the United States, and it is because of the American oil and gas industry.

Mr. NORMAN. And China is not being held to the same emission standards that we are, yet the Biden Administration and the questions you have had don't even address this. They are content to buy from countries that don't like us and let Americans suffer as they pay for not just gas, but every other commodity that they are trying to buy now.

I now yield to Congresswoman Foxx.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you very much for yielding. The title of this hearing suggests that "Big Oil" is running a disinformation campaign designed to prevent action on the climate. However, it is clear that this hearing is part of a Democrat-led disinformation campaign to distract from the Biden Administration's failed policies that are hurting average Americans.

The Biden Administration has injected instability into the energy sector by canceling the Keystone XL pipeline and discouraging domestic exploration and new development. And once gas prices predictably started rising, President Biden even turned to our competitors, as has already been noted, in OPEC and asked them to bail him out. As of this morning, $3.39-per-gallon gas is the average price of gas in America, which is the highest since the Obama-Biden Administration. Do we see a pattern here? This hurts families in my district and across the Nation who now have to decide which items on their grocery list they cannot buy and what trips they can no longer afford to take.

Today's hearing is meant to distract from this harsh reality facing families and shift blame from the Biden Administration's failed policies to the private sector. And since the Democrats aren't interested in asking about this, I want to take a moment to ask Mr. Woods, Ms. Watkins, Mr. Wirth, Mr. Lawler to tell us what your companies are doing to transition to lower carbon energy.

Mr. WOODS. Well, thank you for the question, Congresswoman. It is an important one and one that we have been focused on for quite some time is striking the balance of continuing to meet the growing demand for energy while reducing emissions. Natural gas has been pointed out as one step toward replacing higher emission fuel systems. We are also working on reducing our own emissions at our plant, and from 2016 to 2020, as I have mentioned, we have reduced it by 11 percent and have plans for more aggressive reductions going forward.

Ms. FOXX. OK. I am going to have to ask you to cut it real short because I only have about two minutes left. So the others, can you give me real short answers?

Ms. WATKINS. Congresswoman, thank you for the question. At Shell, we believe climate change is a real challenge that is facing the world. We plan to continue to play a role in that both by continuing to produce low greenhouse gas hydrocarbons here in the U.S., but over time, those will go down and increasing, hopefully, the demand from our customers in collaboration with governments

for low-and no-carbon fuels, like electricity generated by solar or wind or like hydrogen. And so we are very much in action on both setting targets for ourselves, but also working with our customers, working with society in order to accelerate——

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. Mr. Wirth?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, our strategy is simple: be a leader in low-carbon production of traditional energy that the world needs today while growing lower-carbon businesses, and we are doing this in three ways. First, we are taking steps toward net zero by 2050 for upstream Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Second, we are taking steps to address Scope 3 emissions by growing lower-carbon business lines and establishing a new metric for the full value chain of our business. And third, we have committed to invest more than $10 billion on lower-carbon and carbon reduction projects.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. Unfortunately, Mr. Lawler, I have almost run out of time, and I need to ask a question of Mr. Sommers. So I wonder if you could submit your answer in writing.

Mr. LAWLER. I would be happy to do so.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Sommers, despite some of the rhetoric from your critics, it is clear from the things you said and others have said that meaningful steps to reduce emissions from operations have already been done. Could you describe any other effort, in about 30 seconds, that are under way and some of the planned industry initiatives that haven't been mentioned?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, thank you and great to be with you today. First of all, the API Climate Action Framework, which can be found at API.org/climate, is our forward-leaning agenda to address the challenge of climate change. In addition to that, since 2017, the American Petroleum Institute has had a program called the Environmental Partnership, which is all about how we reduce methane emissions within our own operations. This program has had measurable success, and we are continuing to reduce methane operations within the oil and gas industry. We are proud of all that work, and we look forward to expanding that work over time.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Sommers. I yield back to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Thank you, Ms. Foxx. I now yield five minutes to Congressman Hice.

Mr. HICE. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank Chairwoman Maloney for giving this committee yet another opportunity, another platform to highlight the horrible, miserable, failed policies of the Biden Administration and the Democratic Party as a whole, and for also allowing this time yet again to exhibit the dereliction of duty of this committee to perform real oversight on pressing issues like the southern border, like global supply chain issues, and like the horrible withdrawal in Afghanistan, and yet to this day, the hundreds of who right now are left in Afghanistan while we are having hearings like this to supposedly investigate a misinformation campaign by the oil and gas companies.

But let's talk about real misinformation. As it relates to climate change, Democrats and their friends in the media have morphed what is considered a worst-case climate scenario into what today is considered a most likely and sure to happen tomorrow kind of scenario. And it is all about the purposes of justifying an array of

liberal socialist wish list priorities, such as the Green New Deal. Unfortunately, Democrats have shamelessly scared and frightened an entire generation of children in the fearing that the entire end of the world is just upon us. One of our colleagues said we only have 11 years left to save the planet—are you kidding me—shamelessly creating fear in society in a whole new generation. And yet the Green New Deal, which our colleague from New York, her own chief of staff admitted that the Green New Deal was not even about the environment, that it was more of a how do you change the entire economy kind of thing. It promises family sustainable wages. It promises medical and family leave, paid vacation, retirement security. It says nothing about the environment as a whole.

Democrats have become masters of accusing others of the very thing they themselves are guilty of, and in this case, misinformation. It is misinformation meant to scare the public and ignore realities, realities like the truth that the United States has been reducing carbon emissions while China's emissions have been going through the roof. China now produces twice the carbon emissions as the United States and a quarter of all greenhouse gas emissions globally. China. Here is a country who detests freedom, detests democracy, detests human rights. They would love nothing more than for the United States to be crippled in our economy through these rosy sounding, nevertheless horrible policies being presented and crammed down the throats of the American people by the Democratic Party.

And what has the Biden Administration done about it all? Well, ask Mr. Crabtree today and 11,000 others who have lost their jobs because of the horrible policy decisions of this Administration, and by the way, union jobs. Good-paying union jobs, which our Democrats love to crow about, and yet now these individuals have lost their jobs. The Biden Administration had no problem killing the Keystone pipeline, but, at the same time, no problem willing to establish Nord Stream 2. So here we go. Let's give Putin and the Russians everything they need, including economic and political leverage over Europe. What kind of Russian collusion was involved in that kind of deal I wonder.

Yet the Biden Administration cannot escape the fact that the U.S. economy still relies on oil and gas for basic necessities, and yet their plan is let's decrease our own energy independence while increasing reliance upon some of the world's most unstable countries. And yet now, these companies that we are talking to today who are being villainized, are at the same time being begged by the Biden Administration to help reduce energy prices. The hypocrisy is insane.

My time has expired, and with that, I will yield back to the gentleman from South Carolina. Thank you.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, my time has expired.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. Norton, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney, for this important hearing with fossil fuel companies. There is ample evidence that the fossil fuel industry has worked to deceive the public and sow doubt about climate science, and that has been going on for

decades, but the tactics they are employing are not new. They are a mirror image of tactics used by tobacco companies decades ago. In 2019, Sharon Eubanks, a former Justice Department prosecutor, testified before this committee's Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Subcommittee that, similar to Big Tobacco, oil companies have—here I am quoting—"denied that there was a consensus," and at the same time, their internal documents show they knew there was a consensus. Mr. Woods, are you familiar with a scientist by the name of Frederick Seitz? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. No.

Mr. NORTON. All right. Dr. Seitz was a prominent scientist, even heading the National Academy of Science in the 1960's. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, in the 1990's and 2000's Dr. Seitz advised a number of ExxonMobil-funded groups on scientific research. At the same time, he published several articles questioning climate science, including a 1995 Wall Street Journal piece arguing against a report issued by the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In 1998, he led a petition calling for the United States to leave the Kyoto Protocol. Dr. Seitz claimed in a letter with the petition that, and here again I am quoting, "increased atmospheric carbon dioxide is environmentally helpful." Mr. Woods, were you aware that before he began publicly questioning climate science, Dr. Seitz had a role advising tobacco companies on their medical research?

Mr. WOODS. No. I am not familiar with Dr. Seitz, so I don't have any of that context.

Mr. NORTON. In the 1970's and 80's, Dr. Seitz advised the R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, helping oversee millions of dollars in research funding. He later explained that the tobacco companies "didn't want us looking at the health effects of cigarette smoking." Big Oil tries to distinguish itself from Big Tobacco, but the fact is the disinformation campaign used for decades by the fossil fuel industry mirrors Big Tobacco itself and its playbook, injects uncertainty into the public discourse, undermines the science, all while continuing to rake in economic benefits. Ultimately, the tobacco industry was held accountable for its deception, but Big Oil has so far escaped accountability for its longstanding climate denial. And I hope that tide will begin to turn today just as it did with Big Tobacco executives.

I thank you, and I yield back, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Donalds, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, to the witnesses, the leaders of Exxon, Chevron, BP, Shell, I know that the climate activists in Twitter world which Dave Chappelle says doesn't exist, and he is right because it is just people who have nothing better to do but type on their keyboards, and we do it, too, here in Congress. But let's be very clear. You need an apology because what I witnessed today was just rank intimidation by the chair of this committee. Trying to get you to pledge on what you are going to spend your money on is a gross violation of the First Amendment. And just because we are Members of Congress, and we got microphones, and we pass laws does not mean that we also have the ability to infringe on your ability to organize, whether it

is API or anybody else, or what you choose to spend your money on. It is disgusting. It is absolutely disgusting.

Somebody needs to go call Merrick Garland and tell him to get in here and watch the intimidation that came from this very panel today because this is not about defending Big Oil or defending big anything. It is about defending the ability of people in our country to be free, say what they want, think what they want, spend their money how they choose. And if we are not going to be any better than the Chinese, how do we ever expect to beat them on the world stage when we are cutting our neck when it comes to energy production while they are burning more coal, they are increasing their emissions, and they are not showing up in Scotland? You know why they are not showing up in Scotland? Because they are interested in building an economy. They are interested in becoming the dominant economic player across the globe. They are interested in becoming the dominant military player across the globe while we joke around and mess around intimidating you guys, who, frankly, heat our homes, you cool our fridges, you keep our cars going. This is insane. So I am sorry for you, and I am sorry for the people in our country who have to witness shenanigans like this and witness circuses like this. That is why they call that one show on HBO, whatever it is, The Circus, because that is exactly what this is.

Madam Chair, I am requesting that a letter be entered into the record. This is a letter written by Ranking Member Comer and the other ranking members on this committee that actually speaks to the chilling effect that has come from you, Madam Chair, asking you to stop intimidating companies, requesting information that is their First Amendment right to have that information. I ask that that be admitted into the record under unanimous consent.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question for Mr. Sommers now that we are done with that. Mr. Sommers, it was asked earlier of a lot of the executives if they believe in electronic vehicles, and it is a noble goal to have. But, Mr. Sommers, where does electricity production actually come from?

Mr. SOMMERS. Thank you, Congressman. Before I address that question, I do want to clear one thing up, that a difference of views on electric vehicles is not climate disinformation. We as an organization support all forms of energy. We support the rapid advancement of electronic vehicles as well, but at the same time, what we don't agree with is that the Federal Government should be the ones that are funding that buildout of infrastructure. The concern is that as we build out service stations across the country, those service stations have been developed not by the Federal Government, but by private industry. And members on this panel themselves are investing in building out that infrastructure as is appropriate for the private sector. Second of all, I think your question is very, very important, which is, where does that energy come from. Most of the energy in the United States comes from natural gas. It has replaced coal as the primary source of energy in this country.

Mr. DONALDS. Let me ask you this question as a followup. So if we don't have natural gas, and obviously the Democrats are against coal, where would we actually get the electricity to power all of these electric cars? Where would it come from?

Mr. SOMMERS. Well, Congressman, for most countries and for certainly the United States, there would be likely a fuel switch back from natural gas to coal. And because——

Mr. DONALDS. So real quick, and I don't mean to cut you off because you make a great point, but I got 30 seconds. It is important for the American people to understand that if you follow the idiocy that is in the bipartisan infrastructure agreement, which is going to make natural gas harder to procure, we are actually not going to have lower emissions. We are going to have higher because you are going to have to switch back to coal-fired plants. And just for the record, let's also say the world will always demand energy. If you are not getting it from us, where we actually do it more safely and more cleanly, you will get it from Russia, you will get it from China, and they don't care what the climate activists have to say on Twitter. I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Cooper, is now recognized. Mr. Cooper.

Mr. COOPER. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I would like to thank all the witnesses for being here today.

I think the question before us is how do we transition the world to a zero-carbon economy as cheaply and as easily as possible. And most all the witnesses seem to be in favor of market-based solutions to this problem, including a price on carbon. So I would like each of the witnesses to answer, what is the right price of carbon? Mr. Lawler? Mr. Woods? Mr. Wirth?

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, sir. So, you know, BP has been an advocate of an economy-wide, market-based price on carbon for many, many years.

Mr. COOPER. I would like the specific number, please, and I don't have much time, so please tell me the price for carbon that you would support.

Mr. LAWLER. So I don't have a specific price today to answer your question, but we do think it is the most efficient way to——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Woods?

Mr. WOODS. Congressman, it is a very important question. It depends on where you are trying to decarbonize at. We have proposed a very large-scale carbon reduction project in the Houston Ship Channel. That would require $100 a ton and depending on where you are and how close you are to different sequestration, that price will change.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Wirth?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, there are different circumstances and economies around the world. There are different carbon prices in economies around the world.

Mr. COOPER. In the U.S.

Mr. WIRTH. A broad-based and transparent price is very important, and then a price that gradually moves into the economy——

Mr. COOPER. What price? What price?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, there are different opinions on the number. I am talking about the——

Mr. COOPER. I want your opinion.

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, the cost of mitigating emissions is very different in different sectors of our economy, and eventually——

Mr. COOPER. Ms. Watkins? Ms. Watkins?

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. To get to the kinds of reductions that we aspire to, it will be a very high price over time.

Mr. COOPER. Ms. Watkins, the price of carbon. What should it be?

Ms. WATKINS. Yes. We can't say a specific price right now.

Mr. COOPER. OK.

Ms. WATKINS. We need to put this in place. It is a market-based carbon price. It would need to be a very even playing field, and depending on what we are trying to decarbonize, the price will float with the market.

Mr. COOPER. Well, the sooner we can reach a fair price on carbon, and I know it would fluctuate, the sooner we can achieve that market-based reform that you say that you are for. Another part of market-based reforms is whether you are truly a market-based entity or not, and I was wondering if we could agree on the amount of government subsidies that you receive every year. I think at the low estimate it is about $20 billion a year, but the IMF estimates that U.S. oil companies receive some $650 billion in direct and indirect subsidies every year. So can the four key oil executives agree on the amount by which they are subsidized, at least in the United States by the U.S. taxpayer? Is it $20 billion or is it $650 billion?

[No response.]

Mr. COOPER. Crickets. None of you have any idea how much you are being subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, our products are taxed, not subsidized, and I can tell you that a number of the policies that get described as subsidies are very similar to those available to other industries and other companies, and they are important for American energy security, American energy investments, and American energy supply.

Mr. COOPER. Well, when the tobacco companies were on the hot seat years ago, the first step that Congress took was to remove the subsidies for tobacco growing. That was the first step, and I think it is very important that we arrive at the degree of subsidies that are involved. I know that you are taxed, but you also have special provisions that only apply to oil and gas companies and don't apply to other firms. In aggregate, how much are those subsidies because those, by definition, would not be market based. Those are government policies that benefit your companies instead of other types of activities. How much are those subsidies?

[No response.]

Mr. COOPER. Crickets.

Mr. LAWLER. Congressman, I can't answer your question directly, but I would say, though, that a healthy oil and gas industry is very important to the transition for——

Mr. COOPER. I agree. I agree.

Mr. LAWLER. And so——

Mr. COOPER. I am wanting to find answers to market-based solutions which you say that you are for. Final point, shareholder activism, these upstart hedge funds. The front page of The Wall Street

Journal today has advocates of Shell being broken up because apparently, they believe that more money could be made for investors by having a better-run company, and that shareholder activists have taken seats on ExxonMobil's board. I think that could be the market reform that might be faster than congressional action.

I see that my time has expired. I thank the chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from New Mexico, Ms. Herrell, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. HERRELL. Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me start off by saying that I am so glad to have this hearing because I don't think you can truly understand the hypocrisy that happens in this Capitol and in this building unless you are watching it like we are today, or hearing it, or participating in it. And the saddest thing of all is we have a President who has tweeted about the million jobs he is going to create or the 4 million jobs he is going to create. And you know what is sad? He is creating jobs overseas, because the very people that heat our homes, that put us to work every day, that has a profound effect on our entire country in terms of national security and job creation that is under attack.

And while this committee may not like you because your executives, because your companies have been successful, I just want to apologize for the decorum because thank you for what you have done. Thank you, every one of you, for creating the jobs and for bringing it home, for teaching us that we can be energy independent and that we can also have a very reliable and longstanding relationship with each and every one of you and the communities and the people that rely on you. And who we don't talk about, you know, are the seniors or the lower middle-class income people that cannot afford to heat their homes or will have to make decisions this year whether to buy food, or to heat their homes, or to buy gas. And this is just the tip of the iceberg because later today or sometime this week, or maybe this year, we are going to pass the most ridiculous bill in American history, the infrastructure reconciliation bill, that does nothing for the American people. So while you are getting beat down today, there are people here that believe in what you are doing, and we thank you for all of the innovation.

But what I want to do is ask a couple of questions to Mr. Sommers. And this is really a no-brainer, but I am thinking if you get to answer the question maybe somebody will actually listen to you. What would happen to global emissions if my Democrat colleagues got their way and the United States stopped completely producing oil and gas?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, thank you for your question, and you represent one of the most prolific oil and gas districts in the country, representing the New Mexico side of the prolific Permian Basin. And as you know, oil and gas has led to a significant increase in jobs in your congressional district, and because of that, we have been able to reduce emissions because we have been able to find that oil and gas in more environmentally responsible ways. And for that matter, the state of New Mexico receives about 40 percent of its budget from the oil and gas industry.

To answer your specific question, if the United States stopped using oil and gas, it is likely that there would be a reverse switch from the use of natural gas in our electricity generation to the use of coal. You know, in this industry, we need to remember what we at API call the energy trilemma. The energy trilemma is that for every energy source, it needs to be provided affordably, reliably, and cleaner, and so every source has to meet that same challenge. Within the oil and gas industry, we are working toward meeting that challenge every single day. There is a reason why U.S. emissions have continued to go down. Sixty-five percent of the decline in emissions in the last decade is a consequence of that fuel switch from coal to natural gas. We do not want to reverse that progress.

Ms. HERRELL. Right, but we are doing everything we can in this committee and on Capitol Hill to do just that, which I don't think people understand this isn't about just starting the car every day. This is about so many of our day-to-day projects touched by petroleum. In fact, I would just submit to saying anybody who has gotten a vaccination or is going to get one, thank you to the oil and gas industry because I would bet that almost every single one of these syringes has been touched by a petroleum product. But we don't want to give a heads up or pat on the back to the industry because we would rather sit you down in here and tear you down and make the public think that you are all bad, you are rich, and you don't care about anybody. We know better than that.

And this is truly personal for me because you just said it. You know, 40 percent of my state budget comes from this industry. Communities in my state, in my district are completely made up of the men and women that serve, whether directly or indirectly, in jobs related to the industry. And while we sit here and think that we have got a better way, if it is all green and it is all good, then why are we subsidizing green new everything? Why are we pushing out the only industry that is reliable, affordable, and that we desperately need in our Nation to remain a global standing when it comes to energy dominance, when it comes to national security?

I just want to thank all of you for being here today. I hope that what you are saying will resonate, and I hope you will get a chance to finish your sentences because it has been hard listening to you try to get your point made when you are being cutoff. And with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Wirth, you believe that "climate change is one of the biggest challenges of our time." Correct, sir?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, I tried to be very clear on that earlier. We do believe that climate change is real. We accept the consensus and——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Yes, sir. And on page three of your witness statement, you said you support the "global net zero ambitions of the Paris Agreement," correct?

Mr. WIRTH. That is on page three of my statement, Congressman.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. In fact, on your October 11 press release, Chevron announced that it has targeted 2050 for having net zero emissions associated with the upstream operations of the company, correct?

Mr. WIRTH. We have announced a net zero aspiration for Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions for our equity upstream production worldwide.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. I am glad you mentioned that because you mentioned a couple of concepts in your documents. You talk about Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 emissions as well as something called portfolio carbon intensity. And emissions are the total or absolute amount of carbon or greenhouse gases created by Chevron, while carbon intensity has to do with the amount of carbon released per unit of oil and gas that you are drilling for. And I was looking at pages 2 through 4 of your sustainability report, sir, and you call them Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 emissions. Those are the overall or absolute emissions associated with your operations, right?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, there is a taxonomy for how emissions are classified that we apply as do companies across the economy, and Scope 1 emissions are defined as those directly associated with the operations of a company. Scope 2 emissions are those associated with purchased electricity or steam. And Scope 3, there are actually 15 different categories of Scope 3 emissions. In the case of our company and our industry, Type 11 of Scope 3 has to do with the use of products and——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Use of products, correct. Now, Mr. Wirth, according to page 42 of Chevron's proxy statement, you received $29 million in compensation for 2020, correct?

Mr. WIRTH. That is what is reported in our proxy.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. And it appears that you received $33 million in compensation in 2019 as well. I am looking at your compensation calculation on page 49 of the proxy statement, and it talks about how your comp relied on oil/gas flaring and methane intensity reductions, but none of your compensation whatsoever relied on a reduction in Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions, correct? It is not there. Nowhere on that page.

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, it is in the fourth category which relates to health safety and environment, and there is a line in there that relates to achieving our greenhouse gas targets.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. No, there is something called greenhouse gas management, but it is related to intensity. I have the page right here. And so the main point is the case that you could have high overall or absolute emissions associated with your operations, or low or no overall emissions associated with your operations, but you would be receiving the same tens of millions of dollars as you do now. And that is a fundamental problem with your compensation system at Chevron, that you are not incentivized to reduce your carbon footprint, and that is a big reason why Chevron's pollutions continue to go up.

Now, let's contrast that with that with Royal Dutch Shell which made an important announcement today. Ms. Watkins, you announced today a reduction of absolute emissions by 50 percent by 2030, correct?

Ms. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. And you also, interestingly, announced that those emissions would apply to Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3, so total emissions of the company, right?

Ms. WATKINS. So our 2030 target we announced today is for Scope 1 and 2. Our net zero emissions by 2050 include Scope 3.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. So by 2050, net zero across all three scopes, whereas as we know with Chevron, it is only Scope 1 and Scope 2, so not all the emissions. Now, Ms. Watkins, in a time of rising energy demand, why is it that you would say you are going to decline your oil production? Why would you give up the opportunity to supply that additional demand?

Ms. WATKINS. We believe that there is an opportunity. It is part of our powering and progress strategy to accelerate the demand for clean energy, which is why we are working very closely with our customers, and, in fact, we are working with industrial segments, sectors like the aviation industry, like heavy transport, like the marine industry, in order to accelerate the demand for clean energy products, because this isn't something we can do on our own. This is going to take a full collaborative effort between us, between society, and between the government.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Jordan, is recognized.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crabtree, when did you lose your job?

Mr. CRABTREE. Thank you, Congressman. About three hours after the Presidential inauguration this year.

Mr. JORDAN. January 20, 2021, you lost your job. That is right?

Mr. CRABTREE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. You know what has happened to the price of gasoline since that day?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, I think everybody knows the answer to that question, Congressman. It has gone nowhere but up, just like we tried to warn.

Mr. JORDAN. It has increased dramatically, hasn't it? Over a dollar a gallon.

Mr. CRABTREE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Do you know what has happened to the company that was overseeing the Russian Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline? Do you know what happened to them?

Mr. CRABTREE. I believe they were allowed to finish construction. I know that for a fact.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, the sanctions against them were waived. They were allowed to complete construction of that pipeline at the same time yours was closed down and you lost your job. Do you know what has happened to American energy independence since the day you were fired?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, the word "OPEC" seems to be coming back in the media more these days, and I didn't hear that for a lot of years. So we have lost it. That is what has happened.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes. Mr. Sommers, are CO2 emissions in the United States lower today than they were 20 years ago?

Mr. SOMMERS. They are, Congressman.

Mr. JORDAN. Significantly lower. Is that right?

Mr. SOMMERS. They are significantly lower. In fact, CO2 emissions from the power sector, in particular, are at the lowest level since 1978.

Mr. JORDAN. And that is because, you know, things like cap-and-trade passed and regulations from the government caused you to lower them. Isn't that true?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, actually that is because of the innovation that has occurred——

Mr. JORDAN. Exactly.

Mr. SOMMERS [continuing]. in the American oil and gas industry.

Mr. JORDAN. Exactly. Cap-and-trade didn't pass. It is not because of regulations from government. You guys did that on your own because it is just the right thing to do and it is good business, right?

Mr. SOMMERS. That is right, Congressman. As I mentioned before, every energy source has to meet that energy trilemma—affordable, reliable, and cleaner—and that is what this industry has delivered.

Mr. JORDAN. Ten months ago, was the United States of America energy independent, Mr. Sommers?

Mr. SOMMERS. What I would say, Congressman, is that the United States was North American energy independent and well on our way to American energy independence.

Mr. JORDAN. We were exporting a lot, too, weren't we?

Mr. SOMMERS. We were. Unfortunately, over the course of the last few months, we are actually getting oil into United States for the first time in a while.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, that was my next question. So in 10 months' time, we went from being energy independent to now we are importing oil, and we had the spectacle of the President of the United States begging OPEC to increase production. Is that accurate?

Mr. SOMMERS. Well, Congressman, the U.S. was a net petroleum exporter for the first time since 1958 in the year 2020. And, you know, we were very proud of being the world's largest producer of oil and natural gas as a consequence of the innovation and the technological revolution that has occurred in the American oil and gas industry.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes. I mean, I can't say it better than our colleague from Florida who spoke a few minutes ago, but in 10 months' time, we have literally went from energy independence to the President of the United States begging OPEC to increase production, to now we are having to import some of our energy needs. We have went from $2 gas to $3, $4, $5. I was in California week-and-a-half ago, $5 gas. I saw it there, which costs families hundreds of dollars a month in transportation costs. I mean, Mr. Crabtree, I think in his testimony, said he still hasn't found a job, so not only did he lose his job because of the crazy energy policies of this government. His family is paying more for their transportation costs and other energy needs.

And what do Democrats do today? They come in and badger companies, tell them to further reduce, in some cases, production of oil and gas, which is only going to exacerbate the problem. I mean, it literally may be the craziest thing I have ever heard, but that is where they are at. I don't think the American people are with

them, though, and that is the good news. So I want to thank those companies who are actually increasing production. Mr. Sommers, I want to thank you for your testimony today. Mr. Crabtree, you deserve better, and hopefully with some changes that I think are coming, because I don't think the American people are going to tolerate this, hopefully you will be employed real soon, and we will get these energy prices back where the families of this great country deserve to have them.

With that, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Raskin, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, Donald Trump's party of denialism is engaged in campaigns of propaganda and disinformation about climate change, which he said was a Chinese hoax; COVID–19, which he said would disappear by Easter of last year; the 2020 Presidential election, which he continues to claim that he won despite the fact that Joe Biden beat him by more than 7 million votes, 306 to 232 in the Electoral College; and, of course, the violent January 6 insurrection, which he says really took place on November 3, and adding for good measure that the pro-Trump rioters greeted our police officers with hugs and kisses, which is presumably how more than 140 of them ended up injured with broken noses, necks, vertebrae, arms, legs, and so on.

Trump's party has turned the denial of facts, science, and history into standard operating procedure, and we see the ideological machinery of lies working overtime today. But as astronomer Neil deGrasse Tyson has observed, "The great thing about science is that it is true whether or not you believe in it." So they don't believe in science, facts, or the U.S. Constitution. They don't believe in our elections anymore. They have positioned themselves outside of the constitutional order, attacking our constitutional order, but we believe in science and facts and the Constitution.

Now, The Lancet report on the health effects of climate change told us last week that this is a civilizational emergency right now. Not in the future. Today. Rising temperatures, says The Washington Post, have led to higher rates of heat illness, causing farm workers to collapse in the fields and elderly people to die in their apartments. Insects carrying tropical diseases have multiplied and spread toward the Poles. The amount of plant pollen in the air is increasing, worsening asthma and other respiratory conditions, and on and on. Record drought, record flooding, record forest fires, record hurricanes of increasing frequency and velocity. We cannot afford any more propaganda campaigns by corporations subsidized by the government against public policies designed to save humanity.

The First Amendment does not protect fraudulent commercial speech, despite everything you heard today. You can go back and check out McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission, stating clearly that the government may and does punish fraud directly. Check out the Central Hudson case declaring that if commercial speech is fraudulent, it is no longer protected by the First Amendment and it may be regulated by the government. Mr. Lawler, do you accept

that the First Amendment does not accept fraudulent commercial speech?

Mr. LAWLER. I wouldn't say that I am an expert on that particular topic.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Wirth, do you accept that the First Amendment does not protect fraudulent commercial speech?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, I am not a constitutional scholar, and I would trust those who are.

Mr. RASKIN. Ms. Watkins, do you accept that the First Amendment does not protect fraudulent commercial speech?

Ms. WATKINS. Congressman, I am not an expert on the legal aspects of this. I am sorry.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, Mr. Woods, your company has filed several briefs about this trying to use the First Amendment as a sword in litigation against Massachusetts Attorney General Healey. Do you accept that the First Amendment does not protect fraudulent speech?

Mr. WOODS. I am not a lawyer, sir.

Mr. RASKIN. Are you aware of the litigation that Exxon brought against Healey in Federal District Court in Texas?

Mr. WOODS. I am aware that we have had several suits filed against us, and we have hired lawyers to defend our rights.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, use your common sense, and I appreciate the fact you are not a lawyer. But using your common sense, do you think that a company has the right to lie, for example, about climate change, and then use the First Amendment as a camouflage and a shield against litigation?

Mr. WOODS. I don't believe companies should lie, and I would tell you that we do not do that.

Mr. RASKIN. But leaving that aside, because there might be a factual dispute on that particular contention, but do you believe if a company were to lie in commercial speech about something like climate change, it should not be protected by the First Amendment?

Mr. WOODS. I don't think companies should lie.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. And what if a company were to lie? Is that protected by the First Amendment?

Mr. WOODS. I think the legal system and our court systems are designed to deal with those types of issues.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, yes, indeed. In fact, you filed a brief in San Francisco v. Exxon, filed it in Texas District Court, and I would like to submit for the record the opinion by New York District Court Judge Valerie Caproni, dismissing Exxon's First Amendment claims.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would hope as we move forward, every person in America and every person on earth has an interest in us defeating this climate nightmare. And I would hope that the corporations which have received a lot of beneficence, a lot of bounty from the U.S. taxpayers, at the very least would not lie about climate change and would not try to drape themselves in the First Amendment in order to protect their lives.

I yield back to you, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired.

Well, first we are going to hear from the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Grothman. He is recognized for five minutes. And following that, we will have a 10-minute break at the request of our panelists today.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you. That was kind of a scary last couple minutes there.

I will ask Mr. Sommers. You know, when you Google this stuff, at least I remember, you know, being a child growing up in the Milwaukee area, and it seems to me both the water and even more the air is just so much cleaner today than they were at the time. Could you give us some general comments about the amount of pollutants from cars, the amount of pollutants from energy plants, even coal plants replaced with coal plant, as far as the cleanliness of the air today compared to maybe 15 years ago?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman Grothman, thank you for your question, and it is great to be with you here today. You know, first of all, I think it is important to acknowledge that the United States leads the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and, again, that is because of what this industry has done to produce more here in the United States. As I also said, the United States accounts for about 12.6 percent of world emissions, and that number continues to go down, while China's number is 32.5 percent of world emissions, and that number continues to go up, which is one of the reasons why we need global solutions as it relates to climate change. Additionally, the emissions that have come from the electricity sector are at their lowest level since 1978, and that is because of the fuel switch that has gone on from coal to natural gas.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Holy cow. Just a second here. You mean despite the fact the population of this country has gone through the roof and the amount of economic activity has gone through the roof, we have less pollutants coming from the energy sector than 40-plus years ago?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, in fact, obviously the United States population has continued to increase, and world population is expected to grow significantly over the next many years. And even the International Energy Agency expects that if every country were to meet its Paris climate goals, the world would still get 46 percent of its energy from oil and gas. So we need to make sure that we are making proper investments in the United States for that oil and gas because I believe, and I think most Americans believe, that it is important that we are getting our energy here at home rather than being dependent on foreign sources of energy where they are not produced nearly in the environmentally responsible way that they are produced here in the United States.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. I am sure we got a bunch of world travelers up there today. I am looking here on my phone, and it shows that Los Angeles, which I always thought was, you know, kind of a polluting city, has just a fraction of the amount of pollutants that we find in Shanghai, for example. As you guys get around the world, and we can start with you, Mr. Sommers, but other people, do you notice that pollution is more or less as you get around the globe compared to the United States?

Mr. SOMMERS. Well, Congressman, as you know, we live in an environment where what happens in China affects the United

States. In fact, the air in China today will be in California two days from now, which is why it is important that we address this issue from a global perspective while focusing on what we can do as a country to lower our emissions over time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. I am told in other cities, China, maybe even Mexico City, India, pollutants in their major metropolitan areas are a lot higher than the United States. Is that true?

Mr. SOMMERS. That is the case, Congressman, mainly because they have not been afforded the same fuel switch that has occurred in the United States from coal to natural gas. So what we need to do in the United——

Mr. GROTHMAN. Somebody told me they are building over 100 coal plants in China right now. Is that true?

Mr. SOMMERS. That is my understanding as well, Congressman, but what we want to do here in the United States is we have abundant supplies of natural gas, and we want to make sure that we are exporting American environmental progress to the rest of the world. We can do that through liquefied natural gas. We have the resources. We want to share that environmental progress with the rest of the world.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Well, some people like to slow down economic progress here and kind of push that economic progress to other countries. Is that going to result in worldwide pollutants going up or down as we kind of push manufacturing to other countries.

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, as you know, for most of the world, the choice is not between coal and renewables. It is a choice between coal and natural gas, which is why we think it is important that the United States continues to produce so that——

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. Just one more thing from our panelists.

Mr. SOMMERS [continuing]. Across the world.

Mr. GROTHMAN. You guys all have a good story to tell. Don't be afraid to tell people how much cleaner things are than the past. It doesn't do any good to get all woke on us. Thanks.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

At the request of our witnesses, we will take a brief 10-minute break.

The committee stands in recess for 10 minutes.

[Recess.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. The committee will come to order.

The gentleman from Illinois, Representative Quigley, is recognized for five minutes.

[No response.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. Mr. Quigley?

[No response.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. We are going to hold for a few seconds for the witnesses to return. When the witnesses return, we will recognize Mr. Quigley.

[Pause.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. All the witnesses have returned.

The gentleman from Illinois, Representative Quigley, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you for those who are involved today. I guess at this point, perhaps it is helpful to put some of this in perspective and ask a question on the

overall issue of safety. I serve on the House Select Committee on Intelligence, and we are often briefed on climate change as a threat to our national security. The Pentagon refers to climate change as "threat multiplier," and recent reports from the Department of Homeland Security, the intelligence community, the National Security Council, and the armed services outline the emerging threat of climate change and its ability to wreak economic havoc and destabilization in regions, initiate and fuel conflicts, and help foment violence.

The hearing today has helped document a longstanding and concerted effort to muddy the scientific waters on the threat of climate change and pointed work to prevent any substantive action to prevent it, not the least of which was Exxon's internal reports confirming human-caused global warming. Publicly it took the opposite view in a 2017 study of Exxon's communications, concluding that the company systematically misled nine scientific audiences about climate change.

But I think the person who put that all best, Dr. Rod Schoonover, he served a decade for the U.S. intelligence community as senior analyst and senior scientist in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research at the U.S. Department of State, as a director of environment and natural resources. He said and I quote, "If climate change poses a risk to national security, as the Pentagon and intelligence community again reminded us last week, shouldn't we view climate disinformation through the same lens as well?" I think those before us today have to ask themselves that, and as this investigation moves forward, we need to put it under that prism.

Let me make a second point, and that is to remind ourselves of the risk and danger involved in these operations. I guess I would be remiss not talking about a location literally in my backyard, the Whiting Refinery, one of the largest refineries in the U.S., and its operator, BP. In 1991, the residents of East Chicago noticed oil oozing into their basements. A subterranean spill of 400,000 barrels of oil was discovered in the water tables soon thereafter. In 2012, BP had to pay an $8 million penalty and spent $400 million on pollution controls due to the emissions from the Whiting BP. In 2014, Whiting discharged a slug of crude oil into Lake Michigan close to where children swim and wildlife live. This occurred nearly three weeks after BP announced it would double its processing of crude at the Whiting facility.

Earlier this year, a District Court judge ruled that BP repeatedly violated limits on emissions, specifically particulate air emission. Between 2015 and 2018, they conducted nine emission tests and failed all nine, demonstrating that Whiting was spewing soot into the Chicagoland area. Mr. Lawler, what are BP's plans for addressing the health effects of its presence in communities like where the Whiting Refinery is located?

Mr. LAWLER. Thank you for the question, Congressman. So, you know, I am aware of the incidents that have occurred at Whiting over time, and what I can share with you is that we think the safety of the community and the safety of our employees is very important, and that includes the safety of the water and the air that is in the area. What I can say is that we are dedicating resources to correct any deficiencies at the Whiting Refinery that we find. As

you know, the industry is focused on this. We are focused on it, and it is one of our largest refineries in the United States. And the commitment that we have is to lower emissions at the refinery over time and to protect all the individuals that work in and around the refinery.

Mr. QUIGLEY. You know, I think given the limited time we have, what makes sense is if you could submit to the committee the improvements that you deem necessary, where you are in the timeline to make those improvements, and when you expect those to be completed, if you would commit to that, please.

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, we will followup with the actions that we are taking.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Cloud, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you, Chairwoman. Before my five minutes, I ask unanimous consent to submit a few articles for the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. CLOUD. These articles: "With a Pen Stroke, President Joe Biden Cancels the Keystone XL Pipeline Project;" "Biden Lifts U.S. Sanctions on Major Russian Pipeline;" "While Western Nations Kill Energy, China Builds Coal Plants by the Dozen;" "China is Planning to Build 43 New Coal-Fired Power Plants;" "Russia Projects Oil Output Near Post-Soviet Highs in 2022;" "Europe Has Become a Hostage to Russia Over Energy, Analysts Warn;" "Europe Warns Its Gas Prices Surge Will Drive Up Food Costs;" "Biden Asks OPEC to Up Oil Production While Limiting U.S. Energy Production;" "Qatar Petroleum Signs a 15-Year LNG Supply Deal with China;" "Qatar Petroleum Boosts LNG Production;" "Qatar Places a $760 Million Order with China for Liquid Gas Ships;" "Energy Costs are Stoking Inflation. Just Look at U.S. Gas Prices;" "Home Heating Sticker Shock: The Cost of Natural Gas is Up by 180 Percent;" "Food Prices Poised to Surge with Fertilizer Prices at the Highest in Years." Thank you.

Mr. CLOUD. It has been said, of course, many times in this committee in a number of hearings that we are facing a national climate emergency. And I think it is important to put this conversation in context because, of course, any discussion on any climate solution must be a global one. We know the environment doesn't stop at our borders, and we have to be thoughtful of that when we are enacting policies and certainly discussing potential solutions. I think it is also important that we be able to have this conversation without the hysteria from the extreme left. Often there is a sad effort to get Americans to be fearful in order to get Americans to buy into increased government control in their lives in virtually every single aspect.

And I would submit one more article, "Climate-Related Deaths Have Plunged 99.9 Percent Since 1932."

Mr. CLOUD. The world is not going to end in 10 years. People are not dying in record numbers because of climate change. Yes, we do want clean air and water, and, yes, we should continue to make technological improvements to meet those goals. But, Mr. Crabtree, you are not a policy wonk, and therefore, not breathing the D.C.

air. And so I think you can give us kind of just the boots on the ground of an American perspective. We have a number of crises right now. We can talk about inflation, the price of food, the price of gas. We can talk about the supply chain breakdown. We can talk about the crime epidemic in our communities as a result of the defund the police movement and open borders. We can talk about China's nuclear capable hypersonic missile. These things are also threats to the Nation. You mentioned you are concerned about pricing, being able to meet the mortgage payment next month. I imagine, like most Americans, and you can tell me if this is true or not, you rate climate change probably somewhere in between the new national emergency appearance at school board meetings and somewhere with being able to meet your mortgage. Is that correct?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, being able to make my mortgage and take care of my family is my No. 1 priority. I do have concerns about the climate, but I think it is important that we realize we are talking about the negative effect of fossil fuels. But we have got to realize the benefits they have provided this country over the years. If you look at life expectancy in this country and the use of fossil fuels, they go along hand-in-hand.

Mr. CLOUD. I appreciate that thought. I only have a couple more minutes, so I am going to continue if I can. A U.S. National Intelligence Council report said this. It was put out in 2005. It said, "In terms of size, speed, and directional flow, the transfer of global wealth and economic power is now under way. Roughly from West to East, it is without precedent in modern history, and the shift arises from two sources. First, increases in oil and commodity prices have generated windfall profits for Gulf States and Russia. Second, lower costs combined with government policies have shifted the locus of manufacturing and service industries overseas." And so basically, it said that there is a massive shift going from the American people to nations overseas, and it was because of two reasons. One was oil and gas profits going overseas, and two, manufacturing going overseas. That report actually went on to say that this transfer was inevitable. It cannot be stopped. Yet the last Administration, the Trump Administration, showed us indeed that those two things could actually be reversed and give a great windfall for the American people.

Now, the world's demand on energy growing. That is a good thing. That is people coming out of poverty. That is people finding mobility. That is people having fuel to heat their homes many times for the first time. Mr. Sommers, generally speaking, does the U.S. produce energy cleaner or more responsibility than, let's say, here are some of the other nations, top producers of energy: Russia, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Qatar, China. Where does the U.S. rank among those as far as producing energy responsibly?

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired, but the gentlemen may answer the question.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, the first two minutes was submitting reports, articles for record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. That is still your time. The gentleman——

Mr. CLOUD. I believe the rule——

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman may answer your question. Let him answer your question.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Chair, that is not supposed to count against my time.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, point of order. I didn't think that submitting letters for the record counted against your questioning time.

Chairwoman MALONEY. It does, but I will grant the gentleman a little more time. The gentleman may answer your question.

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman——

Mr. CLOUD. Where does the U.S. rank among some of the world's leaders in producing energy responsibly?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank you for your question. Based on the data that we have seen, the United States continues to produce these products in a way that is safer, better, and more responsibly produced from an environmental perspective than any other country on earth.

Mr. CLOUD. Real quick. Has the U.S. reduction in oil and gas production and exports led to a surge in other nations, say, in the Middle East for Asia adopting green technologies?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, as an organization, we, of course, are focused on continuing to produce in an environmentally safe way these products that are demanded by world consumers.

Mr. CLOUD. Right. But I think what we see in some of the articles that I mentioned before, what we see is as we reduce production, actually the world finds other sources that are less clean than United States production to meet the demand. I would suggest that the greater the demand that U.S. production is on the world market, the better it is for our green objectives. One more question, and, Ms. Clark, if you could answer this. Any discussion about——

Chairwoman MALONEY. Very quickly.

Mr. CLOUD. In any discussion about green energy solutions, it is very important that we recognize that they also require natural resources, and that is rare earth minerals. Could you speak to how reliant is the U.S. on other nations for rare earth minerals, and what nation controls most of the rare earth minerals? I think it is 80 to 90 percent.

Ms. CLARK. Thank you, Congressman. I know I don't have much time, but I believe that China controls too much of the supply of these critical minerals, and it is why we have to balance national security and economic security while we are combatting climate change together.

Mr. CLOUD. And the U.S. is what percent reliant on rare earth minerals for other nations?

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired. You may ask your question. She may answer it, but you are three minutes over right now.

Mr. CLOUD. It is 100 percent. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK. The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Sarbanes, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Thanks very much, Madam Chair. The fossil fuel executives that are appearing before us today claim that their com-

panies support reaching the goals of the Paris Agreement, a watershed international environmental treaty, as we know. But the committee looked into the lobbying disclosures filed by your companies and found that your rhetoric of support for the Paris Agreement doesn't match reality when it comes to your lobbying. We know what it looks like when your industry really cares about a Federal initiative and your companies want to see it succeed.

So let me start with you, Mr. Wirth. Your company claims that the Paris Agreement is among your highest priorities. The first sentence of Chevron's climate policy page says, "Chevron supports the Paris Agreement." I notice that you also touted Chevron's support for the Paris Agreement in your written testimony to this committee. Since the start of negotiations on the Paris Agreement in 2015, Chevron has reported 986 total instances of Federal lobbying. Mr. Wirth, do you know how many times Chevron reported lobbying on the Paris Agreement?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, that is information that I don't have in front of me, but it is——

Mr. SARBANES. OK. Well, let me tell you what it is. Not once, not a single time, not one of those 986 instances of lobbying mentions the Paris Agreement. Now I want to compare that to an issue that we know your company really cares about: corporate tax breaks. Mr. Wirth, do you know how many lobbying reports your company filed that included lobbying on tax issues?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, I don't have that information in front of me.

Mr. SARBANES. A hundred and forty-four. That is the answer. You didn't lobby once on the 28 bills and resolutions introduced on the Paris Agreement. When former President Trump was debating withdrawing from the agreement in 2017, you never lobbied the White House. Chevron has spent more than $54 million on lobbying on a lot of other things since 2015, so clearly when your company cares about an issue, you lobby on it and we can see that in the reports.

Let me move on to Mr. Lawler. BP's 2020 shareholder report pledged to, and I quote, "advocate for fundamental and rapid progress toward the Paris climate goals." Since 2015, the company has reported 488 total instances of legislative lobbying. Mr. Lawler, how many of those reports mentioned BP lobbying on the Paris Agreement?

Mr. LAWLER. I don't have that specific number, but what I——

Mr. SARBANES. The answer is one. That amounts to 0.2 percent of your Federal lobbying during that time. By comparison, you lobbied 21 times on the 2017 tax cut bill. And I am running out of time, so I just want to list for the record some information about the other organizations represented here today. Since 2015, API has filed 153 lobbying reports aimed at cutting taxes for oil and gas companies, but just one lobbying report on the Paris Agreement. Exxon has spent $60 million on lobbying since 2015. These are astronomical sums by the way, just as an aside. Of the 1,543 instances of legislative lobbying that Exxon reported, only one mentioned the Paris Agreement, but Exxon lobbied on tax legislation 344 times. So once on the Paris Agreement which you claim is a priority and something you are focused on as a company, 344 times

on tax legislation. And Shell, responsible for 470 instances of legislative lobbying, addressed the Paris Agreement only 5 times. I mean, that is better than the rest of the crowd, but that is not so great in itself, but on the tax cut bill, Shell lobbied 31 times.

So there is no strong public record reflected here in terms of support for the Paris Agreement, regardless of the claims you make and regardless of the rhetoric that we hear day in and day out. We know that we follow the money to determine what your priorities are, and they are headed in a different direction. It is time we start judging these companies, your companies by your actions, not by the rhetoric.

And with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Gibbs, you are now recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you. First of all, I think it has been shameful how the other side wants to demonize this oil and gas industry. I am very proud of our oil and gas industry. They are innovators. They adopt new technologies. They provide a higher standard of living and lots of jobs and economic activity throughout our country.

I want to go back a little bit in history just for a quick review, you know, how this all started. Go back to the late 1800's, the Industrial Revolution, and we had Andrew Carnegie, steel, we had John D. Rockefeller, kerosene and the refinery. We had J.P. Morgan, Thomas Edison, electricity. And they began the Industrial Revolution, and their innovation and their entrepreneurship put us on a path to become a global power in this world that has given us the ability to do lots of good things. We stopped tyranny in the 1940's. We have helped countries around the world improve their standard of living and quality of life. And just recently we brought the world COVID vaccines. So this is an exceptional country, and part of it that has had a big play in that is our great companies.

And I would just revert back to John D. Rockefeller. He started with kerosene, and one of the byproducts that was interesting is gasoline and the invention of the internal combustion engine. They figured out what they could do with Henry Ford and all that took off, but then they had to break up those monopolies, and that probably was a good thing. And the companies that are represented here today, Madam Chair, are a spinoff of the Standard Oil Company, which began in my great state of Ohio. So I am proud of that, and I am proud of all the stuff that they have done to help us and what they are going to do in this century to help us transition, environmentally friendly, but supply affordable energy available to our consumers and provide the power to move our country forward into new technologies, maybe hydrogen renewables or technologies we don't even know about yet.

I think it is amazing the chair of the subcommittee trying to hold these CEOs to account to essentially make a pledge to lower production, and I am glad to see at least one of them, Mr. Woods from ExxonMobil, said we are going to increase production because the demand is out there. We have a President of the United States out there asking OPEC to increase production, the biggest hypocrisy probably in this century, but he did say they are going to work to

lower emissions. And I am just disappointed that the chair failed to recognize that and tried to demonize them on that.

A couple other things here. I always hear, and it came up earlier in the hearing today, about how the oil and gas industry get tax subsidies. It is just not fair. I looked into this a little bit ago, and I can't really find it. The answer was they get anything that all other businesses get, and I will give you an example. I know some of the ANI oil and gas people are out there saying that if you go out and drill a hole, you know, drill a well, those legitimate expenses for the drilling costs and to pay the employees shouldn't be taxed deductible. They call that a subsidy. I don't think that is any different than when I go out in business and do things and I have business expenses, you expense that. And I believe that is the case and that there are no real subsidies that go to the oil and gas industry. At least nobody's told me a real legitimate one.

Mr. Sommers, like I just said, the oil and gas industry, you know, we have gone from $60 oil just last year to $85 oil, and you see the price of gas. What is the status right now with our oil rigs, our exploration in this country? What has happened in the last 10 months? Mr. Sommers.

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank you very much for your question. And as you know, the state of Ohio, our home state, has a very robust oil and natural gas industry and an incredible history of development. And, in fact, it is because of that development in our state that we have got to the point where we are producing natural gas that we can share with the rest of the world to meet environmental challenges, not just here at home, but in the rest of the world. U.S. petroleum demand in the United States reached a record high in the month of September. Unfortunately, supply has not been able to keep pace. Domestic oil production in September was down by 1.9 million barrels a day from its level for the same month of the pre-pandemic year of 2019.

Mr. CLOUD. OK. I am almost out of time. Is that because there has been more pressure put on and our innovators aren't going out and doing what they were doing a year ago because of the fear of more burdensome regulations, the canceling of Federal permits on lands and waters?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank you for your question. There are a number of different reasons for that, including the, you know, worker shortage that is occurring in the United States, but, of course, Federal regulations and announcements have played a significant role as well. When the first announcement out of the Administration was canceling the Keystone XL pipeline and the second announcement was canceling development on Federal lands, and leases on those Federal lands, and permitting on those Federal lands, I do think it is sent chilling effect across the industry about where this Administration was headed in terms of the development of resources here in the United States.

Mr. CLOUD. So I am out of time, but I guess just to close, what the future looks like—higher prices, demands increasing and the supply is not—so we are going to be more dependent on OPEC, and Russia, and everybody else. And I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back. The gentlelady from Michigan, Ms. Tlaib, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you so much, Madam Chair. Mr. Woods, did Exxon help fund One Alaska? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. I am not familiar with that.

Ms. TLAIB. Well, One Alaska was a front group created specifically to oppose Alaska's ballot initiative that would require oil companies to pay their fair share. It actually received nearly $21 million in contributions. Ninety-four percent of One Alaska's contributions came from five oil and gas companies, including Exxon and BP.

So I would like to submit for the record, Madam Chair, an article, "Oil Companies Spend Big to Try to Defeat Alaska's Tax Proposal."

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Ms. TLAIB. Same thing in Colorado in 2018 where a measure—this is a resident lead ballot measure—to ban oil and gas extraction within a half a mile of homes, schools, and waterways on the ballot. That front group was called Colorado Rising and, again, resident led. That one, Mr. Wirth—Mike Wirth—I am not even going to bother to ask if you are familiar with it because I know the answer. Many of you, all of you, helped fund some of these. I guess Chevron specifically funded $33 million behind its subsidiary, Noble Energy. Contributed to that front group. Mr. Sommers, are you familiar with Energy Citizens?

Mr. SOMMERS. I am familiar with Energy Citizens, Congresswoman.

Ms. TLAIB. I am glad you are. It is a front group for American Petroleum Institute, which uses it to flood Facebook with hundreds of ads opposing climate provisions in the Build Back Better Act. There you all spent about, what, nearly half a million dollars in misleading ads since August. Of course when you look at these ads, you all, the public, when you look at these ads, they don't say the name "Exxon," "BP," "Chevron" anywhere. You all hide and you deceive the public so oil and gas companies can go on claiming that they are pro-environment while opposing sensible pro-environment measures in secret. Lies plain and simple.

Madam Chair, I would like to submit for the record as well a Michigan utility's front group's misleading campaign ahead of a vote on energy legislation.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Ms. TLAIB. There DTE Energy and Consumers Energy used front groups called Alliance for Michigan Power and Citizens for Energizing Michigan's Economy, respectively, to target my residents and their amazing work. Amazing work. They are the ones fundraising for this, Madam Chair, to support increased rooftop solar energy. That is how they wanted to cut the energy costs so they can make a living, so they can provide a quality life for their families by reducing their reliance on corporate polluters. Mike Wirth, when are you going to cut the check?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I am not sure I understand the context of your question, but I would like to correct the——

Ms. TLAIB. That is OK.

Mr. WIRTH. Excuse me. I would like to correct something that you——

Ms. TLAIB. Sure.

Mr. WIRTH. You have been provided with some inaccurate information.

Ms. TLAIB. Mm-hmm.

Mr. WIRTH. Noble Energy was not a subsidiary of Chevron in 2018——

Ms. TLAIB. OK. You can submit it for the record, sir.

Mr. WIRTH. It was——

Ms. TLAIB. You can submit it to the committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Chevron has about 70 serious cases of environmental and community abuses in 31 countries worldwide, owing over $50 billion in judgments and settlements. Checks. Literally settlement debts that you all have. So, Mike, when are you going to cut the check?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I am not familiar with the number you cite.

Ms. TLAIB. When are you going to cut the $50 billion check that you owe? It went through the courts. You owe $50 billion to communities in 31 countries.

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I would be happy to take a look at the source for your information on this——

Ms. TLAIB. All right.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. And get back to you on it because I have no understanding of what you are——

Ms. TLAIB. I have a message for you as Chevron CEO. I mean, you made, what, $29 million last year in poisoning the planet? Mr. Wirth, you can't arrest us all. You can't arrest the truth. Do you understand what I am trying to say to you?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I am not exactly following.

Ms. TLAIB. So you are targeting actions against human rights lawyer Gottsinger. I mean, what you did there, your company, maybe through subsidiaries, I don't know. I just want to remind you, there are more of us than there are of you. You can poison the planet to make money, but we are going to defend the planet so we can live, and we will win. So, you know, I need Chevron to cut the check. You owe $50 billion to indigenous communities and people that you harmed for profit.

This is not about vilifying these companies. This is about accountability. You all know we are all paying the cost, from our public health to our environment, the actions that you take, and you are hiding behind subsidiaries, and it is wrong. These are residents putting ballot initiatives on their local ballot to make a difference to save our planet. Get out of the way so they can do the work for the people in the community they live in.

Thank you, and I yield.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins, is recognized five minutes.

Mr. COMER. Point of order. Point of order. Point of order.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Point of order. What is your point of order?

Mr. COMER. I just wanted to state a point of fact with what Representative Tlaib said about Colorado, Proposition 112. Opposition to that measure was deep, which included John Hickenlooper, the senator, and as well as our former colleague, Governor Jared Polis.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, point of order.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The point is not a valid——

Ms. TLAIB. That is not a point of order.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Excuse me.

Mr. COMER [continuing]. Submit to the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. It is not a valid point of order. OK.

Now the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins, is now recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. My, my, my. Good Lord, help us to be protected from this threat from within. American patriots are so done with career politicians and Democrat Party Socialist insanity. We are nauseated by the continuous attacks on working Americans and American industry. This entire debacle of a hearing today has been reflective of the exact reasons why my colleagues across the aisle will lose their majority status very soon.

We have a smashed economy. We have witnessed a disgraceful retreat from Taliban terrorists overseas, abandoning Americans. We have a disintegrated southern border. We have unbelievable inflation. We have medical oppression. We have parents, American parents, being threatened by our own DOJ for having the audacity to exercise their First Amendment rights to assemble and redress grievance. We have companies brought before us today, American men and women, for a public beating by the Democrats on this committee. They have done incredible work to actually lower emissions. These companies have worked with scientists and engineers, not politicians, to reduce methane by 70 percent between 2011 and 2019. They have used innovation to clean up their industry on their own. Their facilities and plants are incredibly clean and safe.

It is abhorrent that my colleagues across the aisle have called a so-called hearing today to demonize American industry whose products make modern life possible. Petroleum products are in everything: the clothes on our back, the wiring in our computers, our computers, our cellphones, all of the equipment used by our military, all medical supplies and equipment, paint, curtains, fabrics, and appliances in our homes, fishing rods, lures, tennis shoes by sportsman, everything, all sports products. It is insane what my colleagues across the aisle are putting these good American men and women through and attacking American workers as our country dissolves around us. You push patriots too far. You have gone a bridge too far. We won't take it anymore.

Mr. Woods, Ms. Watkins, Mr. Wirth, and Mr. Lawler, I am about to ask you about a pledge. Our chairwoman asked you for a pledge. I think it was an absurd request, but I am going to ask you about a pledge. Mr. Woods, do you pledge today to endeavor to continue leading the world in emissions reductions and provide an abundant affordable energy through innovations? I will say it again so you can think about it. Do you pledge today to endeavor to continue leading the world in emissions reductions and provide an abundant, affordable energy through innovations?

Mr. WOODS. We try to do that today, and we will continue to try to do that going into——

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Woods. Ms. Watkins, same question. Do you pledge today for Shell to endeavor to continue leading

the world in emissions reductions and providing abundant affordable energy through innovations?

Ms. WATKINS. Congressman, yes, and I would add clean energy to that.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Wirth, for Chevron, do you pledge today to continue to endeavor leading the world old in emissions reductions through providing abundant affordable energy and with innovation?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, I do.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, sir. Mr. Lawler, for BP America, do you pledge today to endeavor to continue leading the world in emissions reductions and providing abundant, affordable energy for the world through innovations?

Mr. LAWLER. Thank you, Congressman. We will continue and I pledge to lower emissions over time. We are trying to help the world reach net zero, and we will continue to provide the energy that the world needs, and increasingly green. And we have a number of projects in motion today that will support those objectives.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, good sir, for your answer. Madam Chair, I happily yield the balance of my time so that we can get through this horrendous display, a partisan attack upon American workers and American industry. I yield.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from California, Ms. Porter—Ms. Katie Porter—is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Thank you, Madam Chair. We have heard a lot about future plans for investment in renewable energy today. Ms. Watkins, Shell's 2020 annual report called for between $19 and $22 billion in near-term spending. I am representing that with this container of M&Ms. Each M&M represents about $50 million in spending. Ms. Watkins, how much has Shell said it will spend in the near-term on oil, gas, and chemical operations?

Ms. WATKINS. I think you just said we are going to be spending between $18 and $20 billion this year.

Ms. PORTER. That is near term on total spending. How much on oil, gas, and chemical operations?

Ms. WATKINS. We are going to be spending——

Ms. PORTER. Well, according to your annual report, you said you are going to spend $16 to $17 billion for oil, gas, and chemical, with another $3 billion for marketing. How much is Shell going to spend on renewable energy?

Ms. WATKINS. This year we will be spending between $2 and $3 billion.

Ms. PORTER. Two and $3 billion on renewables and energy solutions. In your testimony, you said, "Meeting the demand for reliable energy while simultaneously addressing climate change is a huge undertaking and one of the defining challenges of our time." Shell has made these promises before. Shell pledged to spend $6 billion between 2017 and 2020 on renewable energy. How much of that did Shell actually spend? The answer is about half. Ms. Watkins, does this look like a huge undertaking to you?

Ms. WATKINS. Congresswoman, what I can tell you is that there needs to be both a demand and a supply of clean energy, which is

why we are working very closely with our customers so that that demand increases over time, and we are ready to supply——

Ms. PORTER. Ms. Watkins, to me, this does not like an adequate response to one of the defining challenges of our time. This is greenwashing. Shell is trying to fool people into thinking that it is addressing the climate crisis when what it is actually doing is to continue to put money into fossil fuels. Mr. Sommers, do you recognize the following statement: "Banning Federal leasing and development on Federal lands and waters would derail decades of U.S. energy progress?"

Mr. SOMMERS. I do, Congresswoman.

Ms. PORTER. That is your statement. How many of the Department of Interior's approved and ready-to-drill permits are currently unused?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, it takes a long time to develop these leases that oil and gas companies——

Ms. PORTER. I appreciate that, Mr. Sommers. I am just asking how many permits are unused.

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, I think there is a fundamental misunderstanding as to how these acres——

Ms. PORTER. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Sommers, there are 7,700 permits unused. How many acres of public land are already leased by fossil fuel companies and not even used yet just available for drilling whenever you decide?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, again, I think you have a fundamental misunderstanding as to how this process works and the time and resources it takes——

Ms. PORTER. Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time. The answer is 13.9 million acres. To visualize how much land that is, if each grain of rice were 1 acre, that would be 479 pounds of rice. The American Petroleum Institute even opposed pausing more leasing on our lands. They even sued to stop it because apparently this acreage wasn't enough. Mr. Wirth, you serve on the American Petroleum Institute's Executive Committee. Do you support a pause a new oil and gas leases on Federal land?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, access to resource in this country is essential to ensure the energy security of our country and development——

Ms. PORTER. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Lawler, do you support a pause on new oil and gas leases?

Mr. LAWLER [continuing]. The Administration, and it is our hope that the pause ends soon. We think it is important to go forward.

Ms. PORTER. Reclaiming my time. Thank you for your answer. The answer there was "no." Mr. Woods, do you support a pause on new Federal and gas leases?

Mr. WOODS. No.

Ms. PORTER. Ms. Watkins, do you support a pause on new Federal and gas leases?

Ms. WATKINS. No, I do not because I think it is important——

Ms. PORTER. You already have 13.9 million acres. This is equivalent to Maryland and New Jersey combined. How much more do you need? How much more acreage? You have two of our 50 states at a price that makes the Louisiana Purchase look like a rip off, and you are not even using it. What more do you need? Iowa? Colo-

rado? Virginia? Our public land belongs to the American people, not to Big Oil. When you lobby and you sue so that you can take more of our public land, you are saying too much is never enough. The American people are tired of this charade.

I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sessions, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, thank you very much. And I apologize to our witnesses that were called and asked to take part in this today. As chairman of the Rules Committee for six years, I never witnessed nor would have allowed this kind of intimidation that is taking place on people who we invited to come and provide open answers. On top of that, they raise their hand to tell the truth, and they were repeatedly stopped rather than allowing them to offer their explanations of things they do. I apologize to our witnesses and want to thank them as energy company executives to make sure that America has a sound supply of energy that is available and reliable to where we can avoid the things that happened under President Jimmy Carter, where that same attack took place and we had long lines of people in the middle of the winter attempting to get what they needed. Each of you represent an industry that helps to provide a solid, cost-effective supply. Republicans have had issues with energy, and that is why just a few years ago we opened up the American market. We opened up the American market to the world, and I believe that this helped not just consumers, but I believe it helped other people in the world.

Mr. Sommers, have you ever heard of a term called LIHEAP?

Mr. SOMMERS. Yes, sir. I have heard of LIHEAP.

Mr. SESSIONS. Do you know what LIHEAP is and what it is used for as a Federal program?

Mr. SOMMERS. I do. LIHEAP is a well-established program that helps low-income individuals afford heat in their homes during the winter.

Mr. SESSIONS. And it is primarily used in the Northeast.

Mr. SOMMERS. That is correct.

Mr. SESSIONS. Can you tell me what the product is that is dumped in to ensure this energy would be available in the Northeast?

Mr. SOMMERS. Well, Congressman, as you know, most of the, you know, power in this country, particularly for heat and air conditioning, you know, or 40 percent of it now, comes from natural gas.

Mr. SESSIONS. And LIHEAP, is that natural gas in the Northeast?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, in the Northeast, in all home heating, a lot of it is from actually oil.

Mr. SESSIONS. Diesel, is that correct, or what kind of home heating fuel is it?

Mr. SOMMERS. It is home heating oil.

Mr. SESSIONS. Home heating oil. So what has the rest of the country done that would be of benefit and responsibility for heating their homes?

Mr. SOMMERS. Well, Congressman, as an industry, we have worked hard to develop these resources here at home so that we

don't have to get them from volatile regimes overseas. And that includes, of course, the home heating oil that is used to heat homes in the Northeast.

Mr. SESSIONS. Primarily what I am looking for—you are the one giving the answer—is natural gas is an abundant supply in the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. SOMMERS. That is correct. In fact, it is 40 percent of the heat and air conditioning and power that Americans get in their homes comes from natural gas. And there has been a significant fuel switch that has occurred over the course of the last many years as a consequence of the natural gas and oil revolution here in the United States where we have been able to produce more here in the United States, and we have not had to import those products from overseas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Using the term "clean energy," how clean is natural gas compared to home heating fuel?

Mr. SOMMERS. Natural gas is, well, 50 percent more clean than what it has replaced—coal—and that has been, you know, a real boon to the American environment and has allowed us to cut emissions over time to generational lows.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Sommers, have you ever heard of this committee or another committee holding a hearing about LIHEAP and how dirty that is as compared to clean natural gas?

Mr. SOMMERS. I am not familiar with such a hearing, sir.

Mr. SESSIONS. You would think that that would be part of the agenda is to make their own territory cleaner in the winter. Madam Chairman, I have used my time. I think I made my point. I would like to yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from California, Mr. DeSaulnier, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks for having this hearing. My comments I put in the context of it has been my privilege for 32 years to serve in public office in a region in Northern California that is home to five oil refineries, a significant part of our economy, significant part of our revenue stream for state and local government, for our school districts. Mr. Wirth, I don't know if you are a constituent, but I know some of your predecessors have been. Your headquarters is in the county I represent. I put that in context.

And I have also served in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and was appointed by Pete Wilson, a Republican, to the California Air Resources Board, and served under three Governors, two Republicans and one Democrat. So I remind folks that it was a California Republican who signed the Clean Air Act, Richard Nixon. Ronald Reagan amended it, another Republican, and George Deukmejian, a conservative Republican Governor of California, started the ZEV Program, Zero Emission Vehicles Program, which I have been intimately involved with auto manufacturers, and also, to a degree, under other regulations with the heavy-duty manufacturers.

I have been to funerals of constituents of mine who have died while working in these refineries. I don't know if any of you have ever been on one of those. Five of them died. One of them died be-

cause the company—not yours, but some company that competes with you—was appealing a citation from Cal/OSHA to replace walkie-talkies that cost less than $1,000. Michael Glanzman, who was trying to use that to tell the folks back in the command unit that they should shut down the hydrocracker, they couldn't hear him in time, so he was eviscerated. So that is a long way of saying I have got a long history in this field. You provide value, but it is time to change. And we don't have time, from an economic standpoint or environmental standpoint, to haggle over this, but we have got to remember history and we have got to rebuild trust.

Mr. Sommers, the viewpoint that all of this innovation and our reductions have happened because of private industry is just misleading at best. Mr. Jordan's comments. Mr. Grothman's comments. Our regulations, the California waiver, has propelled this innovation environmentally and from a worker safety standpoint, and it has been my pleasure in very difficult negotiations to be able to work with the private sector to get those. So I wish we could really focus on what is in front of us, an energy industry that is important to us, but whose time is passing. Mr. Grothman's comments and the idea that we are going back to coal in China, I would just remind folks that China is adding 100,000 charging stations and hydrogen fuel stations a month, and it is going up exponentially. The future is not in fossil fuels and in climate carbon intensive industries. It is in renewables and alternatives. And even if we didn't have the existential threat to the climate, that would be an economic reality. It is more efficient.

Mr. Woods, I would like to read a quote, and I would like to ask unanimous to consent to enter these into the record, a series of articles from the L.A. Times, Climate Action News, and correspondence that myself, and Congressman Lieu, and Mr. Welch have all been part of with ExxonMobil.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Thank you. We will provide that information.

Mr. DESAULNIER. So the quote from the L.A. Times article dated October 23, 2015, the headline is, "How Exxon Went From Leader to Skeptic on Climate Change Research." "Throughout much of the 1980's, Exxon earned a public reputation as a pioneer in climate change research. It sponsored workshops, funded academic research, and conducted its own high-tech experiments exploring the science behind global warming, but by 1990, the company in public took a different posture," Mr. Woods. "While still funding select research, it poured millions into a campaign that questioned climate change over the next 15 years. It took out prominent ads in *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, contending that climate change science was murky and uncertain, and then argued regulations aimed at curbing global warming were ill-considered and premature. How did one of the world's largest oil companies, a leader in climate research, become one of its biggest skeptics?" One of your employees, the manager of Science and Technology Department, actually told the board in 1989 of the consequences of denial.

Mr. Woods, in 2015, Mr. Welch, Mr. Lieu, and I met in Mr. Lieu's office with your representative, and we asked for timeline and a response from you on these allegations. It is now 2021. We have

asked repeatedly for this information from you to hear your side of the story while the litigation has gone on. We haven't gotten a response. Would you commit to me personally today to follow through and give us what your representative promised us six years ago?

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired, but the gentleman may answer the question.

Mr. WOODS. Congressman, I am not aware of the request that you reference, but we will followup with you. I will commit to followup with you.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Well, it is real common that you are unaware of it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Keller, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KELLER. Thank you to the many witnesses for being here today. The U.S. Energy Information Administration published the Winter Fuels Outlook for the upcoming months, and their forecast is grim. Half of Americans use natural gas to heat their homes, and they are projected to pay about 30 percent higher energy prices this winter compared to last. Depending on weather and demand, Americans could be paying almost, some estimates, 55 to 60 percent more to heat their homes and businesses than they were last year. Those that will be most affected by these outrageous energy prices will be low-income wage earners and those on fixed incomes, like our senior citizens.

I would ask unanimous consent to include the report into the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Crabtree, as a welder, what was your experience when the Keystone pipeline was shut down, and do you know how many of your fellow employees, workers lost their jobs?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, at the time when the pipeline was shut down, it was in the early stages the construction, so it wasn't a lot. It is the fact that would have been 11,000 union members working had that project been completed. But I know since the new Administration has taken, about 80 percent of our members were without work during peak construction season this year.

Mr. KELLER. Well, how does that make you feel that the President of United States said that you can't build a pipeline here in America but allows the Russians to operate their Nord Stream 2 pipeline?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, it was definitely frustrating to say the least. That is about all I can say about that.

Mr. KELLER. Yes, I can't imagine. And, you know, you have worked on pipelines, you know, welding and so forth. You know, looking at the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, do you believe that those foreign pipelines like that are better protecting our environment or better constructed than ones that we would build here in America, like the Keystone XL?

Mr. CRABTREE. Absolutely not. You know, I am a member of a union, and we take the utmost pride in the construction and the quality of work we put out. There are plenty of projects here in the United States that could have been providing that same natural

gas and putting Americans to work, but instead we are letting Russia take that.

Mr. KELLER. And I would think that you and our fellow Americans with the skill that you have can construct a much safer and a much better pipeline anybody else in the world.

Mr. CRABTREE. That is that is the absolute truth. Like I said, we take a lot of pride in the work we do.

Mr. KELLER. Absolutely. There is no question that vital conservation efforts should be an American priority. It should also not be controversial to say that an all-of-the-above domestic energy approach is good for our country. We cannot turn a blind eye to the realities of energy demand and inability of renewables alone to heat our homes or fuel our vehicles and power our lives. The United States is already producing energy more cleanly and more efficiently than nations like Russia or China. Would any of the witnesses like to speak on the ways in which American-made energy is already innovating without far-fetched government mandates?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, I will speak to that. You know, one of the greatest breakthroughs in technology in the last two decades in energy has been the ability to marry up two technologies which the industry had already used, which is directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing, which has allowed this country to become the leader in oil and gas production in the world once again after decades of decline. And so that is what has enabled the reductions in emissions that have been cited earlier today, greater than a dozen countries combined around the world. It is what has reduced criteria pollutants in our economy and in our cities, and it is just one of many examples of the innovation that goes on by the incredibly talented women and men in this industry across all the companies represented here today, and many, many others who are also part of the great American treasure which is our energy economy.

Mr. KELLER. Thank you. I appreciate that. The other thing I would like to say is, you know, looking at what are great workers do here in America and so on, China has pledged to achieve net zero emissions by 2060. I mean, is there anybody here that really believes that is a serious proposal? I mean, they are building more coal-fired plants now as we speak, you know. They are increasing energy in coal and so on. I would really think that if we think that is a serious proposal, we take a second look at it.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from New York, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you so much, Madam Chair. And, you know, it is not lost on me that we are having a hearing today surrounding fossil fuel misinformation and disinformation campaigns on the same day that we are scheduled to vote on legislation that has been deeply influenced by the lobbying efforts of the fossil fuel industry. It is a wonderful opportunity for us to be speaking with the CEOs of BP, Chevron, Exxon, Shell, and the American Petroleum Institute.

Speaking of which, Mr. Sommers, as the President of the American Petroleum Institute, part of your job is to help lobby, and advocate, and champion the fossil fuel industry, and that includes,

particularly, legislation before the U.S. Congress. You told CNN on television, "We are leaving everything on the field here in terms of our opposition to reconciliation. We are using every tool at our disposal to work against these energy proposals." And, frankly, Mr. Sommers, I appreciate your candor because most lobbying organization heads aren't as forthright and transparent about their efforts to manipulate U.S. legislation. So what did that all-out approach look like? Am I correct, Mr. Sommers, that the oil and gas industry overall, including the companies that you represent and members you represent today, have spent about $55.6 million in lobbying within the last 10 months, this year alone? That figure sounds right to you, correct?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, thank you for your question, but let me clarify something, first of all, about who the American Petroleum Institute is. Our mission, first of all, is that we are a standard setting organization for the global oil and gas industry. We maintain over 700 standards in the areas of health, environment, and safety. In addition to that, we advocate for the oil and gas industry here——

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Sommers, is that figure $55.6 million in lobbying funds correct or not? I have limited time.

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, I don't have those numbers at my disposal.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Well, according to our disclosures, that seems to be the figure, but I will move on. I would like to turn my attention to, and I apologize. We just simply don't have much time allocated here. Mr. Woods, as the CEO of ExxonMobil, are you familiar with an individual by the name of Keith McCoy?

Mr. WOODS. I am.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. He was one of your top lobbyists, correct?

Mr. WOODS. He was a senior advisor in our Washington office.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. I see. Now, earlier this year, McCoy was recorded in a private session as saying, "I liken lobbying to fishing. You have to bait. You throw that bait out there just to kind of reel Members of Congress in because they are a captive audience. They know that they need you and I need them." And he also alluded to having weekly calls with certain Members of Congress as debates around reconciliation were being formed. Are you aware of these calls?

Mr. WOODS. I am not aware of the calls.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. You are not aware of the calls. Have you participated in any calls with Members of Congress throughout this process of reconciliation and infrastructure?

Mr. WOODS. I have.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. You have. Are political donations ever discussed during your calls with Members of Congress?

Mr. WOODS. No, they are not.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. They are not. Does the value of your compensation increase as a result of increased production from Exxon's refineries?

Mr. WOODS. No, volumes from our refineries are not part of my compensation.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Is your compensation tied to Exxon stock price?

Mr. WOODS. Yes, it is.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. It is, and so I would assume with increased value in Exxon stock price and oil production, that would have a boost in the value of your compensation, correct?

Mr. WOODS. My compensation is based on a number of metrics and parameters, from environmental safety and value creation to technology development. It is a portfolio of responsibilities that the compensation committee judges me on.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you very much. You know, I think one thing that often gets lost in these conversations is that some of us have to actually live in the future that you all are setting on fire for us. By 2028, crop yields are already projected to begin to fail with famine beginning to hit the world's most vulnerable populations. By 2038, current U.S. drought fire and extreme heat trends could potentially make whole regions of the United States unlivable if we continue the trends that lobbyists are trying to have us pursue, and we have a tipping point by 2036. We do not have the privilege or the luxury of lobbyist spin, and it is incredibly important that we don't reach net zero in some imaginary future, but that we actually cut through to carbon emissions reductions here in the United States and globally.

I submit back to the chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Fallon, is now recognized for five minutes.

[No response.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. Mr. Fallon.

Mr. FALLON. Yes. Madam Chair, thank you.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK.

Mr. FALLON. Can you hear me?

Chairwoman MALONEY. We can hear you.

Mr. FALLON. Oh wonderful. Thank you so much. I can remember being a child in the late 70's early 80's, and I was fascinated with global and geopolitical events. There was a dream back then that someday the United States could achieve energy independence. But see, at the time there were gas lines, there was an oil embargo, and I remember people were worried, and they were concerned, and they were scared. This dream, it was more like a pipe dream. We are on the cusp of achieving it now of American energy independence, and it is remarkable to me that this Administration and our friends across the aisle seem to be intent on us fumbling that ball. And unfortunately and unwittingly, their efforts are emboldening our enemies by hamstringing our own energy industry.

Canceling the Keystone pipeline was a horrible idea, and the fact of the matter is, since 2000, the United States has been not only a leader in energy production in the world, but also in reducing CO2 emissions. And these are both remarkable achievements, and we should do everything in our power to continue to facilitate this kind of success. And the energy industry, let us not forget, is responsible for 10 million high-paying jobs in this country, and it is also a national security issue.

We had a few months back former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in Washington, and he talked to us about how he felt empowered as America's top diplomat on the world stage with foreign

leaders because they wanted to engage with the United States. One of the primary specific reasons was because of our abundance of fossil fuels. But some of the folks in Congress seem to be intent on us letting Venezuela, and Iran, and China, and Russia, countries that aren't as committed to safety, they don't have the protocols, and the precautions, and the procedures, and the commitment to safety that we do in this country. That is why we should be exploring offshore, and drilling in Alaska, and the Keystone pipeline, because this country, when we produce energy, it is safer for the environment. It is better for everyone on the planet, and there is a definite moral case to be made for the fossil fuel industry and fossil fuels as a whole.

In 1900, the life expectancy in this country was under 50 years of age, about 46. Now, before COVID, it was 79 years. That is a 72 percent increase, and that is all races and creeds are living longer today primarily because of this industry. And our goal for everyone should be that human beings, not only in our country, but on the planet are allowed to live productive and meaningful lives. And if we want cleaner energy, we should at least use the expertise of the energy industry because they have shown and they have proven themselves to be innovators.

And we had a committee hearing demonizing the oil industry a few months back, and one of the witnesses then was saying about we are going to be judged in history. In fact, one of our colleagues just said and made some very rather hyperbolic comments about how the future is being set on fire, of course, you know, crying that the sky is going to fall. By 2028, these dire predictions won't come true, and in 2038, they won't come true just like so many in 2000 that said that Florida would be underwater by 2020. They are not. But we will be judged by our actions today, and we will be judged in history just like so many of our folks in the Democratic majority that are going on wild multi-trillion-dollar deficit spending binges, that they are saddling our future generations, our children, my children, my sons with a crushing debt and forcing them into an inevitable and untenable financial crisis. So if we want more abundant, and inexpensive, and cleaner energy, which we all should do, these witnesses here should be the ones that we are supporting and applauding and not demonizing.

Madam Chair, thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. KHANNA. [Presiding.] Thank you. The gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Welch, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much. You know, the issue here is credibility. The oil companies, when they began producing oil, discovering oil, did not know about climate change, but they were the first to learn about it, and then learning about it, concealed it and denied it. Mr. Woods, on June 6 of 1978, one of your excellent scientists, James Black, in the Product Research Division, circulated a presentation he had given to the management committee on the greenhouse effect: "There is scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels." That is a quote. In your leadership of Exxon, are you aware of what action was taken by the board after that report to it about the greenhouse effect was presented?

Mr. WOODS. My understanding, Congressman, is that report summarizes the work of the broader scientific community, and a full reading of that report is consistent with the broader community, and the report——

Mr. WELCH. Well, let me go on. There are others here. You know, I don't have that much time. In December 18 of 1980, Exxon employee, Henry Shaw, sent an internal memo saying, "an increase in the global average temperature of three degrees centigrade and uneven global distribution of increased rainfall, in addition to some particularly dramatic questions that might cause a series of global problems, such as melting of ice caps." Did Exxon, to your knowledge, share that information, really crucial information, with the public at that time?

Mr. WOODS. I wasn't working for the company at that time, several decades——

Mr. WELCH. You are not aware that that information was made available.

Mr. WOODS. My understanding is——

Mr. WELCH. On November 12——

Mr. WOODS [continuing]. We had no unique knowledge. We were basically——

Mr. WELCH. Well, let me just go through this because these are records from your own company, all right? These are not fake news. This is internal documents. On November 12, 1982, M.B. Glaser, manager of environmental affairs program, sent a memo to the Exxon management on the CO2 greenhouse effect saying, "CO2 release is the most likely source of inadvertent climate modification, and the prevailing opinion attributes CO2 increase to fossil fuel combustion." And finally it said that "Mitigation to the greenhouse effect would require major reductions in fossil fuel combustion." Did you disclose that to your shareholders, something that would be relevant to the value of your assets?

Mr. WOODS. My understanding is those reports were a synthesis of publicly available information.

Mr. WELCH. No, I didn't ask that.

Mr. WOODS [continuing]. The understanding.

Mr. WELCH. Did you disclose that to your shareholders in your report? That is my question.

Mr. WOODS. My understanding is it is a summarized——

Mr. WELCH. No, no, seriously. I am not asking what it is. I am asking whether that information was disclosed in your shareholder reports.

Mr. WOODS. I am not familiar with my reports from 30 years ago.

Mr. WELCH. All right. On February 22, 1989, Duane Levine presented a report to the board of directors. He stated, "Data that greenhouse gases are increasing in the atmosphere and fossil fuels contribute to most of the CO2." To your knowledge, did Exxon disclose that to its shareholders?

Mr. WOODS. We made all of our research publicly available, Congressman. It is my understanding——

Mr. WELCH. OK. I don't mean to be difficult because it is a simple question. Did you disclose it to shareholders? "Yes," "no," or "I don't know.

Mr. WOODS. We made that research publicly available.

Mr. WELCH. Well——

Mr. WOODS. Consistent with the broader——

Mr. WELCH. On May 6 of 1996, nearly 20 years——

Mr. WOODS. We have——

Mr. WELCH. Let me go on, please. Exxon's Lee Raymond stated in a speech to the Economic Club of Detroit, "The scientific evidence is inconclusive as to whether human activities are having a significant effect on the global climate." Do you agree with that?

Mr. WOODS. Congressman, our position taken back in that time, it is my understanding, was consistent with the general state of the scientific discussion and knowledge.

Mr. WELCH. So you don't agree with Mr. Tillerson.

Mr. WOODS. Well, I agree with——

Mr. WELCH. Finally, on June 30, 2021, Keith McCoy, who Ms. Ocasio-Cortez asked you about, acknowledged that Exxon has "aggressively fought climate science," that they have joined "shadow groups to work against some of the early efforts," and that Exxon's support of a carbon tax is purely "a talking point." He said that Exxon is looking out for its investments. How is this knowledge that ExxonMobil had about the dramatic impact of fossil fuels and climate change any different than Big Tobacco knowing about smoking causing cancer, but denying it and continuing to peddle its product? Explain to me the difference.

Mr. WOODS. Well, as I said, at the time, Mr. McCoy's statements did not represent our policy or our approach with respect to our positions in this space.

Mr. WELCH. And the distinction between what Exxon knew and what Big Tobacco knew but didn't reveal? The difference is?

Mr. WOODS. All of our work was made publicly available. Our research was publicly available, and it was consistent and relied largely on outside work. We were part of the broader scientific community working in this space, and we had no unique views.

Mr. WELCH. Well, thank you. My time is up, and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Clyde, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CLYDE. Thank you, Madam Chair. I have noticed a trend going on here of holding hearings on legislation that has already passed the House, such as you did with H.R. 3755, the abortion on demand bill, and the Equal Rights Amendment. As with that trend, I have begun to pick up on another trend that we are setting, and, unfortunately, this one is more disturbing. The new trend is that this committee continues to use or, rather, should I say, continues to abuse its power to conduct oversight into the private activities of private citizens and private companies, which ultimately results in nothing more than one big public shaming campaign. In my 10 months here in this committee, I have been made aware that my Democrat colleagues have leveraged both letters and subpoena threats to either compel private entities to appear before the committee or to hand over privileged and, mind you, protected materials for the committee staff to ransack.

In this congressional session alone, we have seen this committee engage in this manner with Cyber Ninjas, the National Football

League, the Sackler family, and now we are seeing them do it to the companies before us today. This committee used to be called the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. It is now just called the Committee on Oversight and Reform. The day the majority chose to remove "government" from this committee's title was a big red flag to all that House Democrats might truly believe their authorities go beyond four corners of the United States Constitution. This committee should focus its oversight activities and investigation on government operations, not inject itself into private operations.

To our witnesses, I want all of you to know that I support an all-in approach to ensure our Nation is energy independent. History is no stranger to the energy crisis we are experiencing today as once thriving towns and cities shuddered when the main driving force of the economy, the coal mines, closed. We are now seeing this chilling effect, particularly in the oil and gas realm, happen on a macro scale ever since President Biden enacted, by executive fiat, his green policies, such as evident when President Biden chose to shut down the Keystone XL pipeline on his first day in office, a decision that resulted in hundreds of people losing out on good-paying jobs and that seriously undercut our Nation's ability to be energy independent and a net energy exporter. And to add salt to an open wound, President Biden immediately greenlighted Russia's Nord Stream 2 pipeline when he chose to withdraw sanctions in May.

The President's energy policy simply does not make sense. He demands we decrease domestic production, yet he pleads for OPEC to increase their production. OPEC refused, and this disparity in supply became the cause of skyrocketing gas prices Americans are seeing at the pump. Hardworking people and families are paying the price for these terrible energy policies, and seniors and families on fixed incomes especially are at risk of losing their homes and are being forced to choose between heating their homes or putting food on the table. And that is even before President Biden's proposed heating tax found in his absurd big government socialism spending bill called budget reconciliation. It is shameful, but, again, you all have not been called here today to help us conduct oversight of the Biden Administration's policies. No, you have been called here so my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can drag you through the mud.

My first question is for Mr. Sommers of the Petroleum Institute. Given the energy crisis, Mr. Sommers, of countries in the EU and Asia, what they are currently experiencing, many may argue that that is a direct result of pressures to prematurely divest from reliable fossil fuel development. How can the United States avoid a similar fate as the EU and Asia is experiencing, sir?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank you for your question. I do think that the there is a flashing warning sign in Europe right now as energy prices continue to go up. It is mainly a consequence of a lack of supply, and they are going to continue to need more energy as their economy grows. Another major concern that Europe should have is that one of the reasons why natural gas prices, in particular, have gone up is because Russia has decided not to export natural gas to the EU during this critical time. It is, I think, a real warning for American consumers and the world that if you

don't create your own supply at home, you are dependent on supplies from regimes that don't necessarily have your interests at heart. And I think the Europeans and other parts of the world are finding out the importance of creating a supply to ensure that we have access to affordable and reliable energy for decades and decades to come here in this country.

Mr. CLYDE. Thank you. I appreciate that, and I will note that our adversaries are very capable of using energy as a weapon—Russia—and we have done nothing but help them when we have greenlighted the Nord Stream 2 pipeline. And with that, I yield back, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Kelly, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you for being here today. Your companies all claim to have net zero ambitions, and since you all claim to support the Paris Agreement, then you should have net zero greenhouse gas emissions by mid-century. But the record seems to suggest that the companies represented here have a long way to go to get there. Ms. Watkins, in its February 2021 Energy Transition Strategy, Shell said, and I quote, "aligned with the more ambitious goals of the Paris Agreement to limit the average global temperature to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels." Is that correct?

Ms. WATKINS. That is the ambition of the Paris Agreement. Yes, that is correct.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you. Shell said it aims to become a net zero energy business by 2050 and have set goals to cut the carbon content of its products by 20 percent by 2030 to phaseout carbon emissions by 2050. Is that correct?

Ms. WATKINS. Net zero by 2050 is correct, yes, and we just announced today a goal to cut our Scope 1 and 2 emissions by half by 2030.

Ms. KELLY. And why does independent analysis find that Shell's net zero pledge fails to meet the Paris Agreement goals?

Ms. WATKINS. I am sorry, Congresswoman, I am not familiar with the independent analysis that you are talking about. But what I can say is that the company I work for is absolutely committed to these goals that we put out there. My compensation is directly linked to that, and we look forward to continuing to accelerate the energy transition in collaboration with folks like yourself, the government, with our customers, with segments of the industry. This is something that we can't do alone as one company. It really needs to be done in collaboration with society and with the government.

Ms. KELLY. OK. Yes, from what I was reading, it says, "Shell's strategy only decreases oil production by 1 to 2 percent annually through 2030 while it increases gas production four percent over the same time period." And according to the 2021 United Nations Production Gap Report, the world must decrease oil production by four percent and gas production by 3 percent annually between 2020 and 2030 to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. And over a 10-year period, this would equate to a 50-percent increase in gas production for Shell compared to the nearly 30 percent decline we need to reach the goals scientists say are necessary to limit the

most dangerous impacts of climate change. And then earlier this year, Shell appealed an order by a Dutch court to cut emissions by 45 percent by 2030. So can you tell me, does Shell plan to comply with the court order to cut emissions by 45 percent by 2030? You can just say "yes" or "no."

Ms. WATKINS. Congresswoman, one of the reasons we put out the goal we put out today is because we see an opportunity to accelerate our Powering Progress Strategy. And so cutting our Scope 1 and 2 emissions by half by 2030 is a new target. I am very proud of my company for being aggressive.

Ms. KELLY. So was that a "yes" or "no?"

Ms. WATKINS. We are in the——

Ms. KELLY. I am just asking you "yes" or "no" because I don't have a lot of time. That is all.

Ms. WATKINS. We are in the process of appealing the Dutch court order, and so while we are in action to get to net zero by 2050, and we have many targets between now and then to hit, we are appealing the court order because we don't think the courts is the right place to decide this.

Ms. KELLY. So it sounds like even though Shell's transition strategy calls for cutting emissions by 2030, the company is resisting efforts to get there. And is that because Shell's transition strategy to reduce the intensity of its carbon output from oil production relies in part on Shell increasing its gas productions? Is that correct?

Ms. WATKINS. Congresswoman, I would say that I have a different way of putting that. We are not resisting. In fact, we are embracing the opportunity to transition faster, which is why we are working to increase the demand for low and no carbon fuels. So that that is actually how I would characterize it, as embracing the energy transition.

Ms. KELLY. So you can't characterize it as a "yes" or "no" then because experts warn this plan will backslide further to mere operational efficiency rather than reducing the overall climate burden of your product. So again, "yes" or "no," will Shell commit to reducing gas production as part of its emissions reduction plans, Ms. Watkins?

Ms. WATKINS. Congresswoman, we have committed to a number of things, and we believe natural gas plays a key role as a transition fuel in order to continue to lower emissions for the country. And so we are committed to providing that cleaner burning fuel to the world. So we are committed to natural gas over time, but we are also very much committed to continuing to work with our customers to look at no carbon fuels, such as wind and solar. We are building wind turbines off the coast of New Jersey and Massachusetts, and we will continue to look for opportunities to do that, but the demand needs to be there.

Ms. KELLY. That is good to hear that you are looking, but a lot of things you are saying are not supported by evidence. So it shows that it is time for Congress to act, and we can begin by passing the Build Back Better Act to combat climate change and spur the development of renewables. And I yield back. I know my time is up. Thank you.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Biggs, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Madam Chair. I have been in and out of this hearing, but I heard the opening statements and listened to a good deal of the questioning of this morning. And I will tell you that if there is one thing that I hope those leading these very important energy companies and the Petroleum Institute understand is that you have kind of got yourself here. You have seen the attitude. You have heard the attitude from the folks from the left on this committee. It is because of your appeasement. That is what it is. So when you get asked this morning about aren't you embarrassed, that is really kind of an irrational question to ask CEOs about their company policy, to ask and to vilify you and basically say will you repudiate your membership in a manufacturing institute, to then say and repeatedly ask the question and to badger you. That is because you have been appeasing. I am not saying that you shouldn't do your best to reduce carbon emissions and run a clean company. I am saying that you have been brought here so they could beat the crap out of you. That is what this is all about. And they are doing it for political reason, and that is the shame of it all.

This is a hearing where the Democrats attack American workers and the private sector. The President and his allies in Congress has consistently advocated for policies that have led to higher energy prices and increased inflation. In fact, you have got Ron Klain retweeting this—he is the chief of staff at the White House—saying, "Most of the economic problems we are facing"—inflation, et cetera—are high-class problems." Well, even The New York Times has said this year's Thanksgiving feast will wallop the wallet, and that is a result of Biden's policies, and part of those policies are to put two screws on the energy industry.

Some of the inflation is systemic, but some of it is driven by scarcity, just economic market-driven principles. So I hope you get the lesson because if nothing else I say matters, I think you need to know something. These folks would regulate you right out of business tomorrow if they could—don't pretend otherwise—no matter how good corporate citizens you are or how sincere you are in trying to reduce carbon emissions. That is the purpose of this hearing today is to lay the foundation to get rid of you.

And at the same time, you see the hypocrisy or inconsistency of this Administration. Here is one dated today, this very morning. You have got Amos Hochstein, the U.S. State Department senior adviser for energy security, saying, "Energy producers, particularly OPEC, should be increasing its output." Here is one from two weeks ago: "U.S. Worried Energy Supply is Not Meeting Demand." That is where we are headed in the future. What you do is important. Never forget it is important.

At the same time, you got the Biden Administration stopping issuing new oil and gas leases for drilling on Federal land, canceling the Keystone pipeline within hours of taking office, and then removing sanctions on Russia's Nord Stream 2 pipeline, increasing Europe's dependence on Russian oil. We hear this from Mikhail Krutikhin, an energy analyst at the Consultancy of Russ Energy, saying, "We decided we will let them freeze a good bit this winter, and then they will become more talkative and won't insist on quickly abandoning gas. The stakes are very high." This is a high-

stakes game. The Russians get it. You get it. My colleagues across the aisle don't get it. congressional Democrats' proposals for fixing the problem they caused are worse than President Biden's. Their tax and spend budget reconciliation bill will increase energy prices and cripple the American economy. With gas prices at a seven-year high, Democrats in Congress are considering enacting a carbon tax to pay for their socialist policies. They love, they love to tout their support of the Green New Deal claiming that it is the only way to fight climate change. However, it excludes nuclear energy, despite the fact that nuclear energy is carbon free, low cost, and is a reliable energy source. A Democrat member's former chief of staff, Saikat Chakrabarti, stated, "The interesting thing about the Green New Deal is it wasn't originally a climate change thing at all because we really think of it as a how do you change the entire economy thing." He told the truth. Occasionally you are going to get that out.

I urge you continue being good corporate citizens but understand appeasement will lead to the demise of your industry and your company, which will result in thousands and hundreds of thousands of people losing work and living in poverty and impoverished state.

And, Madam Chair, I have a number of articles I would like to submit for the record.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Without objection.

Mr. BIGGS. I have one called, "Oil Leases with U.S. Urging Producers to Ramp Up Supplies," dated today's date. I have one from Reuters, dated October 7, "U.S. Worried Energy Supply Not Meeting Demand, Top Biden Adviser Says." And I have additional ones. Let's see here. We got "As Europe Faces a Cold Winter, Putin Seizes on Leverage from Russia's Gas Output," from The New York Times dated yesterday.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired. We will submit all the articles you would like into the record.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate it.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Davis, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Madam Chairman, for holding this hearing, and let me thank all of our witnesses for being here and being with us today.

Mr. Woods, I would like to ask you a few questions about your company's position on carbon pricing. Exxon's lobbying website states, and I quote, "Without exception, the company's lobbying efforts are aligned with its publicly available positions." Is that correct?

Mr. WOODS. Yes, it is.

Mr. DAVIS. This reflects and refers to carbon pricing or carbon taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODS. I am sorry. Could you repeat the question, please?

Mr. DAVIS. It relates to carbon pricing or carbon taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODS. We do advocate for a carbon tax or a price on carbon, yes.

Mr. DAVIS. So is it fair to say that Exxon has taken a public position in support of a price on carbon?

Mr. WOODS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask because committee staff reviewed Exxon's lobbying reports along with those of other companies, and the committee's analysis found that since 2011, Exxon and its lobbyists have filed 344 reports involved in lobbying on tax legislation or tax policy. Does this figure sound about right to you?

Mr. WOODS. I don't have those numbers available to me.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Well, according to your company's filing, these lobbying efforts focused on a variety of legislative and policy issues, including protecting oil and gas tax breaks and preserving the corporate tax benefits in President Trump's signature tax spending bill. Since 2011, 46 bills have been introduced in the House and the Senate to deal with carbon pricing. Mr. Woods, would you take a guess at the number of Exxon's lobbing reports during this time that referenced attacks or price on carbon?

Mr. WOODS. I haven't seen the report, so I don't know what that number would be.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, thank you. Our information says 12, that Exxon reported only 12 instances of lobbying on Federal legislation that would tax or price carbon. Mr. Woods, your company's lack of action on an issue it says it supports sends a rather interesting signal, and this goes for all the organizations represented here today. Over the last decade, Exxon, Chevron, BP, Shell, API, and their outside lobbyists filed nearly 6,000 lobbying reports. The committee identified only 34 times that these companies and API reported lobbying on any of bills that address carbon pricing. Meanwhile, they lobbied 77 times just on President Trump's tax cuts. If you do the math, it pretty much means that Exxon, Chevron, BP, Shell, and API reported lobbying 150 times more frequently to carve out corporate giveaways in President Trump's tax cuts and job action than on all carbon pricing legislation. So if it wasn't for the analysis that the committee released today, none of us sitting here would know what their pledges are and that their pledges don't hold up under scrutiny.

So I thank you for your answers and appreciate your being here. And, Madam Chairman, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. LaTurner, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LATURNER. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Climate change is an issue that we need to be serious about addressing properly. The concern of this committee today, however, is climate misinformation. As it turns out, there is a lot of misinformation surrounding the energy crisis facing our Nation. The truth is Americans are experiencing the highest gas prices since the Obama Administration, record high inflation, and spiking natural gas prices as we approach the coldest months of the year. It is no secret that as energy prices skyrocket, the cost to ship goods and keep the lights on for manufacturers goes up, and that increased cost is then passed down to the consumer.

According to The Wall Street Journal's "Market Watch," the latest monthly numbers indicate a 5.3 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index. In my home state of Kansas, farmers have to pay for this Administration's shortsighted and counterproductive

policies in the form of record-high fertilizer prices which have surpassed even the previous peaks of the 2008 global financial crisis. Instead of combating this crisis, the White House has doubled down on progressive policies that created this perfect storm of inflation in the first place and forced hardworking Americans to dig deeper into their pockets to pick up the tab.

It is misinformation to suggest that these rising prices and taxes are a necessary evil in achieving our long-term environmental goals, especially when the U.S. is forced to outsource our crude oil and raw materials from countries with less stringent emission standards than us. The Administration's policies also undermine our energy independence. The White House could have made it easier for American companies to increase domestic production and hire more U.S. workers, but, instead, the President begged OPEC and Russia to increase global output to combat the spiking fuel prices. Dependence on Russia and China to fuel our country's baseload and power our electric grid is a national security threat and does nothing to mitigate carbon emissions globally.

Some of my colleagues seem to think it is impossible to have both affordable, bountiful, and innovative energy while also having clean air and water. That is simply not true. Oil and gas produced here in America is among the cleanest and safest in the world. The United States has been a world leader in reducing carbon emissions over the past two decades without socialist policies or complete reliance on inconsistent sources like wind and solar. The data proves that the private sector is tackling climate change without burdensome Federal regulation, and Congress should continue to allow them to do so.

Mr. Sommers, can you describe some of the ways that the Green New Deal policies, particularly included in the reconciliation proposal, would affect your industry?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank for your question. We as an industry have taken on the climate challenge, and, in fact, API released earlier this year our Climate Action Framework, which is a five-step plan to address the climate challenge as an industry. Three of those actions are actually things that we are going to do even if Congress doesn't act on climate change in this Congress or in the future because we know it is a challenge and we know it has to be addressed. And we know that this industry has the technological know-how and the engineers in place and the scientists and geologists in place who can tackle this challenge from the private sector.

Notwithstanding that, we do believe that Congress should also act on climate change. And because we disagree with some of the provisions in the reconciliation package doesn't mean that we don't take climate change seriously. We do have some concerns about what is currently in the package, and we have worked to educate lawmakers on those concerns. One of the concerns that we have is the proposal of a natural gas tax that would potentially increase costs on consumers during a time when energy prices are already spiking. One of the original proposals also included a clean energy performance payment plan that did not include natural gas. As we have talked about earlier in this hearing, one of the real reasons that we have been able to cut emissions over time is because of

natural gas. We need to continue to incentivize that fuel switch from coal to natural gas so that we can continue on that road to progress of cutting U.S. emissions.

Mr. LATURNER. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Florida, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Madam Chair. As we all know, Congress and President Biden are hard at work to pass the Build Back Better Act to take bold, aggressive, and long overdue action on climate change. But many of the witnesses today vigorously opposed key climate provisions in the Build Back Better Act. I find that offensive being from ground zero in the state of Florida where climate change and its impact is not a someday thing. It is a right now thing. And according to InfluenceMap, for example, BP, Shell, ExxonMobil, and Chevron collectively spend more than $150 million every year on lobbying and policy influence activities, but they do this to protect their trillions of dollars in revenues.

Ms. Clark, my first question is for you. How much has the Chamber of Commerce spent to defeat the Build Back Better Act?

Ms. CLARK. Sorry. I don't have that number off the top of my head.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, give me a ballpark.

Ms. CLARK. I really couldn't.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You have no idea how much the Chamber of Commerce has spent on lobbying targeted at the Build Back Better Act?

Ms. CLARK. No, I don't.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are not doing your job very well if you don't know that answer, but I will just give you an idea. Just in September, the Chamber launched a six-figure ad campaign just to pressure House Democrats to try to vote down the reconciliation package. And, you know, for a while, the Chamber actually participated in House GOP leadership strategy calls to defeat the reconciliation package. Perhaps you weren't aware of that either, but that is that is something that actually happened. The Chamber released a statement earlier this month that said, "The Chamber is continuing and expanding its efforts to defeat the reconciliation bill and opposes efforts to link the infrastructure bill to the reconciliation bill." That is just grossly irresponsible, and what you should be doing is working toward trying to find compromise, not just spending millions of dollars to defeat something and work against our progress on addressing the climate change issue.

Mr. Sommers, what about the American Petroleum Institute? What did API spend to defeat the Build Back Better Act?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, we have worked to influence the process, particularly on issues that will affect oil and gas.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. Reclaiming my time. My question is to the tune of how much money.

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, I don't have those numbers at my fingertips.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, I assumed you would answer that way, but let me just illuminate things for folks listening to

this. API used its front group, Energy Citizens, to flood Facebook with hundreds of ads in 140 congressional districts aimed in opposition to the reconciliation package. Here is a bewildering example of hypocrisy. The Build Back Better Act contains provisions to tackle, for example, methane pollution from oil and natural gas production which API claims to support the reduction of methane emissions. Yet API and its front group, Energy Citizens, have carried out a seven-figure TV and internet ad campaign to defeat the Build Back Better methane emissions fee. Mr. Sommers, how do you reconcile your group's claims to support reducing methane emissions with your opposition to Build Back Better provisions that address methane emissions?

Mr. SOMMERS. Thank you for your question, Congresswoman. In fact, the American Petroleum Institute supports the Federal regulation of methane for both new and existing sources. We expect the new regulation to come out soon from the Biden Administration, and we have been working with them on making sure that that regulation makes sense and that it is reducing methane emissions over time. Furthermore——

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. All right. Reclaiming my time——

Mr. SOMMERS [continuing]. This industry——

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am sorry. Reclaiming my time. Except you are opposing the reduction policies on methane emissions in the Build Back Better Act, which is the proposal of the Biden Administration. So you are either lying about your support for reducing methane emissions or you are working against yourself, which makes no sense and certainly isn't money well spent by your institution.

Mr. SOMMERS. Respectfully, Congresswoman——

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No, the time is mine. Thank you. Mr. Woods, your company is a member of API, for example, and API actively lobbies to crush good climate policies as I have just illuminated. Your own former senior director of Federal relations admitted using groups like API to take the tough questions and be a "whipping boy" during congressional hearings. How can you tell us with a straight face that you are part of the solution to climate change when you are part of the lobbying effort to stifle policies to fight climate change?

Mr. WOODS. Well, as I said shortly after the interview was released, that characterization offered up was incorrect and did not reflect the position that our company has taken or the philosophy that we take.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Woods, you can say what you want about climate change, but words matter. Actions matter more, and this hearing illustrates the problems we face. Industry players talk out of both sides of their mouths. Big Oil may talk about climate change and emission reductions and put shiny, polished green colored ads on TV telling Americans they are part of the solution. But when President Biden and congressional Democrats try to advance solutions to actually fight the climate crisis, the fossil fuel industry reaches into its deep pockets to kill these commonsense solutions. You are no better than Big Tobacco in the 90's.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Johnson, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Madam Chair, for holding this hearing.

Mr. Woods, ExxonMobil Corporation now publicly acknowledges the climate crisis while privately funding organizations that promote climate denial or misinformation. Isn't it true that between 1998 and 2017, ExxonMobil Corporation spent $36 million with think tanks promoting climate denial?

Mr. WOODS. I can't comment on the figure that you have offered up. I would tell you that our position that we have taken and what we worked——

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, you would not disagree with that amount, would you?

Mr. WOODS. I don't have the number, so I can't confirm or deny the amount. But I would tell you the position that we take with the groups we work with is consistent with the position that we take publicly. We don't have to——

Mr. JOHNSON. You deny climate change as being connected with CO2 emissions, correct?

Mr. WOODS. Pardon? I am sorry. I missed your question.

Mr. JOHNSON. You spend a lot of money to get across the false point that CO2 emissions do not impact climate.

Mr. WOODS. No, I don't agree with that characterization. We do not spend money. We have long acknowledged the linkage between CO2 emissions and the risk of climate change.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, let me ask you this question. Back in 1979, ExxonMobil commissioned a groundbreaking study that discovered that fossil fuels released carbon emissions that would "endanger humanity." However, isn't it true, Mr. Woods, that no operational changes were made to respond to the horrifying findings that the company's business operations and products were endangering humanity?

Mr. WOODS. Congress, I am not aware of any unique understanding that we had in the science. We engaged with the broader community and worked with them to advance our own understanding, and as time passed and scientific understanding evolved, so did our position and the approach that we took to addressing emissions.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, let me ask you this question, sir. The American Petroleum Institute has known since as early as 1957 that carbon emissions were dangerously warming the atmosphere, and multiple studies published by ExxonMobil and BP found similar results in subsequent years, only to be publicized the first time in 2015 and 2018, respectively. Mr. Woods, when did you first learn that CO2 emissions cause climate change?

Mr. WOODS. Our company from the very early days has worked with the outside scientific group, and our understanding our and our public position has been consistent with that understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, let me ask Mr. Lawler the question. Mr. Lawler, when did you first learn that CO2 emissions cause climate change?

Mr. LAWLER. Thank you for the question. So BP was aware early on, very early on, that there was——

Mr. JOHNSON. Was it before 2018?

Mr. LAWLER. I would say before, even in the 90's and 80's, we were aware of reports that were out. There was a lot of science. There was a lot of debate that was published during that time period. But I would say that BP focused on the landmark IPCC study in 1996, and in 1997, our then CEO, John Browne, acknowledged that the scientific community——

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I want to break in right here. Research shows that between 2010 and 2018, only 2.3 percent of your investments per capita expenditures went to low carbon energies. Is that true?

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, sir, it is true, but what I would say is that——

Mr. JOHNSON. And isn't it also true, Mr. Lawler, that BP earned $183.5 billion in 2020?

Mr. LAWLER. I would have to check that figure. I know in——

Mr. JOHNSON. That means you could not tell me how much of that $183.5 billion was reinvested in clean energy production?

Mr. LAWLER. Are you speaking to revenue or profit? That number seems high. We——

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, you would know better than I.

Mr. LAWLER. Well, we had——

Mr. JOHNSON. You actually profited $183.5 billion in 2020.

Mr. LAWLER. Well, we had something called a replacement cost profit of around $4 to $5 billion in 2020.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, my question is, how much of that was reinvested in clean energy production?

Mr. LAWLER. So in the last two years, we have spent $2 billion on clean energy projects.

Mr. JOHNSON. Two billion out of $183.5 billion. For the people suffering from the impacts of wildfires, floods, and hurricanes right now, 30 years is too long to wait for your company to change. How do you square the reality of facts on the ground with your 2050 date to decrease carbon emissions?

Mr. LAWLER. Congressman, I have a project that I can share with you right now that is amazing. We have installed a 300-megawatt solar facility that is powering the only steel mill in the world with green energy. We are in action. We spent $1.1 billion to join an offshore wind farm just offshore New York. We will spend billions behind that and we are in action. We have very clear targets. And, again, we have stepped forward that we would be reducing our overall production, our absolute production, on a worldwide basis by 40 percent by the year 2030. So we are in action.

Mr. JOHNSON. The world can't wait.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired, and the gentleman may continue answering the question, but his time has expired.

Mr. LAWLER. I would just add, Congressman, that we do have near-term targets that are significant to cut methane, to cut emissions. Fifteen percent of our executive compensation pay is linked to sustainable emissions reductions. But I can just assure you that we are sincere, we are in motion, and we are taking action on a

number of projects. And again, by 2025, we will be spending $3 to $4 billion, $5 billion in 2030, so we are sincere.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Thank you. Thank you so much.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Chairwoman MALONEY. OK. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Ms. Pressley, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you, Chairwoman Maloney. We must treat this climate crisis like lives depend on it because they quite literally do. In my district, the Massachusetts 7th, the sea level rise caused by an increase in global temperatures, which is a direct result of the continued operations of the oil and gas companies before this committee, will destabilize families and sink entire communities. From Cambridge and Chelsea to Fenway and East Boston, my constituents are living in regions that will be completely under water if we do not take bold action to transition to 100 percent renewable, zero emission energy sources as outlined in the Green New Deal.

And as I fight for the livelihoods of my neighbors, I am clear eyed that my opposition is the massive lobbying campaign by the billion-dollar corporations appearing before this committee today. Your companies invest hundreds of millions of dollars in lobbying efforts each year, some of which is disclosed and reported. But the truth is these amounts represent only a fraction of what is actually spent against our efforts to save lives and our planet. We know a key part of Big Oil's disinformation campaign is funding and backing so-called shadow groups to fight against our climate justice efforts. Shadow groups are think tanks, pressure organizations, and other groups who receive funding from industry to engage in advocacy the industry doesn't want its fingerprints on.

Mr. Woods, after your former lobbyist admitted joining shadow groups to undermine efforts on climate, Exxon stated that his comments were "entirely inconsistent" with your company's work. Mr. Woods, do you stand by that statement? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. Yes, I do.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Woods, is it your testimony that Exxon has not at any point funded any think tanks, advocacy organizations, or other shadow groups against climate change efforts? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. The position we take is transparent, and we publish the groups that we support on our website.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Well, whatever your statements are now, I think, you know, the truth is clear here that for years Exxon has funded dozens of these shadow groups, like the Heartland Institute, for example, a leading climate science denial group, which has stated that global warming is actually good for the planet. Mr. Woods, do you commit right here to stop funding organizations that reject the science of climate change? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. We do not support the Heartland Group, so.

Ms. PRESSLEY. "Yes" or "no," do you commit right here to not fund organizations that reject the science of climate change?

Mr. WOODS. We do not support climate denial. We do not ask people to lobby anything different than what our publicly supported positions or expressed positions are.

Ms. PRESSLEY. With millions of dollars that are going to lobbyist, super PACs, and shadow groups, these corporations refuse to invest in their own workers to ensure they have a future in a renewable energy economy. A just transition from pollution-based profits to healthy green living means that no worker will be left behind. Mr. Woods, what percentage of ExxonMobil's annual revenue is being used to train your workers for jobs in the renewable energy sectors? What percentage?

Mr. WOODS. We are focused on making sure that our work force is capable of operating our current operations, and we are investing time and resources——

Ms. PRESSLEY. I am sorry——

Mr. WOODS [continuing]. In developing new solutions.

Ms. PRESSLEY. I am going to reclaim my time since you weren't providing a percentage. So will you commit to providing this committee with the documentation to this answer?

Mr. WOODS. We will work with you to give you what you need.

Ms. PRESSLEY. All right. Mr. Wirth, what percentage of Chevron's annual revenue is being used to train your workers for jobs in renewable energy sectors?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I don't have a number on that. I can tell you we are committed to meeting the needs of the world today and the future in regard to our work force, and we are prepared to do that.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Sorry. I am going to run out of time. Will you commit to providing this committee with the documentation on this answer?

Mr. WIRTH. We will work with the committee to provide responses.

Ms. PRESSLEY. All right. Ms. Watkins, what percentage of Shell's annual revenue is being used to train your workers for jobs in renewable energy sectors?

Ms. WATKINS. Congresswoman, I don't have a number, but I will be happy to work with you to get one. What I can say is that what we are finding is that we have engineers that have built offshore oil and gas platforms in the Gulf.

Ms. PRESSLEY. I am sorry.

Ms. WATKINS. We are now able to——

Ms. PRESSLEY. I am going to run out of time but thank you for that commitment to work with the committee.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Lawler, what percentage of BP America's annual revenue is being used to train your workers for jobs in renewable energy sectors?

Mr. LAWLER. I will need to review what that number is, but what I can say is we are creating entire business units for the renewable sector. Entire business units, spending up to $5 billion a year by 2030.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Would you work with the committee to provide us with those actual percentages?

Mr. LAWLER. Yes, we will.

Ms. PRESSLEY. OK. So I think the point here is that putting profits before people like those in my district and the workers in their very own companies is the reason this crisis is so dire. One climate scientist said, "What we do in the next 10 years will matter for

10,000 years." I believe that what we do in the next 10 days on infrastructure investments will be the true predictor of our planet's future. The Build Back Better Act is a climate justice bill and a workers justice bill. We can and we must act with urgency.

Thank you and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Comer, is recognized.

Mr. COMER. Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Sommers, what do you predict the global demand for oil will be as the United States in the world recover from the coronavirus pandemic?

Mr. SOMMERS. Thank you, Congressman, for your question. What we are already starting to see, as I mentioned in a previous answer, is that world oil demand has already risen significantly. Prepandemic, so in 2019, the world was consuming 100 million barrels of oil every single day. During the worst part of the pandemic in April 2020, the world consumed about 81 million barrels of oil every single day. We are close now back to the 100 million barrels of oil use every single day, and as the economy continues to grow, we expect that to expand as well.

Mr. COMER. So if the industry does, as some of my Democratic colleagues have suggested and asked you to pledge to cut production, what would that do to the price of oil for everyday working Americans——

Mr. SOMMERS. Well, Congressman——

Mr. COMER [continuing]. If the demand is going up?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, we are already starting to see that, you know, because of worker shortages, because of concerns about future and current government regulations——

Mr. COMER. Because the Biden policies. Because of the Biden energy policy is why we are seeing energy prices go up, and what my colleagues on the left are proposing is only going to make it worse. Sir, despite some of the rhetoric from your critics, the oil and gas industry has taken meaningful steps to reduce emissions from operations. Can you describe briefly some of the efforts under way and some of the planned industry initiatives to address this challenge head on?

Mr. SOMMERS. Absolutely. Absolutely. Thank you, Congressman, for that question. The American Petroleum Institute since 2017 has had a program called the Environmental Partnership. This is a program that is all about how do you reduce methane emissions within our own operations. This program has seen tremendous success. It is a program that primarily works with our member companies and non-member API companies to replace products within the oil and gas industry that are leading to methane emissions. And as a consequence of this, we have big operators and small operators working together to ensure that our methane emissions continue to go down. In fact, as a consequence of this program and other programs like it, we have been able to reduce methane emissions by 70 percent in five of the largest oil and gas producing regions, like the Permian Basin.

Mr. COMER. Yes.

Mr. SOMMERS. We are proud of the work that we have done, and we know that we have to continue that work to respond to con-

sumers that want to make sure that their energy continues to come affordably, reliably, but also cleaner.

Mr. COMER. Absolutely, and that gets lost in translation. The industry has made significant investment already. You plan on making significant investment in the future. We are seeing a reduction in emissions, and I think that that has been lost in translation with the rhetoric on the other side. Now, briefly, I am going to shift gears. Mr. Crabtree, you are a member of the union, right?

Mr. CRABTREE. Yes, Congressman.

Mr. COMER. You know, a few years ago when I started out in the Kentucky State House of Representatives, the union was pretty Democrat, but I have seen in Kentucky, the union, especially United Mine Workers and so many other unions that have been just devastated and put out of work by Democrat policies, starting with the Obama Administration. And now we see your union put out of work because of the Keystone pipeline. I mean, what is the general thinking now with the policy from the Democrat Party with respect to energy production in the United States?

Mr. CRABTREE. Well, I mean, it has always been my opinion that I don't care if you are a Democrat or Republican or Independent. I am going to vote for who is going to put me to work, and right now the President has decided to put us out of work, so of course I am not going to support him. I wish that President Trump could have won reelection, though. That is an honest statement.

Mr. COMER. Well, I think a lot of people share your sentiment. My last question to you, sir. If the United States went totally green tomorrow, as some of my colleagues on the left dream about, and eliminated all oil and gas jobs, would Americans be able to power their homes or get their families to work or school?

Mr. CRABTREE. I think you know the answer to that question, Congressman.

Mr. COMER. I know it, but I don't think my friends on the left here know it.

Mr. CRABTREE. I mean, there are so many things that are made from petroleum products. I just can't conceive living in a world where we are going to be carbon neutral or free.

Mr. COMER. Thank you, sir. Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Missouri, Ms. Bush, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. BUSH. St. Louis and I thank you, Chairs Maloney and Khanna, for convening this timely hearing. Thanks in large part to those testifying today and the corporations they represent, St. Louis has 11 more 90-degree days per year than when I was born. Mr. Lawler, are the overwhelming majority of fossil fuel CEOs black or white?

Mr. LAWLER. I don't have the exact numbers, but I would assume they are white.

Ms. BUSH. Yes. Ms. Watkins, is an oil refinery more likely to be situated in a black community or white community?

Ms. WATKINS. I am not sure how to answer that honestly. We have got oil refineries along the U.S. Gulf Coast, and we are very proud to be community members there.

Ms. BUSH. It is black, yes. It is black. Mr. Wirth, are the impacts of climate change more likely to hit a black neighborhood or a white neighborhood first?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I have not seen studies that would allow me to give you a——

Ms. BUSH. The answer is black. The facts are clear. A 2017 NAACP and Clean Air Task Force report found that black Americans are 75 percent more likely to live next to company, industrial, and service facilities that directly harm us. For years, you all have continued to promote fossil fuels despite knowing that promoting them means promoting environmental racism and violence in black and brown communities. You all are still promoting and selling fossil fuels that are killing millions of people. This is a striking example of white supremacy. Your profit-driven choices threaten my life, the lives of my family, my neighbors, and our communities every single day. I sit before you as a black Congresswoman with asthma caused by fossil fuels and the tear gas you fund. I have a lot of questions, let me say.

Mr. Woods, as CEO, are you responsible for what Exxon does? "Yes" or "no." It is just a "yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. For what ExxonMobil does? Yes, I am.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you. Thank you for that answer. It is not a coincidence that toxic waste is frequently dumped in black communities like mine. When toxic waste combines with fossil fuels flooding, the impact is unspeakable. My old basement in St. Louis County in a predominantly black neighborhood used to regularly fill with potentially radioactive waste next to my son's bedroom due to floods made more frequent and intense by your production and burning of fossil fuels. Public school playgrounds in St. Louis regularly flood with the radioactive water. Mr. Woods, would you send your children to one of these schools? "Yes" or "no?"

Mr. WOODS. I am sorry. Could you repeat the question, please?

Ms. BUSH. Would you send your children to one of the schools with radioactive waste where we have this flooding——

Mr. WOODS. No.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you.

Mr. WOODS. I would not.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you. Thank you. And I don't want to either and neither does my community. It is not a coincidence that our communities are more likely to flood. You have known this flooding was coming for years. Ms. Watkins has, too. Ms. Watkins, in a 1988 Shell report, on page 26, it says, "Large low-lying areas, like Bangladesh, may need to be abandoned." Ms. Watkins, does that bother you that your company deemed a country of 98 million brown people expendable in exchange for soaring profits? "Yes" or "no?" It is just a "yes" or a "no."

Ms. WATKINS. Actually, Congresswoman, I am glad my company has been involved in the science research and involved in these discussions for decades, and we have been open and engaging with communities. And we are very active in the communities in which we operate and looking to make ourselves very much members of the community and invest in communities, especially where there is risk of climate change hitting harder than in other places.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you very much because it bothers me. Let me just say that. You didn't say it, but I will say it. It bothers me.

Ms. WATKINS. It bothers me, too.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you.

Ms. WATKINS. What bothers me is that——

Ms. BUSH. That the end of that question. I have to keep moving, but I have another question for you. Was Shell aware that black and indigenous communities in the U.S. will flood and burn first? "Yes" or "no," black and indigenous communities.

Ms. WATKINS. I am sorry, Congresswoman. I am not familiar with what you are referencing.

Ms. BUSH. Let me ask you this. Are black communities like mine in St. Louis expendable to you?

Ms. WATKINS. Of course not. Communities are not expendable. We work everyday hand in hand with our communities. And, in fact, climate change is such a pressing issue that, as companies, we have to work with the communities, and with societies, and with the government if we are going to be able to get to net zero by 2050.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you. You know, your companies for decades have been misrepresenting information and redirecting attention to solutions you know to be false, and that is continuing even in this hearing, but I thank you for speaking up and saying what you said. We appreciate that, but we are at a tipping point. Developing fossil fuels now given the escalation of the climate crisis and its harm on black and brown communities is unconscionable. Given each of your roles in these attacks on our humanity, you all should resign.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from California, the vice chair, Gomez, is recognized for five minutes. And after his questioning, there will be a five-minute quick break at the request of the witnesses. Mr. Gomez.

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to just continue a little bit on Ms. Bush's line of questioning. I was in the California State Legislature for about 4.5 years, and during that time we were able to pass reduction of greenhouse gas reduction goals. We were able to pass cap-and-trade and we were able to pass a lot of the bills that oil opposed, and you opposed it every step of the way. You believed that you were going to upend and get us to stop, and we were able to win those fights, and I get it. You guys have your own business model. That is what you are protecting. But we are fighting across the board for communities in California but also in the country, especially when the fact is the climate crisis disproportionately impacts communities of color. Those are the ones that are most likely to not get the jobs in the oil fields or most likely the ones not to see the direct benefits but also get the dirtier air, the dirtier water. They are ones that are always in the path of the destruction from the oil industry.

So one of the things I want to really kind of focus in is, like I said, Cory Bush' questioning. Let's start with Mr. Wirth. Do you agree the impacts of climate change are worse for vulnerable communities or communities of color and low-income communities?

Mr. WIRTH. Well, Congressman, this is a very important issue I think for society, so I appreciate you——

Mr. GOMEZ. Just a "yes" or "no." I mean, do you agree that climate change is worse for low-income and communities of color?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, there are many different studies, opinions, and assertions on where and how climate change will manifest itself.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Wirth, I mean, listen, I know people that work for you and I respect them very well. Just simple. This was a fight that we fought in California. "Yes" or "no." If you can't answer that, then there is really no reason to ask you the other questions. Do you believe climate change is worse for communities of color and low-income communities? "Yes" or "no?"

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, I don't have the ability to answer that. I think the manifestation of climate change——

Mr. GOMEZ. So I will take that as you are a "no." OK. Mr. Wirth, Chevron's business code of conduct includes the following principle: "protect people and the environment." So when Chevron states that the company has an ethical obligation to protect communities, does that include communities of color? "Yes or "no."

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, absolutely. Chevron strives to be a force for good in the communities in which we operate, and we are committed to continually improving our environmental and social performance, especially in communities that are vulnerable.

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you, Mr. Wirth. Thank you. I am glad that you see that. Low-income communities and communities of color are on the front lines of coping with climate change and the legacy of fossil fuels. Mr. Wirth, do you believe Chevron has a moral obligation to prevent the negative health conditions and impacts and death caused by your products and the use of your products?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, I think we have an obligation for doing our part to respond to this great challenge that we have spent all day talking about.

Mr. GOMEZ. Could you answer yes" or "no" on my question?

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. The future. I am sorry?

Mr. GOMEZ. "Yes" or "no." Just "yes" or "no," do you see that also you have a moral obligation to prevent the negative health conditions and impacts caused on people by the use of your products?

Mr. WIRTH. Congressman, we have an obligation to support people in their livelihoods with affordable, reliable energy with good jobs, and doing our part——

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. To reduce the carbon intensity of the energy system——

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you, Mr. Wirth. Ms. Watkins, I want to kind of go over to you. Shell has said that they have a goal of offsetting 120 million tons of CO2 by 2030. Is that correct?

Ms. WATKINS. We have a goal that we just announced today of reducing our Scope 1 and 2 emissions that we control by 2030.

Mr. GOMEZ. OK. If Shell is committed to reducing its environmental impact, then why do you plan to appeal a recent court ruling in the Netherlands mandating Shell to reduce its emissions by 45 percent by 2030?

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, we are appealing that court ruling because we feel that that is not something that should be decided in the courts and we are actively looking at accelerating. We are accelerating our powering progress strategy as evidenced by the new target that we put out today, and we look forward to continuing to work with governments, like yourself, with society in order to accelerate the demand for cleaner——

Mr. GOMEZ. Let me redirect the question. You mentioned Scope 1 and 2, but you leave out Scope 3, and Scope 3 emissions are 90 percent of your emissions. So how do you plan on reducing it by 120 tons by 2030 if you are not targeting 90 percent of your emissions?

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired, but the gentlelady may answer his question.

Ms. WATKINS. Yes. So our Scope 1 and 2 emissions by half by 2030. I don't know the exact tonnage of that. That number is not familiar to me. But what I can say around Scope 3, and you are right, the vast majority of the emissions are created from the use of the products that we sell. We will be net zero including Scope 3 by 2050 in step with society. That is our target for 2050. It includes Scope 3.

Mr. GOMEZ. OK. Your press release says——

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. And I now am calling for a quick five-minute recess. It is a request from the witnesses.

We stand in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairwoman MALONEY. The meeting will come to order.

Without objection, Mr. Casten is authorized to participate in today's hearing.

Mr. Casten, you are recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CASTEN. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to our witnesses. I know it has been a long day. I want to just start by saying as a chemical engineer by training who spent a while as an engineer and then running some energy companies, I love chemical engineering. It is a lot of fun. I am sure you have a lot of fun with it. I always thought it was cool that you can look at the temperature and heat exchanger on one side and predict with amazing accuracy how the yield is going to change other side of your refinery, or a slight change in inputs changes the temperature. And I think it is no surprise that, you know, it is organizations like yours who employ a lot of smart people like that.

You are actually pretty good at understanding how changes in chemistry affect temperature. And, in fact, James Black back in 1978, as you, of course, know, did this presentation to Exxon where he predicted that we would have a doubling in CO2 based on current growth rates around 2025, and that would lead to a 1 to 3 degree increase in temperature, which is basically exactly where we are. So, Mr. Woods, kudos. You hire exceptionally talented people. You have trained them. That is one of the talents of a CEO. I commend you. We know that in the light of that information you denied.

You founded the Global Climate Coalition. You funded Willie Soon's research that was contrary on climate science, and I don't want to go into that. You have had those conversations already. But I do want to talk about something that is in the news this week, which is that we have got all this information coming up that Facebook is phenomenally good at sowing disinformation. Not only can they not stop it, but they are actually really good at inflaming it. They can convince people that vaccines are bad. They can convince people to take horse medicine. They can even convince people that it is patriotic to attack the United States Capitol. Good people.

So in light of that, in light of this amazing tool to spread disinformation, in light of the fact that you guys have actively worked to spread that disinformation, it is intriguing to me that in 2021, according to InfluenceMap, Exxon has spent $4 million on Facebook ads. Seventy-five percent of that money has been since June, and, in fact, your digital advertising spend was running $50,000 a week in March and got up to $600,000 a week in October. Mr. Woods, do you dispute those numbers about your advertising spend?

Mr. WOODS. I don't have those numbers available to me.

Mr. CASTEN. Sound about right, though?

Mr. WOODS. I don't have a good view of those numbers today.

Mr. CASTEN. Could you speculate on what might have been going on in the last month that would cause you to rapidly increase your spending on a platform that is designed to amplify disinformation?

Mr. WOODS. Well, Congressman, I would first make the point that I think differences of opinion are not disinformation. We have——

Mr. CASTEN. Respectfully, sir, the laws of thermodynamics are not negotiable. We are not going there. I just want to know, do you know why you were amping up your spending on Facebook in the last few weeks by a factor of 12?

Mr. WOODS. I don't know what our spending in Facebook is, so it is hard for me to comment on what has changed.

Mr. CASTEN. OK. Well, there is this Build Back Better Act going on it seems to be getting a lot of attention. It certainly seems dispositive. Mr. Sommers, that same analysis analyzed a little over 25,000 ads from the fossil fuel industry. They found that 20 percent of those were from American Petroleum Institute that were promoting natural gas as a climate solution. Now, again, I go back to my friends in the chemical engineering sector. Methane is about 84 times as potent a greenhouse gas chemical as carbon dioxide. When it is initially released, it lasts a little over a decade in the atmosphere and then breaks down. Over 100 years, it is about 30 times as impactful. Over 20 years, which is kind of the time we have to get the zero, 84, which means there is somewhere between a 1 to 3 percent leakage rate in the system, and methane is actually worse than coal. And you all are out there promoting this as a part of the climate solution. Let's call it two percent just to be even.

Mr. Sommers, do you dispute that methane is an 80 times more potent greenhouse gas than CO2?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, thank you for your question. Natural gas has led to——

Mr. CASTEN. Sir, I am just asking for a "yes" or "no." Do you dispute that it is 84 times as potent?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, this industry has done everything that we can do to limit methane emissions over time.

Mr. CASTEN. I will get to the leaks. Do you dispute the science is my only question?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, we trust the climate science.

Mr. CASTEN. OK. Good. Do you believe that the natural gas system today has less than two percent leaks from wellhead to burner tip?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, we don't dispute the science in this space. We are looking——

Mr. CASTEN. How about the leakage rates? I get that we don't want to have leaks, but is it your position that there is less than two percent leaks from wellhead to burner tip?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congressman, we have programs at the American Petroleum Institute to work to limit methane emissions.

Mr. CASTEN. OK. But you are ducking the question, sir. If you don't have that, you have got to ask why you are calling something a climate solution that, as we sit today, is warming up the planet. I will leave you both with an observation. A former board member of mine, who is an idol of mine, used to tell us when we got in board disputes that the only thing that matters in this life is whether our grandchildren are proud of us. The West is on fire. Floods are coming. Ice is melting because of analysis you had in 1978. My question for all of you, which you can submit for the record, is, are your grandchildren proud of you?

I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

Without objection, Mr. Jones is authorized to participate in today's hearing.

Mr. Jones, you are recognized for five minutes.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, if you listen to our witnesses today or read their companies' climate plans, you might conclude that carbon capture is nothing short of a miracle, a technology solution so impactful that it will save us from the catastrophic effects of climate change. Exxon, for example, is promoting a proposed carbon capture and storage hub in Texas designed to capture emissions from industrial facilities and power plants, a way, at least according to Exxon's own ads and marketing materials, to have the best of both worlds: continue to burn fossil fuels with reckless abandon but pay none of the climate price.

Mr. Woods, at an investor meeting earlier this year, you were quoted as saying, "Carbon capture and storage is going to be needed to reduce emissions," and your written testimony reflects that sentiment as well. Today there are 13 active commercial carbon capture and storage sites in the U.S., according to the Global CCS Institute's 2020 report. One of those sites belongs to Exxon, correct? A simple yes" or "no" will do.

Mr. WOODS. I am not familiar with that report, but we do have a facility in the U.S., yes.

Mr. JONES. In Shute Creek, Ohio.

Mr. WOODS. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Twelve of those sites, including the one Exxon owns, the captured carbon is used for what is called enhanced oil recovery, a method to combat hard-to-reach oil by injecting pressurized CO2. Is that correct? Again, a simple "yes" or "no" will do, sir.

Mr. WOODS. Yes.

Mr. JONES. In fact, 95 percent of the carbon being captured at these U.S. sites is used for extracting more oil. To be clear, Exxon and others are using captured CO2 to extract more oil and calling this a climate mitigation strategy. Mr. Woods, "yes" or "no," when Exxon promotes carbon capture as a climate solution, does this include carbon capture used for enhanced oil recovery?

Mr. WOODS. Congressman, I would say that you are confusing the technology with its uses. Carbon captures is a proven technology to concentrate CO2, and then the question is what you do with that concentration. We can store it. Our Houston hub is used to capture that CO2 and then store it in aquifers offshore. It would not be used for enhanced oil recovery. So there is a difference between the technology and then what you use the technology for.

Mr. JONES. So, Mr. Woods, I am sorry, I do have other questions. I just want to get a "yes" or "no" answer. When Exxon promotes carbon capture as a climate solution, does this include carbon capture that is used for enhanced oil recovery? "Yes" or "no."

Mr. WOODS. Our focus has been to capture CO2 and sequester it, not for EOR.

Mr. JONES. OK. So even though the overwhelming majority of existing carbon capture technology deployed is ultimately used to extract even more fossil fuel, Exxon plans to increase investment in carbon capture as a way to "be consistent with the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement." But the truth is carbon capture might help the fossil fuel companies extract more oil, but it won't do anything to prevent us all from paying the catastrophic costs of the climate crisis. To make enhanced oil recovery work from a climate perspective, Exxon, and to be fair, the rest of the fossil fuel industry as well, would need to capture and store and ever-increasing amount of carbon for which there is neither the technological capacity or infrastructure at scale to meet our 2030 or even 2050 obligations in the Paris Climate Agreement. The U.S., as you know, is committed to reaching net zero emissions by 2050, but Exxon's carbon capture facility has only been able to capture and bury less than 20 percent of the carbon produced by the single plant on which it operates.

Mr. Woods, how do you expect to capture enough of Exxon's future emissions from extraction transportation and other company operations to remain consistent with the country's net zero obligation?

Mr. WOODS. Congressman, that is the big challenge we all face, moving from one energy source to another. And it has been widely recognized in order for society to be successful, by the IPCC and the IEA, that carbon capture will play an important role in that. And the policy to support implementation of carbon capture will be important to achieve society's objectives. So no matter what solution we go to, there is going to be extensive need for additional investment in infrastructure as well as the technology to replace today's energy system. So it is not a question of spending more

money. It is where you spend that money. And I would make the point that a number of solutions are required and a number of large investments in those solutions are required across our economy and across the world as a whole.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Woods. I understand that to mean that you don't know yet how you can capture enough future emissions from extraction transportation and other company operations to remain consistent with our country's net zero obligation.

And with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

Without objection, Mr. Levin is authorized to participate in today's hearing.

Mr. Levin, you are now recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you so much, Madam Chairwoman, and thanks to all the witnesses. I want to shift our focus to the oil refinery workers your companies employ. Mr. Woods, I am going to ask you a few "yes" or "no" questions and then get into the issue in more detail. Does ExxonMobil educate workers on possible job loss from climate change, and have you advised workers that you believe addressing the climate crisis may cause some of them to lose their job?

Mr. WOODS. What we have talked about with our organization is the opportunity to address the risk of climate change through investments in technologies——

Mr. LEVIN. Right, but I am asking about people's jobs, sir.

Mr. WOODS. Yes, and I will get to that. So——

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I don't have a lot of time. So do you talk to them about that they may lose their jobs? "Yes or "no." Their current jobs.

Mr. WOODS. We believe that the transition will involve capabilities and skill sets that are consistent with our existing businesses, so there is an opportunity to evolve those jobs in two different applications, like carbon capture, like biofuel.

Mr. LEVIN. Got it. So do you have specific programs in place to retain and protect the workers that you currently employ? Is that when you are kind of saying?

Mr. WOODS. No. What I am saying is as the world transitions and has the solutions that are going to be required, like hydrogen and biofuel and carbon captures, those investments will require workers to operate those facilities. And the skills of those workers are very——

Mr. LEVIN. OK. I understand, sir. So would you say that, from your perspective, the company considers the well-being of your workers when you are making new business decisions?

Mr. WOODS. We believe that——

Mr. LEVIN. It is a simple question, sir.

Mr. WOODS [continuing]. Our workers are fundamental to the value proposition of our company, so they are very important to the equation.

Mr. LEVIN. OK. Well, I really have to question a lot of what you consider, how much you really consider them when you are making these decisions given reports coming out of the Beaumont Refinery. Can you confirm that on May 1, your company escorted 650 oil refiners in Beaumont, Texas, in the refinery there, off the job, replac-

ing experienced members of United Steel Workers Local 13243 with temporary workers in an effort to force a vote on your latest contract proposal?

Mr. WOODS. At Beaumont, we have had contract negotiations ongoing for quite some time. We failed——

Mr. LEVIN. Did you lock the workers out, sir, and replace them with temporary workers?

Mr. WOODS. We failed to reach an agreement, and as part of that process and a strike notice, we had a lockout. That is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, Madam Chairwoman, ExxonMobil states in its guiding principles for employees, "We are committed to maintaining a safe work environment enriched by diversity and characterized by open communication, trust, and fair treatment." I fail to see how that is true based on today's hearing. ExxonMobil and other fossil fuel companies have sold this untrue narrative that they are acting out of concern for their workers while simultaneously undermining them as in the case with the lockout in Beaumont, Texas.

We have evidence that their workers aren't their primary concern in their business decisions regarding climate change. As many have referenced earlier, former ExxonMobil senior adviser, Keith McCoy, was caught on camera defending ExxonMobil's early efforts to fight against climate science, stating that, "There is s nothing illegal about doing that, and we are just looking out for our investments. We are looking out for our shareholders." He didn't mention the workers. And now when these companies can no longer hide from their climate denialism and disinformation, they work behind the scenes to shift climate liability away from profit margins and onto the backs of their workers by refusing to give them a seat at the table or to be clear about the long-term impacts that climate change has on their livelihoods.

I am tired of oil industry-backed groups opposing efforts to address climate change in the name of protecting good jobs and workers. Let us remember it was not the CEOs and big bosses of these companies that made oil refinery jobs good jobs. It was unions and workers who fought for decades and are still fighting for these benefits. We can save life on earth as we know it and support our workers to have good jobs. I implore all the witnesses testifying today to give oil refinery workers a seat at the table, and I remain steadfast in my commitment to ensuring that workers are held harmless and supported in this transition while corporate polluters pay for the climate disinformation they have peddled for decades.

With that, Madam Chairwoman, with 10 seconds to spare, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

Without objection, Ms. Omar is authorized to participate in today's hearing.

Ms. Omar, you recognized for five minutes.

Ms. OMAR. Thank you so much, Madam Chair. I am glad to join this discussion. I know there has been a lot of conversations around the coordinated efforts that the fossil fuel companies have put together to create and spread disinformation about climate change.

As we heard earlier, in 1998, the American Petroleum Institute, or API, assembled a global climate science communication team comprised of fossil fuel companies and front groups working to co-

ordinate a misinformation campaign surrounding climate change. Mr. Wright, the Action Plan says Sharon Kneiss of Chevron was a member of the Global Climate Science Communication Team, correct?

Mr. WIRTH. Congresswoman, I appreciate the question. I am——

Ms. OMAR. It is just "yes" or "no," sir.

Mr. WIRTH. I am not familiar with the instance you are referring to, so I don't have any knowledge of that.

Ms. OMAR. All right. Mr. Woods, the Action Plan also says Randy Randol of Exxon was a member of the team. Do you agree?

Mr. WOODS. I don't know about that. That was several decades ago and——

Ms. OMAR. OK. So on page two of the April 3, 1998, Action Plan, it says that these employees were listed as members who contributed to the development of the plan. In 1998, the Global Climate Science Communication Team produced an action plan outlining a strategy to conduct a coordinated misinformation campaign on climate change. Mr. Woods, an Exxon employee was involved in developing this action plan, right?

Mr. WOODS. As I said, I am not familiar with that activity. That was 20 years ago, and so I can't——

Ms. OMAR. OK. And, Mr. Wright, is that the same for you? Do you know that these employees were involved in creating this action plan?

Mr. WIRTH. I don't have information about the instance that you are making reference to, Congresswoman.

Ms. OMAR. OK. Again, on page two of that Action Plan lists these employees. The plan explained that, "Victory" would be achieved when "average citizens understand uncertainties in climate science" and recognition of that uncertainty "becomes part of the conventional wisdom." We have heard today that Exxon executives were warned about the reality of the climate change as early as the 1970's. As we know, API shared information within the industry about the dangers of climate change. Yet both of your organizations contributed to a plan to inject an uncertainty into the climate debate. Mr. Sommers, "yes" or "no," did the Global Climate Science Communication Team achieve victory as it was laid out in that Action Plan?

Mr. SOMMERS. Congresswoman, I am not familiar with what you are referring to. In 1998, I was 23 years old. I came to API in 2018 and focused on the climate change.

Ms. OMAR. I study the history of the institution I participate in. I am sure you do as well. But it seems very clear that they did. The fossil fuel industry worked collectively to prevent action on climate change. They coordinated their campaigns with groups like the Global Climate Science Communication Team. Their efforts at disinformation were conscious and deliberate. Over the past three decades, the fossil fuel industry has continued their efforts by making $780 million in political donations with 80 percent of those donations going to Republicans. In 2020 alone, the industry made $139 million in donations to candidates and committees, of which 84 percent went to Republicans and mostly climate deniers. It is yet another reason we need to get the fossil fuel money out of our politics.

Fossil fuel companies have polluted our air, land, and water for profit despite knowing the devastating impact it has on our companies. It seems like you all have achieved that victory of leading the public with disinformation. And as one of my colleagues said earlier, I hope that you are ashamed of the future that you contributed to for your children and for ours. And I ask all of you to resign.

With that, I yield back, Madam Chairwoman.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady yields back.

I am prepared to close now. All of our witnesses have had their time to ask their questions and the witnesses have responded, and I thank them for their time and their testimoneys. But before we close, I want to offer the ranking member an opportunity to offer any closing remarks he may have.

Mr. COMER. Well, thank you, Madam Chair, and I honestly sincerely think this was one of the better hearings that we have had today. The one thing that I think most Americans who watch this hearing would take from it is that the Biden energy policies have already had a dramatic impact on the inflationary prices that we have seen of gas and what we are going to see this winter with natural gas. So I think that was an important thing for the American people to see. This was a timely hearing because gas prices have risen 27 days in a row. Twenty-seven days in a row with no end in sight.

You know, we have had a lot of interesting antics from my friends on the other side of the aisle. We have had a request to make a pledge to, of all things, cut production. When we are seeing gas prices soaring right now, the last thing in the world we need to do is cut production. We have seen them make try to get the CEOs to make a pledge to cut production at the same time Joe Biden is pleading with OPEC to increase production. It makes no sense. And we have had questions about how much lobbying the energy industry spent to lobby on behalf of the Paris Climate Accord. Of course they spent little to none on lobbying for that. The only countries that would have spent money lobbying for the Paris Climate Accords would have been energy companies in China or Ukraine. Perhaps when we become the majority and we subpoena Hunter Biden, we can ask Hunter Biden about that question.

And then, you know, as our colleague, Representative Omar, just said, attacking the oil and gas industry for donating 80 percent of their contributions to Republicans. The first thing that crossed my mind, Madam Chair, is I guess they feel like fools for donating 20 percent to the Democrats. I mean, this is crazy this policy that is only going to make energy prices higher, only going to make us more dependent on foreign countries for our energy and is going to do nothing to reduce carbon emissions. And finally, we have seen stunts like with Katie Porter. You know, it looked like she was in California. Madam Chair, I hope she doesn't get fined by Gavin Newsom for polluting or whatever she was doing there in the back of her car in California.

But, you know, the most predictable thing that we have seen today is the trend with the Democrats attacking private sector companies for making a profit. And what always confuses me is why my friends on the left continue to attack companies for making a profit while at the same time wanting to increase the corporate

tax. If corporations don't make a profit, it doesn't matter what the corporate tax rate is. So I think there are a lot of differing opinions that the American people have seen today from this hearing.

I want to thank our witnesses who came here today. I want to thank you for the investment that you have made in creating good-paying jobs and doing your best to see that we are less dependent on foreign oil. I want to also thank you for your investments to reduce carbon emissions. The climate is very important to Republicans as well. We just want to work with the private sector to reduce our carbon footprint while at the same time reducing our dependence on foreign countries for energy, and, at the same time, create and maintain good-paying jobs. So that is a hallmark of the Republican policy. We care about the climate, but we also want to work with the private sector to reduce carbon emissions and continue to create good-paying jobs.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman yields back.

I want to thank all of the witnesses for appearing today and thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their participation in this important hearing.

I have been listening carefully to today's testimony. As I said earlier, I had hoped today would be a turning point for the oil industry. I was grateful to hear the top fossil fuel CEOs finally admit that climate change is real, that burning fossil fuels is causing it, and that we must act urgently to fix it. But I was disappointed that we also heard much of the same denial and deflection we have heard before. Today's witnesses refused to take responsibility for Big Oil's decades-long disinformation campaign. And even after agreeing that we are, in fact, in "Code Red" crisis, they refuse to stop funding groups like the American Petroleum Institute that are still blocking reforms, like expanding the use of electric vehicles. So I see no choice but to continue our committee's investigation until we see the truth.

We requested documents from each of these companies six weeks ago which were due on September 30. We followed up before the due date to identify categories of documents that were of particular importance to be produced quickly. After they missed the deadline, we sent warning letters to all six companies urging them to complete their productions by October 25 or face further action. Unfortunately, none of the six entities have produced a substantial portion of the key documents the committee requested. Instead they produced reams of other documents, many of which were publicly available. One entity sent in 1,500 pages printed from their own website, available publicly, along with 4,000 pages of newsletters filled with industry press releases. Others sent us thousands of pages of publicly available annual reports and the company's postings on Facebook and LinkedIn.

Now, let me tell you what the fossil fuel companies have not produced. These organizations have not produced the detailed funding information that we requested and that we need to understand their payments to shadow groups and to 150 public relations companies, and advertisements on social media payments, payments that today's witnesses seem intent on continuing. Nearly all the companies have failed to turn over board materials the committee

needs to examine corporate strategies on climate change. And with only a few limited exceptions, the fossil fuel companies have not produced any internal documents or internal communications from senior executives about their company's role in climate change. I have tried very hard to obtain this information voluntarily, but the oil companies employed the same tactics they use for decades on climate policy: delay and obstruction. Well, that ends today.

I am formally notifying the ranking member and members of the committee that I intend to issue subpoenas to the fossil fuel entities represented here today. I have draft subpoenas here. Please know that I do not take this step lightly. When Republican Dan Burton was chairman of this committee, he issued more than 1,000 subpoenas without a single complaint from my Republican colleagues. I have been much more selective, but we are at Code Red for climate, and I am committed to doing everything I can to help rescue this planet and save it for our children. We need to get to the bottom of the oil industry's disinformation campaign, and with these subpoenas we will.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, point of order. Point of order.

Chairwoman MALONEY. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. COMER. I just want to publicly say I object to the issuance of subpoenas. The oil and gas executives here today have provided over 100,000 pages of documents, and we feel like that is an infringement upon their First Amendment rights.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, they produced documents, but they were not the documents that we requested. Most of it was like this, completely publicly available on their website, their annual reports. And as you know, Chairman Khanna and I wrote you a letter yesterday highlighting our serious concerns that the fossil fuel organizations were not fully compliant with our request and were obstructing and delaying our investigation. I also noted that we gave these organizations multiple opportunities to produce them voluntarily. We requested it in writing and phone calls and reaching out to their offices. In fact, Chairman Rho Khanna and I wrote to them just last week and warned them if they did not comply voluntarily, that the committee would be forced to consider additional steps to obtain compliance.

So we have been true to our word, and we spent a great deal of time trying to obtain these documents. We were not able to obtain them. They are important. We are now requesting them with a subpoena. I have draft subpoenas here. I am willing to share them if you would like them.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, we strongly reiterate the fact that we feel this is an infringement upon their First Amendment rights. This is the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We are supposed to focus on waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal bureaucracy.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Great. The meeting is adjourned.

Before we close, in closing, I want to thank our panelists once again for their remarks, and I want to commend my colleagues for participating in this very important conversation.

With that and without objection, all members will have five legislative days within which to submit extraneous materials and to submit additional written questions for the witnesses to the chair,

which will be forwarded to the witnesses for their response. I ask our witnesses to please respond as promptly as you can. And with that, this meeting is adjourned.

Chairwoman Maloney. And with that, this meeting is adjourned.

○