



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2024

No. 113

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FONG).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 9, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VINCE FONG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING MY HUSBAND, JOSEPH LESKO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my husband, Joseph Lesko. He is here in the House gallery today, right there.

I am totally convinced that God brought Joe and I together. We met in July in Phoenix at a snow skiing club, believe it or not. For both of us, it was our first time attending the meeting. That had to be fate.

I knew as soon as I saw him that I had to talk to that man, and I made a

beeline over to talk to him. We have now been married for over 30 years.

This will be my last year in Congress. I have decided it is time for me to go home and join my husband, Joe, our children, and our grandchildren. My mother, my sister, my brother, and my entire family lives within 20 minutes of my home, and I am here in Washington, D.C., most of the time, so it is time for me to go home.

I thank my husband, Joe, for being a wonderful husband, a wonderful father, and a wonderful grandfather. He has been there for me and our children through the ups and downs. He has supported me when my opponents vilified me in TV commercials. It hurt him probably more than me.

He has stood by me when I had to be here in Washington, D.C., working. He was at home, and it is hard. It is hard on a family. It is hard on a husband.

I thank Joe for always being there for me. I thank him for being a great husband and father and for being a great man. I love you.

HONORING MY MOTHER, DELORES LORENZ

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my mother, Delores Lorenz.

My mom will be 95 years old this year, and she is still going strong. She lives on her own. She cuts her own grass. I hope I can be like her.

My mom has always been there for me. She stayed home and raised us kids. She worked hard. Believe me, being a mom is hard work. She got up early in the morning because my dad had to go to work very early in the morning, and she would make sure that she would make him breakfast every morning.

She washed our clothes, cleaned up everything, and made our dinners. She was famous for baking pies, although she said she is now retired from baking pies, which makes me sad.

She helped all of us kids with our homework, and when I ran for Con-

gress, my mother stood in the heat in front of the Ace Hardware store outside of Phoenix, Arizona, and walked her whole neighborhood to collect signatures to get me on the ballot.

I love my mom. She made me who I am. I thank my mom for always being there for me. I thank her for everything she does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to refer to persons in the gallery.

RECOGNIZING PARK AND RECREATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize July as Park and Recreation Month.

It is a fitting month to celebrate, as many Americans visit our Federal, State, and local public parks and recreation systems this summer.

As a lifelong resident of rural Pennsylvania, an avid outdoorsman, and a former recreational therapist, I strongly support our Nation's parks and recreation facilities. Our parks provide countless recreational and educational opportunities for individuals and families to enjoy the outdoors.

This month recognizes the important role these parks and public facilities play in the lives of Americans and the contributions of employees who work every day to maintain public parks across the Nation.

Our parks create opportunities for people to come together and experience a sense of community. They contribute to local economies by attracting businesses, jobs, and increasing housing values. Ninety percent of people in the United States agree that public park recreation facilities and activities are important government services. This support spans across all people in the

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

country regardless of race, income, or political affiliation.

Nearly 75 percent of Americans agree it is important to ensure all members of their community have equitable access to public parks and recreation facilities. In the United States, local public park and recreation agencies generated nearly \$201 billion in economic activity and supported almost 1.1 million jobs.

The most economically sound areas are those with ample public park and recreation facilities and activities. A key factor in business expansion and location decisions is the quality of life for employees, with a premium placed on adequate and accessible public parks and open space.

Mr. Speaker, public parks and recreational facilities foster a variety of activities that contribute to a healthier society. Americans living within a 10-minute walk of a park have higher levels of physical activity and lower rates of obesity. People who use public parks and open spaces are three times more likely to achieve the recommended levels of physical activity than nonusers.

Recreation programs at public parks provide children with a safe place to play, access to healthy foods, opportunities to be physically active, and enrichment facilities that help prevent at-risk behavior such as drug use and gang involvement.

Over the summer, many Americans will visit public parks and recreation facilities to spend time outdoors with family, friends, and neighbors. We are blessed with beautiful outdoor facilities. It is my hope that all Americans get out and enjoy the parks in their areas.

HONORING JUDGE JERRY RELLIHAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and service of Judge Jerry Rellihan, who passed away last month from a heart attack.

Jerry's career in law began as a prosecutor in Kansas City, Missouri. He later founded The Law Firm of Jerry Rellihan, P.C., serving the Kansas City metro area for many years. In 2015, he was elected as associate circuit judge for St. Clair County, based in Osceola, Missouri, in the Fourth Congressional District, where he served with fairness, compassion, and integrity.

Judge Rellihan's contributions to our community extended far beyond the courtroom, though. He was a mentor, leader, and friend to many. His wisdom and kindness touched the lives of countless individuals, and his legacy will continue to inspire us all.

Today, we remember Judge Rellihan not only for his professional accomplishments but also for his humanity and the positive impact he had on everyone he met.

Our sincere condolences to his family, friends, and all who mourn this great loss.

CELEBRATING CARLA AND BEN FORD'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 60 years of marriage between Carla and Ben Ford. Carla and Ben are Missouri District Four constituents living in Johnson County who met on a blind date at the stockyards.

They are not only strong in their marriage but also in the family they have created and in upholding their American values. Their 60 years together have brought many things to be thankful for, the most important being their two children, three grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

What started out as a blind date turned into six decades of love and the beginnings of future family lines. They say that trust, communication, and laughter have kept them together all these years.

I congratulate this Missouri District Four couple on the lovely marriage they have had and built. We wish Ben and Carla many, many more happy years.

CONGRATULATING MEGAN WALKER AND ALY PRENTZLER

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have started a contest much like the art contest where you can see the art displayed in the gallery just down the hallway here, but we started a speech contest. We wanted to rebuild patriotism in America, and we are starting with school-age children in the Fourth Congressional District. The topic: What does America mean to you?

We have two more winners today, Mr. Speaker, of this contest.

I begin with Megan Walker from Buffalo High School, Buffalo, Missouri, Dallas County. She says: "America to me is a place where I can choose who I want to be and am given the opportunities and resources to do it. America is my home, where I can feel safe expressing who I am no matter what I believe. I am given every chance possible to achieve my goals and build relationships with people that I choose. Americans are encouraged to be creative individuals by our country's leaders. I am able to feel safe and protected by my country and the people in it. We are allowed freedoms that many others are not, and I will forever be grateful for America."

Our next speech contest winner is Aly Prentzler from Glasgow High School in Glasgow, Missouri, Howard County. "America to me means freedom, freedom that has been fought for by brave men and women who serve in the military. It means even more to me since I have family members who have been part of the military. My papa served in the Army to make sure I have the right to make my own choices. My oldest brother is currently serving to make sure I continue to have this right. I am proud of this freedom and those who have fought for this right."

Mr. Speaker, I thank these students for being a shining example and a light in the classroom, sharing what America means to them.

PROTECTING OUR RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize how important the situation is in California right now across the board with our resources: our water supply, our timber, our mining, and our agriculture.

Right now, of course, you are probably reading a lot of headlines about the fire situation, how much of our forests and open lands are in big trouble, and you are going to hear that side of the aisle talking all day long about climate change.

I throw back at them, if the climate is changing, what are we actually doing as people on the ground about it besides figuring out who we are going to tax or whose car we are going to take away or whose gas stove we are going to take away?

What are we doing, practically, about making our forests more fireproof or firesafe?

What are we doing about our water supply to make sure that there is more water stored so that people, agriculture, and, yes, even the environment can use it?

What are we doing to ensure we have a stronger electrical grid?

What is it we have happening? We see they want to tear out part of the electrical grid in the form of hydroelectric dams in northern California as well as up in Oregon and Washington, et cetera. It is just one after another.

Hydroelectric dams provide CO₂-free electricity, if you want to worry about the CO₂. Now, CO₂ only makes up 0.04 percent of our atmosphere, but they are using it as a weapon in order to force us to change our lifestyles.

□ 1015

Let's store more water so we have it for agriculture, so we have it for hydroelectric power, and so we have it for all manner of things that we need water for, for human use and environmental use. Let's move the ball on that.

In my own district, we have a project called the Sites Reservoir that has been talked about for 50 years. It seems to be coming close to fruition of actually getting started to be built, but there are still roadblocks that could be thrown up. There could still be weaponized lawsuits to try and stop the building of the Sites Reservoir, which would be 1½ million acre-feet of storage for California, as well as its positive flood control benefits when you are pulling the water out of a flooded river system into that reservoir. Why can't we think ahead a little more about these issues with our infrastructure?

Agriculture in California is one of the most important components of our food supply for this whole country that you can imagine. We have so much that we grow in California, from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley, that many of those crops, 90 to 99 percent of them, are grown in California.

If we don't grow it there, we are going to have to import it, or we have to do without. If we have to import it, it means it is going to be a higher cost, it is going to be lesser quality, or it will not be a reliable, constant source if they want to play trade games against us with it as well.

Why don't we produce it in California? We have the water supply. Hundreds of thousands, millions of acre-feet, even, escape to the sea each year because we are not storing it. We are not trapping it. We are not putting it into groundwater recharge, which would be extremely helpful for the San Joaquin Valley, especially where the ground has actually subsided. It is sinking somewhat.

We pull a lot of water out of the ground in order to do agricultural activity, but that said, agriculture also means groundwater recharge. If we are flooding those fields and irrigating those fields, it percolates back down in there.

Instead, they take more water away from the farmers, and they want to replace it with what they call solar farms, which is an insult. Why would you call that a farm?

Indeed, we are finding more and more that these massive solar arrays, as well as windmills, can actually change the climate in the area where they are. Think of the concentration. Think of the heat sink. We see that in urban areas, the urban heat sinks from so much pavement, so much concrete, and so many buildings. It raises the temperature.

If you want to talk about temperature once again, what are you going to do to the San Joaquin Valley where the idea is to take more and more ag land out and put so-called solar farms in?

We need to have our State be much more productive in keeping agriculture going, keeping the jobs going, and having a domestic food supply that is reliable.

With that comes infrastructure, building more water supply, and not tearing out our hydroelectric dams but actually preserving them and adding more to our electrical grid.

We have the Diablo Canyon Power Plant that has been in place for 40-plus years. It was almost going to be decommissioned here this year or next year with the two different reactors. They bought 5 more years. We need 40 more years for that plant, and we need more plants like that.

We have small nuclear plants that we can build more and more of around the country to keep our electric grid stable. Right now, when you see the temperatures in California, and a lot of the

West, perhaps, over 100 degrees, 105, 108, even some other areas that are higher than that, it is going to be really tough on our electrical grid because we don't seem to have the foresight to produce electricity.

All these things work together for affordability and for families to sustain their homes and run the air conditioner and have a stable food supply that is halfway reasonable in cost.

It is a domestic food supply and one that brings jobs to our backyard and the water supply that we all need. We will need all of the above on this.

RECOGNIZING BROOKE CHILDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere gratitude for Brooke Ann Childers, our amazing district director in Savannah.

Brooke passionately served the First Congressional District of Georgia for many years, and our district is better off for her hard work and dedication.

As our district director, Brooke has ensured that the highest level of constituent outreach and services are met throughout the district.

From cofounding the southeastern Rotary E-Club to volunteering across Georgia's First District, Brooke continues to improve our community in her professional and private life. She is a member of several women's GOP groups and the First Congressional District GOP.

In every aspect of Brooke's time with us, she has prioritized the growth, well-being, and empowerment of the people she encounters.

I am forever grateful for her leadership in our district office and representation in our community.

I wish Brooke good luck in her future endeavors. We surely will miss her.

RECOGNIZING CHARLIE CONDON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize University of Georgia baseball player Charlie Condon who recently was awarded the Golden Spikes Award.

This award is given annually to the premier amateur baseball player in the country, combining on-field accolades with a penchant for sportsmanship.

Condon began his career at Georgia as a walk-on and ended his career as the single-season home-run leader at Georgia.

He broke the Georgia program record in just two seasons of being in the lineup, hitting 62 home runs in only 116 games.

Charlie also led the country in home runs, batting average, slugging percentage, total bases, and OPS this season as well.

Not only is he the university's first Golden Spikes Award winner, but he is also the first Dick Howser Trophy winner, as well as the Bobby Bragan National Collegiate Slugger Award winner.

In addition to his stellar hitting, he was also well accomplished in the field, playing first and third base and all three outfield positions.

I congratulate Charlie on an amazing career at the University of Georgia. I look forward to seeing how many more home runs he hits in his professional career.

RECOGNIZING BERNADETTE BALL-OLIVER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Mrs. Bernadette Ball-Oliver following her recent retirement from the Savannah-Chatham County Public School System.

Mrs. Ball-Oliver completed her successful 35-year career as the deputy superintendent of teaching and learning for the school system where she always put the needs of students first.

She graduated from Beach High School and returned to Savannah's public school system as a high school English teacher.

Throughout her career, she served as a teacher, an assistant principal, a principal, and worked in the central office as a school turnaround executive director for her alma mater before becoming deputy superintendent.

Mrs. Ball-Oliver is known for her dedication to promoting what is best for students and improving educational outcomes for students across Savannah.

I know I join all students, parents, and employees of the Savannah-Chatham County Public School System in wishing Mrs. Ball-Oliver a wonderful, well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING DR. RUSSELL T. KEEN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the exciting news that Augusta University has named its next president, my friend, Dr. Russell T. Keen.

The Georgia Board of Regents voted for Keen to lead the university, which includes the primary medical and dental school in the State.

I echo the words of USG Chancellor Sonny Perdue when I say that we are looking forward to seeing how Dr. Keen continues to push Augusta University toward being one of the best research universities in the Nation and to set its students up for lifelong success.

Keen is well equipped for the new position as he has over 20 years of experience in higher education, including his current role as executive vice president for administration and chief of staff to the retiring president.

I congratulate Russell. He is more than qualified to lead this prestigious institution. I know he will serve the Augusta community very well.

NEGATIVE NATIONAL SECURITY CONSEQUENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the negative national security consequences of 3½ years of President Biden's open-border policies.

While we hear President Biden and his allies boast about a so-called drop in illegal immigrant encounters in recent weeks, the number of national security threats resulting from this administration's policies continue to mount.

According to the Department of Homeland Security's own threat assessment for this year, illegal drugs produced in Mexico and sold in the United States will take more American lives than any other threat we face.

Further underscoring the threat our country faces due to the President's open-border policies, we learned 2 weeks ago that the Department of Homeland Security has identified more than 400 illegal immigrants that have entered the U.S. over the last 3 years as "subjects of concern." They are subjects of concern because they were brought here by an ISIS-affiliated human smuggling network, according to sources who spoke with NBC News.

These unnamed officials report that 150 of these individuals have been arrested, but the whereabouts of many more are unknown. We also don't know whether the money earned in this human smuggling operation is funding ISIS activity.

A couple of weeks prior to this story, NBC also reported that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement arrested eight men from Tajikistan, also for suspected affiliation with ISIS, in three major U.S. cities. This turned out to be an entirely separate ISIS-affiliated human smuggling network.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a couple of examples from recent weeks. We face many, many more national security threats that are a direct result of open borders and a refusal to uphold existing immigration laws in this country.

More than 350 illegal immigrants who are on the terror watch list have attempted to cross into the United States since President Biden took office. More than 1.8 million people have successfully evaded Border Patrol. Hundreds of thousands of unknown individuals have been admitted into the U.S. on parole with no way of tracking many of these individuals. This widespread abuse of parole authority was a key factor in my vote to impeach DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas. It has truly paved the way for countless instances of crime across this country.

The President's recent executive order is far too little, far too late. It doesn't go far enough to treat these threats to our safety and security with the seriousness that they merit. The action, however, does prove what I have been saying and arguing for months, that the President has and has had the authority to end this crisis at our border. It also highlights the fact that our Commander in Chief waited 3½ years before taking any action to curb the unprecedented flow of illegal immigrants into this country.

This isn't hyperbole. These are facts. As sobering as they may be, I fear they will persist as long as President Biden or whoever is making decisions at the White House is in the White House.

HONORING ANDRE JONES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Andre Jones, in recognition of BIPOC Mental Health Awareness Month. Andre's life and creativity are an invitation to celebrate the beauty of our shared humanity.

Andre, a Chicago native from the Logan Square area in Illinois-03, has published a unique coloring book. It is called "Colorful Memoirs: A Journey Through Andre's Life," that offers a glimpse into his experiences and affirms his credo: Just like you, I am a human being.

Andre participates in the community living programs at Envision Unlimited where he practices his commitment to inclusion and community building through his leadership of the cycling committee. Andre is donating the proceeds from the coloring book to support his beloved summer cycling programs.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, I commend Andre for his contributions to mental health awareness and his ongoing efforts to equip and uplift our community.

I thank and congratulate Andre.

HONORING NAT VIKITSRETH

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Nat Vikitsreth in recognition of BIPOC Mental Health Awareness Month.

Nat is the founder of Come Back to Care based in the Illinois-03 and a self-described dot connector, norm agitator, and a lover of liberation. She brings wit, authenticity, honesty, and audacity to the work of collaborating with parents to address intergenerational family trauma and healing from internalized oppression.

Nat unapologetically pursues social justice and liberation in her practice while rooting her work in our sacred shared humanity.

While she has a long, impressive list of awards, publications, and traditional credentials to be proud of, Nat believes that her work with parents, caregivers, and children is the highest honor.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, I commend Nat Vikitsreth for her contributions to mental health, especially for Black and Brown communities, and her unwavering commitment to the sacred work of healing and justice.

I thank and congratulate Nat.

□ 1030

HONORING JACK ROSS

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Illinois Third constituent and veteran, Jack Ross.

Jack was wounded in action during his deployment in Vietnam while serving as his squad's point man. Like so many servicemembers living with disabilities and traumas as a result of their service, Jack witnessed unspeak-

able horrors and returned home injured and with PTSD.

His commendable service and sacrifice were recognized with two Purple Hearts, two Bronze Star Medals and an Air Medal.

Upon returning home, Jack turned his military experience into a lifetime of community leadership. He owns and operates Manor Press, a veteran-owned business in River Grove. He has also served on the boards of Oak Leyden Developmental Services and his alma mater, Guerin Prep High School.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, I commend Jack Ross for his courage, for his service to our communities, and his unwavering leadership.

CONGRATULATING HENDERSON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' SOFTBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Henderson County High School girls' softball team on an amazing season and their first-ever State championship.

The Lady Colonels won the title in a dominating fashion by a final score of 11-0.

This State title capped an impressive season. The team notched 36 wins and recorded multiple school records, including highest batting average, most hits, most runs scored, most singles, most doubles, most RBIs, and most stolen bases.

Three players on the Henderson County team were also named to the All-Tournament Team. This is an amazing accomplishment for Henderson County High School, for the program, the community, and I am so honored to represent this great community in west Kentucky.

I again congratulate the Henderson County girls' softball team on their first-ever State championship.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the new bill that I filed titled the "Presidential Ethics Reform Act."

This bill is a bipartisan bill that I have filed with Representative KATIE PORTER from California. The American people are skeptical about whether government officials actually work in the public interest, regardless of which party they are in.

This bill would require Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose foreign payments, family gifts, family loans, family use of government travel, and tax returns.

Increasing transparency is a key step to restoring trust in the government. Let the American people see for themselves whether or not there are conflicts of interest with their leadership.

Both parties have complained about previous administrations having conflicts of interest, especially among

their immediate family members. That is why Representative PORTER and I have filed this piece of legislation.

To summarize, let me go through what the Presidential Ethics Reform Act actually does.

First of all, it requires Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose payments, transfers, or other items of value from foreign sources received by themselves or immediate family members within 2 years before taking office, during their time in office, and for 2 years after leaving office.

This bill requires Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose conflicts of interest upon taking office and throughout their time in office.

This bill requires Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose gifts valued at more than \$10,000 received from or by immediate family members within 2 years before taking office, during their time in office, and for 2 years after leaving office.

This bill requires Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose loans or loan repayments made to them by an immediate family member of any amount or received by an immediate family member from any source, except commercial loans, for over \$10,000 within 2 years before taking office, during their time in office, and for 2 years after leaving office.

This bill requires Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose when immediate family members accompany the President or Vice President on official travel, specifying when they do so, and whether or not it is for business purposes.

Finally, the Presidential Ethics Reform Act requires Presidents and Vice Presidents to disclose tax returns for the 2 years preceding their time in office, during their time in office, and for the 2 years following their departure from office.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this ethics bill will address all the concerns that Members of both parties and members of both the conservative and liberal media have had about this administration, the previous administration, and administrations prior to the last administration.

When I announced the Biden influence pedaling investigation in November of 2022 when it was apparent that the House was going to flip from Democrat to Republican, I said two things about that investigation that I hoped would be accomplished: number one, that the American people would be given the truth about just exactly what the Biden family has been doing in their family schemes, and I believe we have provided that; and, secondly, we were going to pass legislation to define influence pedaling and prevent it from happening in the future.

That is what the Presidential Ethics Reform Act does today. I am pleased to file this bill in a bipartisan manner with my colleague KATIE PORTER.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORAN). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MALOY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, like a shepherd, lead us into this day. You have blessed us with the refreshment of mercy and shelter. You have led us to drink freely from the still waters of Your grace. Refresh both our minds and our souls for the work that lies ahead.

Then guide us along the path of righteousness. Though the way is enshrouded with the darkness of these times, remind us that we have no need to fear, for You remain with us. Guide us with Your rod of protection. Comfort us with the strong staff of Your compassion.

Open our eyes to the bounty You set before us, a feast rich with Your abiding presence, anointed with Your wisdom, overflowing with evidence of Your steadfast provision.

Surely, Your goodness and love will remain with us, now and in all the days to come.

May all in this House dwell with You this day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BIDEN BORDER CRISIS THREATENS FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the Biden border crisis threatens all American families at risk of murderous attacks.

Since Biden, there have been 16 million illegal alien crossings. In April alone, there were 180,000 illegal alien crossings.

This represents 38 consecutive months of higher illegal crossings than any month under President Donald Trump.

In the last 7 months, more than 27,000 Chinese communist nationals illegally crossed, breaking the total of all of last year.

The American people have exposed corrupt Judge Merchan, dismissing his unethical witch hunt with the achievement ultimately of electing President Donald Trump. Merchan will be warmly welcomed as my guest at the Trump inauguration.

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

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN DIEGO PRIDE

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of San Diego Pride, a two-day celebration of love, acceptance, and diversity. The event is a powerful testament to the resiliency and spirit of the San Diego LGBTQ community.

San Diego Pride started in 1974 with an unsanctioned march. Since then, it has grown into one of the city's largest, most cherished events. The centerpiece is a parade through Hillcrest, the vibrant neighborhood that serves as San Diego's LGBTQ hub, which I am proud to represent. Its streets, adorned with Pride flags, reflect the tireless work of people who refuse to be muted and marginalized.

I take this opportunity to celebrate the achievements of the community in San Diego and beyond and reaffirm my commitment to ensuring that everyone can live authentically and without fear of discrimination. Together, let's celebrate our diversity and recognize that love knows no boundaries.

RECOGNIZING DAVID LINDSAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding performance of Central Mountain High School's David Lindsay.

He recently repeated as the State champion in the PA Class 3A tennis singles championship. It takes great skill, tenacity, and determination to be named the champion at this level 2 years in a row.

On May 26 at the Hershey Racquet Club, David completed a back-to-back sweep of the 3A singles championship bracket. He won 6-2 in the final match and remained the best singles player across the Commonwealth.

Madam Speaker, this is an incredible accomplishment for David and the Wildcats. I am proud of the team and David for their monumental season and dedication to the sport. I look forward to seeing what the future holds for David.

Congratulations to David for being the best in the Commonwealth and making the community proud.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tout the transformational Flexible Services Program in Massachusetts' Medicaid program and to highlight an important upcoming transition that will further strengthen its approach to supporting those experiencing illness, hunger, and homelessness.

Since early 2020, Massachusetts has been providing housing support and nutrition services like medically tailored meals, food prescriptions, kitchen supplies, and nutrition education and counseling to eligible members through MassHealth.

It is also the first of its kind to serve vulnerable household members like children and high-risk pregnant mothers.

Early next year, the program will transition to a new health-related, social needs services framework to better provide supplemental nutrition services to eligible members. Transportation and food delivery costs will be included as a supplemental benefit, currently among the biggest barriers to adequate and affordable nutrition.

I am incredibly proud of Massachusetts' forward-thinking approach to providing nutrition and housing supports to those struggling to make ends meet. I encourage other States to look at this innovative model. Together, we can end hunger now.

REMOVING NONCITIZENS FROM EXISTING VOTER ROLLS

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, only Americans should vote in American elections. That is why I rise in support of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility or SAVE Act, introduced by my friend from Texas (Mr. ROY).

This bill would require States to obtain proof of citizenship, in person, when registering an individual to vote and also requires States to remove noncitizens from existing voter rolls. These proposals are as commonsense as it gets.

Unfortunately, many on the other side disagree. While falsely alleging that the 2016 election was stolen due to foreign election interference, they ignore the very real threat of foreign election interference that currently exists.

Maybe if President Biden didn't hold the door open for more than 9.5 million immigrants to enter our country illegally, this bill wouldn't be necessary. Because he did, it is essential to pass the SAVE Act to uphold the integrity of our elections.

CELEBRATING THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF DEPEW

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 130th anniversary of the village of Depew. Named in honor of U.S. Senator Chauncey Depew and incorporated at a time of significant growth and industrialization on July 23, 1894, Depew quickly became a key manufacturing and railroad hub for the city of Buffalo.

Built on the hard work of immigrants hailing from Holland, Ireland, Prussia, Hungary, Ukraine, and Poland, the village thrived, raising generations of hardworking and successful Americans.

Historically known for being a vital manufacturer in the railroad industry, the village continues to be a hub of economic development in western New York, hosting numerous businesses in the logistics, construction, and hospitality industries, among others.

For the thousands of people who live there, Depew is home; a great place to raise a family, start a business, and be a part of a tight-knit community.

It is the kind of place where neighbors look out for each other and where civic engagement is still a core part of daily life.

I congratulate the people of Depew and my friend Mayor Kevin Peterson on the village's 130th anniversary and thank them for their continued contributions to the fabric of western New York.

HONORING ROSANELLE EATON

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable life and enduring legacy of Rosanell Eaton. She achieved incredible feats, overcoming obstacles and championing voting rights.

Mother Eaton was a trailblazing figure in Franklin County where she was the first African American to register and vote. She rode 8 miles to Louisburg at the age of 21 on a mule to pass a literacy test.

Her work placed her on the State and national stage with her daughter, Armenta, by her side until her passing at 97 years old. She wore many hats and had an infectious smile and loved her church, her faith.

Recently, Michael and Deborah Liter, church members, renovated the building that once served as the local board of elections office at 217 Court Street and named it in her honor.

Mother Eaton's impact was felt far and wide, and she still inspires us. While at the building dedication, the sky became overcast, but the Sun reappeared, and our angel shone upon us.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8281, SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION H.J. RES. 165, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "NON-DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8772, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7700, STOP UNAFFORDABLE DISHWASHER STANDARDS ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7637, REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1341 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1341

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided

and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance”. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8772) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived.

SEC. 4. (a) No amendment to H.R. 8772 shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and pro forma amendments described in section 5 of this resolution.

(b) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 5 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 8772 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 6. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 8772 for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that

are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 1341, providing for the consideration of five measures: H.R. 8281, Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act; H.J. Res. 165, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance”; H.R. 7700, Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act; H.R. 7637, Refrigerator Freedom Act; and H.R. 8772, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2025.

House Resolution 1341 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 8281, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act; H.J. Res. 165, Providing for congressional disapproval under

chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Non-discrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance”; H.R. 7700, Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act; and H.R. 7637, Refrigerator Freedom Act.

House Resolution 1341 also provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 8772, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2025.

The rule provides one motion to recommit for each measure.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to bring forward this rule and look forward to supporting the underlying measures on the House floor later this week. H.R. 8772 supports the House of Representatives and its operations, recommending approximately \$5.5 billion for activities under the legislative branch’s jurisdiction. This includes the support of certain agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the Government Accountability Office.

Each agency listed in this appropriations package provides research and analysis to Congress. The Government Accountability Office, in particular, provides fact-based information and investigates Federal spending and performance. The reports and recommendations of this office are often used by Members of Congress and their staff as the basis for legislative recommendations and the basis for amendments.

My Democratic colleagues admit themselves in the Committee Report that there is no contention with the funding in this package. I hope then, Madam Speaker, that we may be able to pass this bill on a bipartisan basis to support Congress and a continuation of its ability to work on behalf of the American people.

H.R. 7637 and H.R. 7700 prohibit the Department of Energy from issuing, updating, or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators and dishwashers unless the standards are determined by the Department to be technologically feasible, economically justified, unlikely to increase net costs for consumers, and result in a net savings of energy.

Madam Speaker, inflation has taken a toll on every American. Appliance bills may not seem to be ostentatious, but they prioritize the taxpayer’s right to choose how to furnish their homes based on their lifestyle and not this administration’s Green New Deal laundry list.

H.J. Res. 165, introduced by Congresswoman MARY MILLER, prevents a Department of Education rule proposed and finalized under President Biden from taking effect. This rule, if not reversed, would place unfair burdens on schools, colleges, and universities, as well as potentially undermining protections in Federal law for biological women.

We must uphold Title IX for females to have equal access in academic and

athletic settings. For nearly half a century, it has been successful in ensuring that female athletes and scholars have opportunities historically only afforded to their male counterparts. This final rule from the Biden administration counters these efforts and seeks to fundamentally change what might be protected under Title IX. I urge my colleagues to support Congresswoman MILLER's resolution and oppose the Department of Education's rule on this matter.

H.R. 8281 introduced by my fellow Rules Committee member Representative CHIP ROY requires proof of citizenship to vote in Federal elections. This is a commonsense bill, and I hope Members across the aisle can agree to it. The right to vote in our Nation is a privilege, and it is a responsibility given only to American citizens.

Since taking office, the Biden administration has released well over 8 million illegal aliens into the country and over 1.5 million of these have been what are called got-aways. In some places in our country, the District of Columbia included, they allowed non-citizens to vote in local elections. This legislation corrects this trend for elections on the Federal level, requiring States to obtain proof of United States citizenship and identity before votes are cast.

Additionally, this legislation both allows a State to remove noncitizens from existing voter rolls and permits citizens to sue election officials who fail to do so.

Americans' faith in our national elections has declined precipitously over the last two election cycles. To restore that faith, we must work to protect American voters and the integrity of those very elections. Strengthening existing voter ID laws is a certain way to achieve both of these efforts. We owe it to our constituents to restore confidence in their electoral process.

I appreciate the bills brought before us today by my colleagues and all of the effort that has gone into crafting them. We did have a robust debate with witness testimony last night in the Rules Committee. Madam Speaker, I look forward to continuing those discussions here today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Republican Party released their new platform, and I heard Republican pundits saying that this platform was going to be more moderate. I saw reporters even claiming that Republicans were softening their radical, extreme views on abortion and on same-sex marriage. I even saw one Republican Senator on TV yesterday defending the platform and trying to spin it to make Trump sound like a normal, rational, moderate person, which is an impossibility, by the way.

Then I actually read the platform, and it is more of the same old same old. It is more of the same fear-mongering and divisive politics that they have been pushing for years now. They are not kicking MAGA extremism aside; they are doubling down on it.

Talk is cheap around here. Look at their legislation. Look at the bills before us this week. If someone looks at these bills and thinks the Republican Party is normal or rational or moderate, I think they need to get checked out because they are living in a fantasy world. These bills are getting crazier and crazier the longer they are in charge.

Here is the Republican agenda for this week: more attacks on the LGBTQ community; more attacks on immigrants; more attacks on voting rights because they know they can only win if fewer people vote; more attacks on working families; and more giveaways to special interests and billionaire companies.

There is nothing new here. There is just more division, more destruction, and more disarray.

There has been a lot of talk about Project 2025 lately, the Republican plan to dismantle the government, get revenge on their political adversaries, weaponize the White House, and install Trump as a dictator.

The former President recently made a laughable attempt to try to distance himself from its extremism, and what do you know, now Project 2025 is right here on the House floor because it is what Republicans actually believe.

That is what this SAVE Act is about. It is a voter suppression bill that lays the groundwork for them to undermine the next election so they can justify another January 6-style attempt to seize power even if they lose.

They will use this gotcha bill to say Democrats want to give noncitizens the ability to vote in Federal elections. Let me say now: That is a lie. It is a total lie. It is a lie that Democrats are against preventing noncitizens from voting in Federal elections. That is already illegal. What we are against is making it harder for American citizens to vote, and that is what this bill does.

Republicans in this bill want to require all this new documentation for an individual just to register to vote. They say: Well, you can use your passport.

What about someone who can't afford a \$130 passport? What about someone who doesn't have the time to take a day off from work to get their birth certificate? What about someone who recently got married and changed their name so their birth certificate doesn't match their ID?

The Republican answer here is: Too bad. You can't vote.

They are going to disenfranchise millions and millions of people in response to what we know, that there have maybe been a couple dozen cases of voter fraud over the last two decades.

This isn't about voter fraud. Let's be clear. This is not about voter fraud. It is about them trying to cheat in the next election. It is paving the way again for another violent insurrection if their candidate does not succeed.

I should say, Madam Speaker, the key witness in the House Administration Committee on behalf of this bill is one of the architects of Project 2025.

□ 1230

I mean, they are all linked. Let me throw one other thing out there for Members to digest. The chairman of the House Administration Committee, the Republican chairman of the House Administration Committee, I asked him pointblank whether Trump lost the election. He couldn't give me a direct answer. What the hell is wrong with these people?

They are so detached from reality. They are so oblivious to the truth. This is dangerous stuff.

Then, another Project 2025 priority is more giveaways for polluters and attempts to dismantle the entire Federal Government's effort to protect the environment. It is shocking, actually.

They want to take freedom away from women. They want to take freedom away from the LGBTQ+ community. They want to take freedom away from families who want to use IVF, but freedom for fridges? Sign them up. They want freedom for refrigerators and dignity for dishwashers while taking away the rights of actual people. It is sick.

For the record, if somebody wants to keep their 50-year-old refrigerator, go for it. This bill has nothing—nothing—to do with that.

This bill gives billion-dollar companies the ability to cut corners when they make appliances. I guess nothing says freedom to Republicans quite like forcing their constituents to pay more on their electric bills.

Republicans don't want to talk about how extreme they are. The bottom line is, we should want companies to make appliances more efficient. Why? Because it saves consumers more money. The only reason to be against that is to help the big energy companies so they can charge consumers even more.

My Republican friends don't want to talk about how they want to ban abortion nationwide and take away the right to choose in every State. They don't want to talk about how their own members want to ban IVF. They don't want to talk about their obsession with attacking the LGBTQI+ community. They want to turn the clock back on voting rights. The legislation that we are seeing on the floor today is just more of the same.

While Republicans desert the American people in service to Donald Trump, Democrats will remain committed to doing our job: lowering the cost of living, standing up to the special interests of big corporations, protecting the right to vote, and defending the freedom of our constituents. We are

proud to stand on the side of democracy, on the side of the American people, and on the right side of history.

Madam Speaker, this is just an awful rule. I will say more about that later. I urge a strong “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of the President.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am going to yield to Mr. ALFORD here in just a moment, but let me yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of a response.

It is difficult for me to sit here and be lectured about the cost of living by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, 2 years ago in the Rules Committee, when Republicans were in the minority and Democrats were in the majority, we pleaded with the then-majority to not do the American Rescue Plan, to not do the Inflation Reduction Act, and to not engage in all of this vast Federal spending that they had teed up.

The problem was, after the coronavirus infection in December 2020, the economy was basically getting back on its feet. All we had to do was stay out of the way. Instead, \$2 trillion went to the American Rescue Plan and \$4 trillion to the Inflation Reduction Act, with an extremely bloated infrastructure bill.

What happened? The cost of living blew through the roof for the poor and middle class because inflation became so severe.

The people who are supposed to be watching this, like the Chairman of the Fed and the Treasury Secretary, said that inflation is transitory, that we will get a handle on that. We are sitting here now, 18 months later, and they don't have a handle on it.

My colleague talked about the cost of living and talking to his constituents about that. They are still suffering from what Democrats did at the beginning of this administration.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BURGESS for leading this rule debate.

Madam Speaker, as I travel the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Missouri, I get one question repeated often, over and over: What are we going to do to secure our elections? We can pass a lot of laws in Congress, but if we don't secure our elections, we don't have a democracy. We don't have a Republic.

Voters in the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Missouri

want to make sure that only those who should be voting are voting—one vote, one person, one citizen of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, that is why I rise today in support of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or SAVE Act, H.R. 8281.

For years, progressive Democrats have falsely claimed that 2016 was stolen because of foreign election interference. Yet, today, they are ignoring the real threat of foreign interference: noncitizens registering and voting in U.S. elections.

The SAVE Act will address this threat head-on by requiring proof of citizenship in order to register to vote. It is pretty simple. It allows State officials to accept a wide variety of documents that will actually make it easier for citizens to register to vote. The bill also ensures that States can access the databases they need to clean up our voter registration rolls and remove noncitizens.

It is very simple, Madam Speaker. If you are not a citizen of the United States of America, you should not be voting in elections in the United States of America, but just like our progressive Democrat friends have defended on this very House floor Marxism, socialism, and open borders, they are opposing this very measure at this time in our Nation's history.

The dirty little secret is that progressive Democrats want to turn the some 12 million illegal aliens that have come into our precious sovereign Nation—because of this failed administration and their lack of ability to stop the illegal immigrants—they want to turn them into voters to secure more power, to make them dependent upon the U.S. Government.

Madam Speaker, we cannot let that happen. We will not let that happen. It is time to secure our border. It is time to secure our elections. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule for the SAVE Act and the act itself. The time is now. We may not have time again.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I don't even know where to begin after all that.

Madam Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the CATO Institute titled: “Noncitizens Don't Illegally Vote in Detectable Numbers.”

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

There was no objection.

[From the Cato Institute, Nov. 25, 2020]

NONCITIZENS DON'T ILLEGALLY VOTE IN DETECTABLE NUMBERS
(By Alex Nowrasteh)

One of the most frequent and less serious criticisms that comes across my desk is that immigration is bad because non-citizens vote illegally in such large numbers that sway elections. A new report by James D. Agresti, pushed by some news outlets, argues that the number of noncitizens who illegally voted in

2020 substantially increased Biden's vote share but did not affect the outcome of the election. It has been illegal for non-citizens to vote for federal elected officials since 1996, so these noncitizen voters would all be breaking federal law. Is the Agresti paper reliable? Are large numbers of noncitizens voting in federal elections to such an extent that several states voted for Biden as a result?

No, but to understand why you have to follow how the Agresti paper arrived at its conclusion. The Agresti report relies on a peer-reviewed academic paper by political scientists Jesse T. Richman, Gulshan A. Chattha, and David C. Earnest that was published in 2014 that estimates the rate at which noncitizens voted for president in 2008. Their paper relies upon responses to the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) for the 2008 election that found a substantial proportion of noncitizens voted in that year. The Agresti paper combined two figures from the Richman, Chattha, and Earnest paper to get their primary estimate that 15.8 percent of noncitizens voted in 2008. Agresti then applies that 15.8 percent rate to the non-citizen population in swing states in 2020 to reach their conclusion.

The big problem, as explained in two succinct pieces, is that non-citizens voting illegally is a small subset of a small population of Americans measured in the CCES survey. In the CCES survey, as in any survey, a certain number of respondents click the wrong box. Thus, some respondents will incorrectly click that they are non-citizens by accident and that they voted. Or they will make any number of other errors. This general problem is called measurement error and it afflicts every survey. These errors are common in surveys, but if it surveys enough people and there isn't a tragic flaw in design that causes large numbers of people to make the same error, then it doesn't matter much for the final result.

“The problem is that the authors focused on a small number of non-citizens in a very large survey that likely accidentally said they were noncitizens who voted when they were really citizens who voted. The CCES survey asked about 20,000 people how they voted and about 19,500 of them said that they were U.S. citizens. Since the CCES is about federal elections, it oversamples citizens who can vote and under sample non-citizens who can't vote. In fact, the number of reported non-citizens in the CCES survey who said they voted in a federal election is just about exactly the number who should have misidentified themselves as non-citizens in such a large survey.”

“This problem arises because the survey was not designed to sample non-citizens, and the non-citizen category in the citizenship question is included for completeness and to identify those respondents who might be non-citizens. We expect that most of that group are in fact non-citizens (85 of 105), but the very low level of misclassification of citizens, who comprise 97.4 percent of the sample, means that we expect that 19 ‘non-citizen’ respondents (16.5 percent of all reported non-citizens) are citizens who are misclassified. And, those misclassified people can readily account for the observed vote among those who reported that they are non-citizens [emphasis added].”

Survey misuse, misdesign, and misinterpretation is a serious problem that we all witnessed right after the 2020 election. This strain of research appears to be another instance of that. There are likely many problems with America's voting system and there is no doubt that a non-zero number of non-citizens illegally voted, but there is no good evidence that noncitizens voted illegally in large enough numbers to actually shift the

outcome of elections or even change the number of electoral votes

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at a press conference on the SAVE Act, the Speaker of the House said: “We all know intuitively that a lot of illegals are voting in Federal elections, but it has not been something that is easily provable. We don’t have that number.”

Madam Speaker, this body legislates based on facts—at least, it is supposed to—not on intuition. Maybe it is time for House Republicans to get serious about their jobs and stop making laws based off of absurd conspiracy theories.

If my Republican friends want to talk about protecting elections, maybe they ought to start telling the truth about the last election. Let me remind my colleagues that the leader of their party tried to submit fraudulent slates of electors to steal the last election.

That is voter fraud, Madam Speaker. That is what voter fraud looks like.

My friends on the other side of the aisle said not a thing after court after court upheld the fact that we had a free and fair election, but the former President actually submitted fraudulent slates of electors to try to change the results of the last election.

The gentleman from Texas went on about the cost of living and blamed the American Rescue Plan Act and the Inflation Reduction Act. Those bills were passed in the aftermath of a pandemic to save our economy and to save American families from going bankrupt.

Madam Speaker, I remind the gentleman that inflation is coming down faster in the United States than in any other country in the world, but if he is blaming the Inflation Reduction Act and the American Rescue Plan Act for increased high inflation in countries like China and other countries in the world, that is absurd.

Let me just say one other thing because this is the rule that we are talking about here today. Republicans are emboldening our adversaries and abandoning our allies. They held up aid to Ukraine for 9 months, doing irreparable damage to the fight against authoritarianism.

By the way, I should also point out to those who dragged their feet on Ukraine that Russia bombed a children’s hospital in Ukraine. Deal with that. Another war crime, yet we had Republicans holding up the Ukraine aid package. The Ukrainians are fighting against authoritarianism.

Speaking of authoritarianism, we have here four more closed rules, four more completely closed rules. Putin would be proud of some of the most authoritarian rules I have ever seen. They must have learned that from their patron saint, Donald Trump.

On the one structured rule here, they made only Republican amendments in order, no bipartisan amendments nor Democratic amendments, even though many of them were rule compliant. Republicans just want to shut this place down. They said “no” to everything.

If this is what my Republican friends consider a fair process, wow. I mean,

we have a bill that we think will disenfranchise millions of American citizens in terms of voting.

The ranking Democrat, Mr. MORELLE, had an amendment that he offered that was totally rule compliant. We ought to at least have that debate. The majority can vote to suppress the vote all they want, but we ought to have that debate and get people on the record. The Republicans of the Rules Committee said no.

What is the majority afraid of? Are Republicans afraid of a little debate on some of these important issues?

We have a different definition of “fair” because this process, once again, makes a mockery of this institution and once again shows the majority’s disdain for democracy. The Rules Committee continues to be a place where democracy goes to die.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition not only to this rule but the bills that it advances.

I have to say that I am amazed daily by the debates that I hear in this Chamber and in our committees and outraged that the GOP is using the floor to advance a hateful agenda to take away voting rights and to advance insane legislation.

One week after we celebrated this great Nation’s independence, we are here today as they are putting forward legislation to protect our kitchen appliances. That is right, folks. They are running bills on the floor titled the freedom for refrigerators and dignity for dishwashers. I am not making this up. These are the real names of the bills they are running this week.

Apparently, they are more concerned about the freedom of our refrigerators than the freedom to make decisions about our own bodies. They are more concerned about our dishwashers than they are about democracy. They are more concerned about appliances than an autocrat who is seeking reelection and says he wants to be a dictator on day one.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues, honestly, how do they do this with a straight face? Y’all, this ain’t normal. This is insane.

Is this the freedom and democracy that our country fought for, arguing for kitchen appliances? Is this what constituents are telling my colleagues? Mine are telling me they are terrified about the future of this country, their families, and their rights. They are asking us to fight to protect LGBTQ+ rights and abortion, address climate change, lower costs, and protect voting rights.

□ 1245

You are over here asking us to vote on a bill to protect the rights of dishwashers and refrigerators. It is insane. I am just at a loss. It is time to wake up. It is time to get to work. It is time to serve the American people because, literally, our democracy depends on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would, once again, like to remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of the President and also to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), who is a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, first, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee and the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule today which includes consideration of my bill, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act.

The Biden Department of Energy, pandering to radical environmentalists, is actively working to make life harder for the American people. Under the administration’s latest proposed dishwasher efficiency standards rule, the average American family would be stuck with fewer, more expensive appliance options, with no real cost savings over the appliance’s lifespan.

By limiting consumer choice and imposing draconian new standards and regulations that make absolutely no sense from either an affordability or energy standpoint, this administration is making life harder for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 7700, and push back on these unaffordable policies that jeopardize access to affordable, reliable consumer products that we all once took for granted.

I am also proud to cosponsor another measure to be considered under this rule, the SAVE Act, which will require proof of U.S. citizenship to register to vote in Federal elections. This legislation will ensure that only American citizens decide America’s future.

The Democrats’ open-border policies have brought nothing but chaos and destruction to our communities as millions and millions of illegal aliens have flooded into this country. The left’s refusal to secure our borders is deliberate, and it is a direct threat to our democratic institutions as a growing number of noncitizens are registered to vote and have been found to vote in our local, State, and Federal elections.

By allowing noncitizens to vote, they dilute the voice of every American citizen, undermining what should be a free and fair election.

Enough is enough. We cannot stand by while our borders are overrun and our communities are destroyed. The SAVE Act must be passed to protect the integrity of our elections.

Madam Speaker, our country was built on the principles of freedom, fairness, and justice. This administration’s policies are a slap in the face to every immigrant who followed the legal path to citizenship and who respected the rule of law and earned their right to participate in our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the SAVE Act so that we can safeguard our elections, secure our borders, and ensure a brighter future for all Americans.

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

Madam Speaker, sadly, this place is becoming a forum for trivial issues to get debated passionately and important ones not at all. I would say to the gentleman who just spoke that—and he should know this—that it is illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. It is already the law, but I feel like we have to point that out to my Republican friends.

In listening to the way he spoke with such passion about dishwashers and refrigerators, I feel I need to remind the viewing audience that this is not Home Depot. This is supposed to be the United States Congress where we are supposed to be tackling serious issues that are confronting the American people, and, unfortunately, under this Republican leadership, we never do that.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would restore the nationwide right for providers to provide abortion care and for patients to receive care.

With bill after bill, House Republicans are letting the American people know who they are. Every opportunity they get they try to inject poison pill riders to ban IVF, to restrict access to abortion care, and to make life harder for the American people. As I have said before, they want to turn back the clock on our rights.

Just look at Project 2025, a dystopian plan for the future of our country crafted by former Trump administration officials. They want to cut your earned benefits. They want to cut school meals, and, yes, end access to abortion care. They even want to take mifepristone off the market completely.

Madam Speaker, we must bring H.R. 12, the Women's Health Protection Act, to the floor to let them know that we will not let them turn back the clock on the American people.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), to discuss our proposal.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and in strong support of something my constituents are call-

ing about. It is not dishwashers, and it is not refrigerators. It is support for the Women's Health Protection Act which will provide in law the right for Americans to make their own reproductive healthcare decisions.

The rightwing extremists on the Supreme Court who authored the Dobbs decision overturning abortion rights have shown that they will do anything to further their regressive, extreme, and dangerous ideology regardless of the long history of Court precedent.

For almost 50 years, the intensely personal decision about whether or when to bear a child or have an abortion was right where it belongs, with the one who is pregnant.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim to be pro-life, but the policies they support are anything but.

I remember the days before Roe v. Wade when abortions done without medical care could and often did have tragic outcomes, including death. Even before the Dobbs decision, maternal death rates in 2020 were 62 percent higher in States that ban or restrict abortion than in States where it was acceptable.

Restrictive abortion laws also cause infant mortality rates to rise, including in Texas where both infant death rates and the number of babies who died of birth defects have increased since their restrictive law banning abortion as early as 6 weeks went into effect.

A study from Johns Hopkins University found that between 2021 and 2022, the infant mortality rate increased by 8.3 percent in Texas, and that is compared with a 2.2 percent increase nationally. While the death rate of babies 28 days old or younger fell in other States overall, it increased by 5.8 percent in Texas.

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, these laws are not about protecting life. They are about control: controlling the bodies of others and removing their personal freedom to make the decision about whether or when to bear a child.

This will not stop at the State level. At the first opportunity, congressional Republicans will try to enact a nationwide abortion ban to prevent anyone in this country from getting the care they need.

For these reasons and more, we must defeat the previous question so we can pass the very important Women's Health Protection Act to protect the right to abortion and restore the freedoms that the Supreme Court, with support from Republicans, brazenly stripped away.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to point out, and to bring us back to the discussion at hand, that we are talking about only having American citizens voting in American elections.

We are talking about checking a Department of Energy that has just run roughshod over the rights of working Americans. Let's remember what we are doing here today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me remind people what we are here about, as well, a voter suppression bill, we are here to talk about freedom for household appliances, and we are here to attack the LGBTQ+ community. That is what these bills are all about before us today.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the BBC titled "Project 2025: A wish list for a Trump Presidency, explained."

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

There was no objection.

[From BBC News]

PROJECT 2025: A WISH LIST FOR A TRUMP PRESIDENCY, EXPLAINED

(By Mike Wendling)

President Joe Biden's Democrats are mobilising against a possible governing agenda for Donald Trump if he is elected this November.

The blueprint, called Project 2025 and produced by the conservative Heritage Foundation, is one of several think-tank proposals for Trump's platform.

Over more than 900 pages, it calls for sacking thousands of civil servants, expanding the power of the president, dismantling the Department of Education and other federal agencies, and sweeping tax cuts.

The Heritage Foundation unveiled its agenda in April 2023, and liberal opposition ramped up as former President Trump has taken a lead in polls after President Biden's poor debate performance.

Early this July, Heritage president Kevin Roberts raised the prospect of political violence during a podcast interview.

"We are in the process of the second American revolution, which will remain bloodless if the left allows it to be," Mr Roberts told the War Room podcast, founded by Trump adviser Steve Bannon.

The remarks prompted the Biden campaign to accuse Trump and his allies of "dreaming of a violent revolution to destroy the very idea of America".

The comments have refocused attention on Project 2025.

It is common for Washington think-tanks to propose policy wishlists for potential governments-in-waiting. The liberal Center for American Progress, for example, was dubbed Barack Obama's "ideas factory" during his presidency.

What has Trump said about Project 2025?

In early July, Trump said on his social media platform that he knows "nothing about Project 2025".

"I have no idea who is behind it. I disagree with some of the things they're saying and some of the things they're saying are absolutely ridiculous and abysmal," he wrote.

"Anything they do, I wish them luck, but I have nothing to do with them."

However, several people linked to the project worked in Trump's administration or as allies in his re-election campaign.

Project 2025 director Paul Dans was chief of staff at the Office of Personnel Management under Trump.

Associate director Spencer Chretien was a former special assistant to Trump and associate director of Presidential Personnel.

Adviser Russell Vought worked in Trump's Office of Management and Budget.

What is Project 2025?

The Project 2025 document outlines four main aims: restore the family as the centrepiece of American life; dismantle the administrative state; defend the nation's sovereignty and borders; and secure God-given individual rights to live freely.

It is one of several policy papers for a platform broadly known as Agenda 47—so-called because Trump would be America's 47th president if he won.

Heritage says Project 2025 was written by several former Trump appointees and reflects input from more than 100 conservative organisations.

Here's an outline of several key proposals: Government:

Project 2025 proposes that the entire federal bureaucracy, including independent agencies such as the Department of Justice, be placed under direct presidential control—a controversial idea known as “unitary executive theory”.

In practice, that would streamline decision-making, allowing the president to directly implement policies in a number of areas.

The proposals also call for eliminating job protections for thousands of government-employees, who could then be replaced by political appointees.

The document labels the FBI a “bloated, arrogant, increasingly lawless organization” and calls for drastic overhauls of this and other federal agencies, including eliminating the Department of Education.

Immigration:

Increased funding for a wall on the US-Mexico border—one of Trump's signature proposals in 2016—is proposed in the document.

However, more prominent are the consolidation of various US immigration agencies and a large expansion in their powers.

Other proposals include increasing fees on immigrants and allowing fast-tracked applications for migrants who pay a premium.

EPA—Climate and Economy:

The document proposes slashing federal money for research and investment in renewable energy, and calls for the next president to “stop the war on oil and natural gas”.

Carbon-reduction goals would be replaced by efforts to increase energy production and security.

The paper sets out two competing visions on tariffs, and is divided on whether the next president should try to boost free trade or raise barriers to exports.

But the economic advisers suggest that a second Trump administration should slash corporate and income taxes, abolish the Federal Reserve and even consider a return to gold-backed currency.

Abortion:

Project 2025 does not call for a nationwide abortion ban.

However, it proposes withdrawing the abortion pill mifepristone from the market.

Tech and education:

Under the proposals, pornography would be banned, and tech and telecoms companies that facilitate access to such content would be shut down.

The document calls for school choice and parental control over schools, and takes aim at what it calls “woke propaganda”.

It proposes to eliminate a long list of terms from all laws and federal regulations, including “sexual orientation”, “diversity, equity, and inclusion”, “gender equality”, “abortion” and “reproductive rights”.

Jared Huffman, a Democrat congressman from California, has launched a Stop Project 2025 Task Force.

He described Project 2025 as “a dystopian plot that's already in motion to dismantle our democratic institutions”.

Mr. Huffman said the project would “abolish checks and balances, chip away at church-state separation, and impose a far-right agenda that infringes on basic liberties and violates public will.”

“We need a coordinated strategy to save America and stop this coup before it's too late.”

Heritage has previously said Mr Biden's party was scaremongering with “an unserious, mistake-riddled press release”.

“House Democrats are dedicating taxpayer dollars to launch a smear campaign against the united effort to restore self-governance to everyday Americans,” said Mr. Roberts in early June.

“Under the Biden administration, the federal government has been weaponized against American citizens, our border invaded, and our institutions captured by woke ideology.”

The Heritage Foundation is one of the most influential of a number of think tanks that has produced policy papers designed to guide a possible second Trump presidency.

Since the 1980s, Heritage has produced similar policy documents as part of its Man-date for Leadership series.

Project 2025, backed by a \$22m (£17m) budget, also sets out strategies for implementing policies beginning immediately after the presidential inauguration in January 2025.

In his speeches and on his website, Trump has endorsed a number of ideas included in Project 2025, although his campaign has said the candidate has the final say on policy.

Many of the proposals would face immediate legal challenges if implemented.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this article describes Project 2025, a policy wish list for a second Trump term cooked up by some of Trump's closest allies at the far-right Heritage Foundation. It is chilling. It is a chilling window into what may await us come January should Mr. Trump win.

The items on Project 2025's agenda are straight-up dystopian. They want to take complete control of the Department of Justice and end the independence of all Federal agencies. They want to take mifepristone off the market which would amount to a virtual nationwide ban. They want to slash efforts to combat climate change, implement inhumane border policies and fire thousands of government employees.

I am just scratching the surface here. You can read it for yourself, Madam Speaker. I urge people to download it and to read all the information on it.

If that wasn't horrifying enough, the architects of this atrocious Project 2025 are also threatening political violence to all who oppose them.

Just last week, Kevin Roberts, the president of The Heritage Foundation, said that the second American Revolution will remain bloodless if the left allows it to be.

Madam Speaker, Donald Trump literally incited an insurrection to stay in power. He claimed he would be a dictator on day one of his second term, and the Supreme Court just granted him full immunity for acts committed while in office.

Is anyone here stupid enough to believe he won't act on these threats?

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from

New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico, the Chair would, once again and, hopefully, for the last time, remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities towards presumptive nominees for the Office of the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I didn't think I was.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, the House Republicans' bills would give freedom to refrigerators but restrict freedom for American citizens to vote.

Last week we marched in parades and celebrated our Nation's 248th birthday. Democracy and elections are at the core of that celebration. However, this week, Republicans welcomed us back to Washington with a bill that chips away at Americans' most sacred right, the right to vote.

This bill is consistent with Project 2025, the extreme Republicans' blueprint they want to implement in a second Trump Presidency. Project 2025 is their proposal to restrict democracy, restrict women's freedoms, and favor the wealthy. Remember that, Madam Speaker. These bills favor the wealthy and corporations over consumers.

Project 2025 would do away with the Department of Education and destroy Social Security.

The architects of Project 2025 are the same people who served as experts for the bill we are hearing this week. We don't need to wonder if these extreme proposals could become a reality because the Republicans are showing us that when they are in charge they will go after our freedoms, our voting, and our planet.

Rather than celebrate the record-high turnout of our last Presidential election in 2020, the Republicans' SAVE Act, which is actually a voter restriction act, would decrease voting access for Americans citizens.

Republicans don't like mail-in and absentee voting, so they go after that.

If this bill becomes law, a recently married woman who changed her last name couldn't use her birth certificate to register to vote because her name would no longer match. If this bill becomes law, a military ID—imagine that—a military ID would not be enough for that servicemember to vote. Our men and women sacrifice so much. They risk their lives. Why would Republicans make it harder for them to vote?

Perhaps it is because military servicemembers voted in bigger numbers for President Biden than Trump than they had expected.

If that wasn't enough, their voter suppression bill would also make it more difficult for Native Americans to vote. They would not accept Tribal IDs. Imagine, the first Americans being restricted from their ability to vote.

I believe that they are going after the very communities that voted

against Trump last November with these bills.

But, wait, Madam Speaker, that is not enough. Once again, Republican bills favor big corporations over consumers. Republicans want to roll back popular energy efficiency standards because they favor the richest corporations. While the Nation swelters and the heat kills, Republicans ignore the climate change only to protect their biggest benefactors. They don't care about saving folks money on their energy bills.

Sadly, it doesn't end there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. At a time when women demand that we have reproductive freedoms, Republicans instead brought us a bill to give refrigerators freedom. Republicans say that it is overreach to regulate home appliances, but they will regulate women's bodies. We say no, we are against these bills. We are against Project 2025. We urge Americans to see what they are doing and what they intend to do.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purposes of a response.

First off, on Project 2025, this is the work of a think tank. Here is a news flash for everyone: There are think tanks in Washington, D.C. There are a lot of them. There are right-leaning think tanks. There are left-leaning think tanks.

In fact, one of the more frightening left-leaning think tanks is Center for American Progress. The head of the Center for American Progress is now ensconced in the White House as the Domestic Policy Advisor to the Biden administration. Members shouldn't pretend that there aren't think tanks on the left just as think tanks exist on the right. Their purpose is to provide information to legislators, House Members and Senators, and sometimes to inform legislation.

The issue keeps coming up about freedom. Let's talk about freedom for just a moment.

What about the freedom for the parents who were targeted by the Biden Department of Justice for voicing their concern about their children at a school board meeting?

What about the freedom of the Jewish students who are being violently targeted on college campuses and whose mere existence is so offensive to the radical, pro-Hamas left?

What about the freedom for homeowners in my State on the southern border who cannot safely leave their homes because, in May alone, there were over 170,000 illegal immigrant encounters, including 350 members on the terrorist watch list, at least 350 that were apprehended. There is no telling how many more came across undetected and undeterred.

Let's talk about freedom of the American families who are working to put food on their tables, create opportunities for their families, but the economy of the Biden administration is crushing them.

Let's talk about freedom of citizens of our country who want to have a vote in secure elections and want to have confidence in our systems. This bill today will provide that confidence.

My colleagues support freedom, but it seems that their idea of freedom is reserved for those whose expression of it aligns with their values and their agenda. Nevertheless, the question that is before us today is not do we all share the same views on what constitutes good policy; but, rather, did we provide for consideration of these measures in a manner that is consistent with the rules and precedents of the House?

I believe we did our duty and responsibility at the Rules Committee to advance these measures to the House floor, where our colleagues can decide whether or not to support them on their merits.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I respond to the gentleman from Texas by saying: When Democrats speak of freedom, we are talking about freedom for people, not for dishwashers.

The gentleman raised the issue of Project 2025 as somehow it is the product of some distant think tank.

Madam Speaker, I would include in the RECORD a list of all the former Trump administration officials who are architects of this atrocious document.

I also point out for the record that the key witness in the House Administration Committee on this horrific voter suppression bill is one of the co-architects of Project 2025.

The gentleman tried to take a swipe at the Center for American Progress. I think they actually have good ideas, but the Center for American Progress doesn't want to install Joe Biden as a dictator, unlike what Project 2025 wants to do with regard to Trump.

Madam Speaker, we know that there is a lot that we can do when you have competent leadership in control. Look at the last Congress when the Democrats were in charge. We invested to rebuild our neglected infrastructure of airports, roads, bridges, and ports in our communities.

Many of my Republican friends voted against it, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take bows and issue press releases when the majority gets the money and a project is happening in their district.

We brought manufacturing back to the United States, passing the Chips and Science Act to drive innovation and create good-paying jobs. We made the largest investment in climate, protecting our water and our air. We strengthened our supply chains and set up new programs to support minority

businesses. We ensured that our veterans got healthcare that they earned during their service.

I would say to my friends: It is possible for us to deliver for the American people, though I haven't seen much of it yet this year. All we have done is vote on bills that destroy and dismantle progress, that further polarize this country. Now the far-right fringe are forcing us in a way that we are plummeting toward a costly government shutdown in an effort to get their extreme agenda through.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from The Hill titled: "Democrats deliver as Republicans dither."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Hill, Jan. 13, 2023]

DEMOCRATS DELIVER AS REPUBLICANS DITHER
(By Debbie Cox Bultan, Opinion Contributor)

For the first time in a century, the House of Representatives failed to elect a Speaker on the first ballot, or even on the tenth, as Republicans were held hostage by a small group of extremists within their own party. Republicans ultimately found the votes needed in the 15th round, after tempers flared and concerns grew about the power that extreme members potentially would have in the new Congress. This kind of spectacle is the opposite of what Americans want to see.

In November's election, voters clearly rejected extremist candidates, opting instead for leaders such as Gov.-elect Josh Shapiro in Pennsylvania and Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson in Michigan, who ran on platforms promising to solve problems and better meet the needs of constituents. "Chaos agents" and 2020-election deniers lost in major statewide races across the country. Now, in return for voters' trust, Democrats must continue to deliver on issues that matter to ordinary Americans and show that we are the party that can deliver for our constituents.

Washington, it appears, is headed for two years of gridlock. This heightens the importance of state and local leaders, who must play a critical role through their work by putting forth innovative policies and by making the most of federal investments, including in infrastructure, housing and a clean-energy economy. Here's how:

First and foremost, state and local leaders must stay focused on issues that matter to voters. They have a tremendous opportunity to do so and to show the value of Democrats' approach to government, by making wise use of investments approved by Congress and signed into law by President Biden over the past two years.

The American Rescue Plan, for example, did more than just save scores of small businesses that were struggling to recover from the COVID pandemic. State and local leaders are using the funding to bolster child care initiatives in Columbus, Ohio, and expand broadband access in Brownsville, Texas. In Kansas City, Mo., local leaders are using that funding to address the issues of homelessness and affordable housing.

Similarly, school districts across the Nation will be transitioning from diesel-fueled school buses to electric ones through funding from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. The demand for electric buses was so overwhelming that the Environmental Protection Agency doubled the amount of funding available at the end of last year, to nearly \$1 billion. Cleaner buses mean cleaner air

for the children and neighborhoods, as well as long-term financial savings for school districts.

There is the potential for thousands more projects across the nation to repair aging roads and bridges, and huge opportunities to grow a clean-energy economy that is sustainable and pays well. Plus, thousands of high-paying jobs will be created through the CHIPS and Science Act, an initiative to bring high-tech manufacturing back to American cities and towns.

Though the federal laws were largely pushed by Democrats, folks in red, purple, and blue states also reap the benefits. Increasing broadband access is not an issue of the political left or right but an American issue. The same can be said of safe bridges, access to affordable child care, quality education, and protecting our planet for future generations.

In addition, elected leaders must maintain focus on preserving and strengthening democracy. This means building upon safeguards to ensure that American elections continue to be safe from interference and malfeasance; expanding access to voting, both in-person and by mail; and fighting against anti-democratic and anti-voting legislation.

While Jim Crow-type voter discrimination tactics may appear to be in the rearview mirror, the North Carolina Supreme Court ruled in December 2022 that a GOP-backed voting law “was motivated by a racially discriminatory purpose,” adding that the law was “formulated with an impermissible intent to discriminate against African American voters.” Voting rights underpin all other rights in a functioning democracy. While some may seek to suppress the voices of Black and brown Americans, Democrats must continue to listen and heed the voices of all voters.

Finally, Democrats cannot be distracted by fights that don’t matter to their constituents. Rather than comment on the chaos in the House, state and local leaders should use every opportunity to show constituents what a functioning governing body can deliver in terms of good-paying jobs, affordable child care, and access to fast, reliable internet connections. After all, this is what voters have demanded.

Much success over the past two years came from local elected officials working with state officials, who together work with federal officials to bring positive change to communities. This is what happens when those who believe in government—who believe in democracy—work together for the betterment of us all.

Democrats can—and must—continue that work for the next two years. By being beholden to extreme members of their party, it seems that Republicans in Washington may continue to deliver nothing but turmoil.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, I am. Are you prepared to take notes?

Mr. McGOVERN. Okay. I will give you copies of what I am saying so you can have them.

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

Madam Speaker, at the end of the day, it is not just about the legislation here. It is about two competing visions for America.

Democrats want an economy that lifts all people up. We are fighting for workers. We want opportunities for kids, success for families, and dignity for seniors. We want democracy to be secure at home and around the world. We have a vision of a better future and an idea of how to get there.

The bills today show, once again, that Republicans are more interested in division and taking us backward and turning back the clock on reproductive freedom, on voting rights, on lowering prices, on holding big corporations accountable. On all these things and more, the majority wants to drag us back. That is what their party now stands for. That is why we are wasting time with more misguided MAGA junk instead of working together to get things done for the American people.

I know those who are watching this debate maybe think this is a little bit strange, the topics that we are talking about here today. I think my Republican friends are confused what House they are in.

Again, they are not in Home Depot. They are in the House of Representatives. We ought to be debating big issues. We ought to be moving this country forward. Instead, we are dealing with this garbage. This is a waste of time. It is a waste of time.

I get it. Republicans are beholden to the most extreme elements of their Conference, but we could actually find common ground and get stuff done. We don’t have to agree on everything to agree on something. Surely there are some things we can agree on that we have in common that we can move forward to help move this country in the right direction.

Instead, it is all the same old same old. Every bill that comes to the floor has all these anti-abortion riders, anti-LGBTQ riders, anti-anything-that-is-good riders. This has to stop. This has to stop. We can do better.

Again, I respectfully suggest to the chairman of the Rules Committee that one of the ways we could do better is that the gentleman can open up the debates a little bit more. We have four completely closed rules and no opportunity for any amendments. There is one structured rule, and only Republican amendments are made in order. All of the bipartisan and Democratic amendments, totally rule compliant, were shut out.

That is not the way to find common ground. That is not the way to move legislation forward in the way where it will eventually become law. We can do better. We have to do better. If not, I

will say the American people in November, I think, will make a different choice, and we will be able to get back on the right track.

Madam Speaker, again, I wish we were doing something more substantive here today other than talking about refrigerators and dishwashers. I wish we were doing something more positive other than trying to repress the vote in this country, but it is what it is.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote down this rule, to open up this House, and to reject these awful, awful garbage bills.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I agree with the ranking member. We don’t have to agree on everything to agree on something. In fact, 81 percent of the Rules Committee measures passed in this Congress have garnered bipartisan votes on the underlying measures for final passage.

We do keep hearing the points made on the other side that the legislation on the SAVE Act is not necessary and that noncitizen voting is already illegal. It is also illegal to simply walk across the border into this country without the proper authorization, and yet it happens every single day.

Noncitizens registering to vote is not a hypothetical. In 2019, Pennsylvania admitted that it had inadvertently allowed over 10,000 noncitizens to register to vote. Texas found nearly 100,000 noncitizen registrations. I think 100,000 would cause a significant impact on a Federal election.

In 2020, when Illinois implemented automatic voter registration, more than 500 noncitizens were accidentally registered to vote.

As of May 2023, the Virginia Department of Election Officials have removed over 1,400 registrants from its official voter registration rolls with a reported reason for removal due to noncitizen status. Of those noncitizens who were removed, 335 individuals had cast a ballot in Virginia elections over the previous 4 years. In total, these noncitizens cast over 800 ballots.

To the question as to whether or not these offenses were prosecuted, in response to inquiries, the Virginia Attorney General’s Office said that it had no prosecution records related to this illegal voting even though voting illegally is a class C felony in Virginia. The SAVE Act is really essential to close those loopholes.

I do find it sometimes perplexing when I hear the arguments on the other side that purportedly Democrats are here in defense of democracy and somehow Republicans are opposed to democracy. I will remind my friends on the other side of the House that it is not us who are attempting to undo the

votes of millions of Democrats nationwide to remove the nominee of their party from their ballot.

Madam Speaker, America is in a state of crisis. The southern border is wide open. Americans are paying for it with their lives. The Biden administration has turned its efforts to change protections under Title IX. I reiterate that, with the number of illegal aliens who have entered our country since President Biden took office, we should almost wish for a border czar in a situation like this.

There have been over 7 million encounters with illegal aliens at our southern border, and the number of got-aways has increased by 390 percent. Americans are losing their lives. This is not just theoretical. Americans are losing their lives due to this administration's failure to protect our sovereignty.

I have said it here on the House floor before. Let me repeat it now: Jocelyn Nungaray, Rachel Morin, Laken Riley, Alex Wise, Lizbeth Medina, Melissa Powell, Riordan Powell, and Travis Wolfe are just a few of those names who were taken from their families by this crisis at the southern border. How many more Americans will have to be named before the Biden administration acts?

House Republicans do have a solution. We passed it last May. H.R. 2 would be instrumental in securing the southern border and dissuading the abuse of our immigration system, providing funding to hire and train more Border Patrol agents, and hold Secretary Mayorkas and President Biden accountable for their inability to protect the American people.

Certainly, my colleagues would not oppose Mr. ROY's good-faith measure to ensure that those who come to this country illegally are not able to vote illegally. The right to vote in America is fundamental to what it means to be American. By ensuring that only American citizens are taking part in this tradition, we can safeguard the integrity of our electoral system and guarantee that the right to vote does not lose its importance.

Your vote matters. My vote matters. It is an extension of our voice. It is our participation in this country, our right to speak for what policies we want to see enacted and what leaders we want to see in office. It is important to protect this right as it is important to secure our southern border.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Members to support this rule and support the underlying measures. I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1341 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the

consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOLINARO) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1341; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1341, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8281, SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 165, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "NON-DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8772, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7700, STOP UNAFFORDABLE DISHWASHER STANDARDS ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7637, REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1341) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance"; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8772) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 186, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—194

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Aderholt | Armstrong | Banks |
| Alford | Bacon | Barr |
| Allen | Baird | Bean (FL) |
| Amodei | Balderson | Bentz |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Bergman | Gosar | Murphy | McBath | Phillips | Stanton | Cammack | Hill | Norman |
| Bice | Graves (LA) | Nehls | McClellan | Pingree | Stevens | Carey | Hinson | Nunn (IA) |
| Biggs | Graves (MO) | Newhouse | McCollum | Pocan | Strickland | Carl | Houchin | Obernolte |
| Bilirakis | Green (TN) | Norman | McGarvey | Porter | Suozzi | Carter (GA) | Hudson | Ogles |
| Bishop (NC) | Grothman | Nunn (IA) | McGovern | Pressley | Swalwell | Carter (TX) | Huizenga | Owens |
| Boebert | Guthrie | Obernolte | Meeks | Quigley | Sykes | Chavez-DeRemer | Issa | Palmer |
| Bost | Hageman | Ogles | Menendez | Ramirez | Takano | Ciscomani | Jackson (TX) | Pence |
| Brecheen | Harris | Owens | Meng | Ross | Thanedar | Cline | James | Perry |
| Buchanan | Harshbarger | Palmer | Mfume | Ruppersberger | Thompson (CA) | Cloud | Johnson (LA) | Pfluger |
| Bucshon | Hern | Pence | Morelle | Ryan | Thompson (MS) | Clyde | Johnson (SD) | Reschenthaler |
| Burchett | Higgins (LA) | Pfluger | Moulton | Salinas | Tlaib | Cole | Jordan | Posey |
| Burgess | Hill | Posey | Mrvan | Sarbanes | Tokuda | Collins | Joyce (OH) | Rodgers (WA) |
| Burlison | Hinson | Mullin | Scanlon | Tonko | Comer | Crane | Kean (NJ) | Rogers (AL) |
| Calvert | Houchin | Reschenthaler | Nadler | Schakowsky | Torres (CA) | Crawford | Kelly (MS) | Rogers (KY) |
| Cammack | Hudson | Rodgers (AL) | Napolitano | Schiff | Torres (NY) | Curtis | Kelly (PA) | Rose |
| Carey | Huizenga | Rogers (KY) | Neal | Schneider | Trahan | D'Esposito | Kiggans (VA) | Rouzer |
| Carl | Issa | Rose | Neguse | Scholten | Underwood | Vargas | Davidson | Roy |
| Carter (GA) | Jackson (TX) | Rosendale | Nickel | Schrader | Watson | De La Cruz | Kiley | Rulli |
| Carter (TX) | James | Norcross | Perez | Sorensen | Watson Coleman | Kim (CA) | DesJarlais | Rutherford |
| Chavez-DeRemer | Johnson (LA) | Rouzer | Scott (VA) | Vasquez | Wild | LeLa Cruz | Kustoff | Scalise |
| Ciscomani | Johnson (SD) | Roy | Ocasio-Cortez | Scott, David | Williams (GA) | Estes | LaHood | Schweikert |
| Cline | Joyce (PA) | Rulli | Pallone | Veasey | Williams (GA) | Ezell | LaLota | Scott, Austin |
| Cloud | Kean (NJ) | Rutherford | Panetta | Velázquez | Wild | Fallon | LaMalfa | Self |
| Cole | Kelly (MS) | Scalise | Pappas | Wasserman | Williams (GA) | Lawler | Lamborn | Sessions |
| Collins | Kelly (PA) | Schweikert | Pascarella | Sherrill | Watson | Lee (FL) | Lee (FL) | Simpson |
| Comer | Kiggans (VA) | Perez | Slotkin | Schultz | Watson Coleman | LaTurner | Smith (MO) | Smith (NE) |
| Crane | Kiley | Self | Sorensen | Trotter | Watson Coleman | Smith (NE) | Smith (NJ) | Smith (NJ) |
| Crawford | Kim (CA) | Sessions | Weston | Watson Coleman | Williams (GA) | Fallon | Lesko | Smucker |
| Curtis | Kustoff | Simpson | Wexton | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | LaHood | Letlow | Spartz |
| D'Esposito | LaLota | Smith (MO) | Arrington | Griffith | Williams (GA) | DesJarlais | Lopez | Stauber |
| Davidson | LaMalfa | Smith (NE) | Babin | Grijalva | Williams (GA) | Ferguson | Loudermilk | Stefanik |
| De La Cruz | Lamborn | Smith (NJ) | Beyer | Guest | Williams (GA) | Finstad | Lucas | Stefanik |
| DesJarlais | Langworthy | Smucker | Bowman | Harder (CA) | Williams (GA) | Fischbach | Fitzgerald | Stiel |
| Duarte | Latta | Spartz | Cárdenas | Hunt | Williams (GA) | Fitzpatrick | Luetkemeyer | Stiel |
| Duncan | LaTurner | Stauber | Clyburn | Jackson (IL) | Williams (GA) | Fleischmann | Luna | Steube |
| Dunn (FL) | Lawler | Stefanik | Clyde | Jackson Lee | Williams (GA) | Flood | Mace | Strong |
| Edwards | Lee (FL) | Steil | Crenshaw | Jordan | Salazar | Fong | Malliotakis | Tenney |
| Ellzey | Letlow | Steube | Davis (IL) | Joyce (OH) | Sánchez | Fox | Maloy | Thompson (PA) |
| Emmer | Lopez | Strong | Diaz-Balart | LaHood | Smith (WA) | Franklin, Scott | Mann | Tiffany |
| Estes | Loudermilk | Tenney | Donalds | Lesko | Spanberger | Fry | McCaull | Timmons |
| Ezell | Lucas | Thompson (PA) | Evans | Luttrell | Steel | Fulcher | McClain | Turner |
| Fallon | Luetkemeyer | Tiffany | Gallego | Massie | Titus | Gaetz | McClintock | Valadao |
| Feenstra | Luna | Timmons | Garamendi | Mast | Trone | Garbarino | McCormick | Van Drew |
| Ferguson | Mace | Turner | Garcia (TX) | Meuser | Waters | Garcia, Mike | McHenry | Van Duyne |
| Finstad | Malliotakis | Valadao | Gimenez | Mooney | Weber (TX) | Gonzales, Tony | Meuser | Van Orden |
| Fischbach | Maloy | Van Drew | Granger | Moore (AL) | Wilson (FL) | Good (VA) | Miller (IL) | Wagner |
| Fitzgerald | Mann | Van Duyne | Greene (GA) | Moore (WI) | Wilson (FL) | Gooden (TX) | Miller (OH) | Walberg |
| Fitzpatrick | McCaull | Van Orden | Wagner | Waters | Williams (GA) | Gosar | Miller (WV) | Waltz |
| Fleischmann | McClain | Walberg | Walberg | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Miller-Meeks | Webster (FL) | Wenstrup |
| Flood | McClintock | Waltz | Waltz | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Graves (LA) | Mills | Westerman |
| Fong | McCormick | Webster (FL) | Webster (FL) | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Graves (MO) | Green (TN) | Williams (NY) |
| Foxx | McHenry | Wenstrup | Wenstrup | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Graves (MO) | Molinaro | Williams (TX) |
| Franklin, Scott | Miller (IL) | Westerman | Westerman | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Green (TN) | Moolenaar | Wilson (SC) |
| Fry | Miller (OH) | Williams (NY) | Williams (NY) | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Greene (GA) | Grothman | Wittman |
| Fulcher | Miller (WV) | Williams (TX) | Williams (TX) | Williams (GA) | Williams (GA) | Guthrie | Mooney | Womack |
| Gaetz | Miller-Meeks | Wilson (SC) | Wilson (SC) | Wilson (SC) | Wilson (SC) | Moore (AL) | Moore (UT) | Yakym |
| Garbarino | Mills | Wittman | Wittman | Wittman | Wittman | Hageman | Harris | Zinke |
| Garcia, Mike | Molinaro | Womack | Yakym | Yakym | Yakym | Harshbarger | Harshbarger | |
| Gonzales, Tony | Moolenaar | Yakym | Zinke | Zinke | Zinke | Hern | Hern | |
| Good (VA) | Moore (UT) | Zinke | | | | Higgins (LA) | Higgins (LA) | |
| Gooden (TX) | Moran | | | | | | | |

NAYS—186

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Adams | Correa | Horsford | | | | | | |
| Aguilar | Costa | Houlahan | | | | | | |
| Allred | Courtney | Hoyer | | | | | | |
| Amo | Craig | Hoyle (OR) | | | | | | |
| Auchincloss | Crockett | Huffman | | | | | | |
| Balint | Crow | Ivey | | | | | | |
| Barragán | Cuellar | Jackson (NC) | | | | | | |
| Beatty | Davids (KS) | Jacobs | | | | | | |
| Bera | Davis (NC) | Jayapal | | | | | | |
| Bishop (GA) | Dean (PA) | Jeffries | | | | | | |
| Blumenauer | DeGette | Johnson (GA) | | | | | | |
| Blunt Rochester | DeLauro | Kamlager-Dove | | | | | | |
| Bonamici | DelBene | Kaptur | | | | | | |
| Boyle (PA) | Deluzio | Keating | | | | | | |
| Brown | DeSaulnier | Kelly (IL) | | | | | | |
| Brownley | Dingell | Kennedy | | | | | | |
| Budzinski | Doggett | Khanna | | | | | | |
| Bush | Escobar | Kildee | | | | | | |
| Caraveo | Eshoo | Kilmer | | | | | | |
| Carbajal | Espaiatl | Kim (NJ) | | | | | | |
| Carson | Fletcher | Krishnamoorthi | | | | | | |
| Carter (LA) | Foster | Kuster | | | | | | |
| Cartwright | Foushee | Landsman | | | | | | |
| Casar | Frankel, Lois | Larsen (WA) | | | | | | |
| Case | Frost | Larson (CT) | | | | | | |
| Casten | García (IL) | Lee (CA) | | | | | | |
| Castor (FL) | Garcia, Robert | Lee (NV) | | | | | | |
| Castro (TX) | Golden (ME) | Lee (PA) | | | | | | |
| Cherifius- | Goldman (NY) | Leger Fernandez | | | | | | |
| McCormick | Gomez | Levin | | | | | | |
| Chu | Gonzalez, | Lieu | | | | | | |
| Clark (MA) | Vicente | Lofgren | | | | | | |
| Clarke (NY) | Gotheimer | Lynch | | | | | | |
| Cleaver | Green, Al (TX) | Magaziner | | | | | | |
| Cohen | Hayes | Manning | | | | | | |
| Connolly | Himes | Matsui | | | | | | |

NOT VOTING—53

□ 1350

Mr. CLINE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 338.

Stated against:

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 338.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 201, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—205

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Aderholt | Banks | Boebert | Casten | Garcia (IL) |
| Alford | Barr | Bost | Castor (FL) | Garcia, Robert |
| Allen | Bean (FL) | Brecheen | Castro (TX) | Golden (ME) |
| Amodei | Bentz | Buchanan | Cherifius- | Goldman (NY) |
| Armstrong | Arrington | Bergman | Goldman (NY) | Leger Fernandez |
| Bacon | Biggs | Burgess | Gomez | Gonzalez, |
| Baird | Bilirakis | Burchett | Clark (MA) | Lieu |
| Balderson | Bishop (NC) | Calvert | Clark (NY) | Lofgren |

NOES—201

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Adams | Clyburn | Hayes |
| Aguilar | Cohen | Himes |
| Allred | Connolly | Horsford |
| Amo | Correa | Houlahan |
| Auchincloss | Costa | Hoyer |
| Balint | Courtney | Hoyle (OR) |
| Barragán | Craig | Huffman |
| Beatty | Crockett | Ivey |
| Bera | Crow | Jackson (IL) |
| Beyer | Cuellar | Jackson (NC) |
| Bishop (GA) | Davids (KS) | Jacobs |
| Blumenauer | Davis (NC) | Jayapal |
| Blunt Rochester | Dean (PA) | Jeffries |
| Bonamici | DeGette | Johnson (GA) |
| Bowman | DeLauro | Kamlager-Dove |
| Boyle (PA) | DelBene | Kaptur |
| Brown | Deluzio | Keating |
| Brownley | DeSaulnier | Kelly (IL) |
| Budzinski | Dingell | Kennedy |
| Bush | Doggett | Khanna |
| Caraveo | Escobar | Kildee |
| Carbajal | Eshoo | Kilmer |
| Cárdenas | Espaiatl | Kim (NJ) |
| Carson | Fletcher | Krishnamoorthi |
| Carter (LA) | Foster | Kuster |
| Casten | Foushee | Landsman |
| Case | García (IL) | Larsen (WA) |
| Castor (FL) | Garcia, Robert | Larson (CT) |
| Castro (TX) | Golden (ME) | Lee (CA) |
| Cherifius- | Goldman (NY) | Lee (NV) |
| McCormick | Gomez | Lee (PA) |
| Chu | Gonzalez, | Leger Fernandez |
| Clark (MA) | Vicente | Lofgren |
| Clarke (NY) | Gotheimer | Lynch |
| Cleaver | Green, Al (TX) | Magaziner |
| Cohen | Hayes | Manning |
| Connolly | Himes | Matsui |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Manning | Phillips | Stansbury |
| Matsui | Pingree | Stanton |
| McBath | Pocan | Stevens |
| McClellan | Porter | Strickland |
| McCollum | Pressley | Suozzi |
| McGarvey | Quigley | Swalwell |
| McGovern | Ramirez | Sykes |
| Meeks | Raskin | Takano |
| Menendez | Rosendale | Thanedar |
| Meng | Ross | Thompson (CA) |
| Mfume | Ruiz | Thompson (MS) |
| Morelle | Ruppersberger | Titus |
| Moulton | Ryan | Tlaib |
| Mrvan | Salinas | Tokuda |
| Mullin | Sarbanes | Tonko |
| Nadler | Scanlon | Torres (CA) |
| Napolitano | Schakowsky | Torres (NY) |
| Neal | Schiff | Trahan |
| Neguse | Schneider | Trone |
| Nickel | Scholten | Underwood |
| Norcross | Schrier | Vargas |
| Ocasio-Cortez | Scott (VA) | Vasquez |
| Omar | Scott, David | Veasey |
| Pallone | Sewell | Velázquez |
| Panetta | Sherman | Wasserman |
| Pappas | Sherrill | Schultz |
| Pascrall | Slotkin | Waters |
| Pelosi | Smith (WA) | Watson Coleman |
| Perez | Sorensen | Wexton |
| Peters | Soto | Wild |
| Petterson | Spanberger | Williams (GA) |

NOT VOTING—27

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Babin | Gimenez | Massie |
| Crenshaw | Granger | Mast |
| Davis (IL) | Griffith | Moore (WI) |
| Diaz-Balart | Grijalva | Moskowitz |
| Donalds | Guest | Peltola |
| Evans | Harder (CA) | Salazar |
| Gallego | Hunt | Sánchez |
| Garamendi | Jackson Lee | Weber (TX) |
| Garcia (TX) | Luttrell | Wilson (FL) |

□ 1358

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to travel cancellations and delays relating to Hurricane Beryl that hit the Houston area, I was unable to vote during today's first vote series at 1:30 p.m.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted: NAY on Roll Call No. 338, H. Res. 1341, the motion on ordering the previous question; and NO on Roll Call No. 339, H. Res. 1341, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7700—Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act; H.R. 7637—Refrigerator Freedom Act; H.J. Res. 165—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Non-discrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance;” H.R. 8281—Safe-guard American Voter Eligibility Act; and H.R. 8772—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2025.

STOP UNAFFORDABLE
DISHWASHER STANDARDS ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1341, I call up the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7700

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act”.

SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING AND ENFORCING ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR DISHWASHERS.

(a) TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE AND ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a dishwasher under such section unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a dishwasher if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard is not technologically feasible or economically justified.

(b) PROHIBITION ON INCREASED COSTS TO CONSUMERS.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a dishwasher under such section unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a dishwasher if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard is likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

(c) SIGNIFICANT ENERGY SAVINGS REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a dishwasher under such section if the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of energy; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a dishwasher if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of energy.

(d) COVERED PRODUCT; ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARD.—In this section, the terms “covered product” and “energy conservation standard” have the meanings given such terms in section 321 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291).

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7700.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7700, Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act, and I thank Congressman LANGWORTHY for leading these efforts.

The Biden administration has lost sight of the original intent behind the Department of Energy conservation standards. Instead, they are contradicting the statutes and doing so at the expense of Americans' quality of life, their pocketbooks, and their energy bills.

Instead of harnessing the abundant resources we are blessed with in this country, the Biden administration wants to lower your standard of living by telling you what appliances you can have in your home, and they want you to pay more for it.

An analysis from the Department of Energy found that their dishwasher efficiency mandates would increase the upfront cost by up to 28 percent. It is estimated that these proposed standards may take consumers over 16 years to pay back the increased cost on a dishwasher that won't even last 12 years.

The Biden administration has abused the Department of Energy's appliance standard program to go beyond the authority granted to them by Congress by proposing these overreaching standards.

Americans will suffer the consequences of the Biden administration's rush-to-green agenda.

The DOE's net zero rush-to-green energy agenda is reaching into your home to impose cost increasing regulations on appliances in every corner of your home.

We have debated gas stoves and other appliances here, and now here we are today debating on dishwashers.

The Biden administration has proposed over 15 regulations that affect appliances, like I mentioned, not only gas stoves but hot water heaters, refrigerators, freezers, and now dishwashers.

They argue these regulations will save money and reduce emissions, but that is just simply not the case. One study found these regulations could increase the cost for the average American family by over \$9,000.

These increased efficiency standards mean Americans need to run their appliances twice as long to get the same effect, and we all know it. You run the dishwasher, you open it up, the dishes aren't clean, and you have got to run it again. It happens to every American family multiple times. You are not saving money. You are not saving water and electricity running your highly efficient appliances when you have to run them two or three times just to get the dishes clean or to get them dry.

This bill would prevent this abuse from the DOE, and it will prevent the Department from enforcing standards on dishwashers unless they are technologically feasible and economically justified, they are not likely to result in additional costs to the customer, and they won't enforce the standards unless they will result in a significant conservation of energy. American families know that is just simply not happening in their homes.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 7700, Stop the Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act, to protect affordability and preserve the quality of life that Americans expect and deserve.

I thank Representative LANGWORTHY for leading this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today's debate demonstrates why House Republicans simply cannot govern. This bill, H.R. 7700, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act, doesn't need to be brought up today because House Republicans already passed it 2 months ago as part of another larger bill.

In other words, today's debate is a waste of our time. It is clearly being brought up because Republicans simply don't have any other bills to bring to the floor. They are fresh out of ideas that can meet the approval of the extreme elements in their party.

Now, at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the American people want us to work together to build on the progress we have made to grow our economy for the future and lower everyday costs for American families, the House Republican majority wants to have another debate about protecting dishwashers even though this legislation will increase home energy bills on the average American family.

This bill would gut popular energy efficiency standards for dishwashers. Energy efficiency standards are popular for three key reasons. First, they save Americans money on their energy bills. Second, they boost innovation by modernizing appliances for the future. Third, they reduce greenhouse gas pollution in our ongoing efforts to combat the climate crisis.

□ 1415

The Biden administration's past and planned energy efficiency actions will save Americans \$1 trillion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than 2.5 billion metric tons over the next 30 years. I will repeat that: They will save Americans \$1 trillion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than 2.5 billion metric tons over the next 30 years. That is why there is so much support for these efficiency standards. This is something we should all support.

This used to be a bipartisan issue, but not anymore. Extreme Republicans have decided that they would rather do the bidding of corporate polluters as they continue to move forward with their polluters-over-people agenda.

H.R. 7700 attacks a popular and effective Department of Energy program that saves Americans money by setting efficiency standards on household appliances. It adds burdensome and duplicative language to the Department of Energy's process without defining any of its vague metrics.

This bill completely ignores the mechanisms and practices that already exist at the Department of Energy. Worst of all, it gravely threatens the Department of Energy's ability to implement and enforce the already-finalized dishwasher standards. In pushing this legislation, Republicans ignore the fact that the Department of Energy already must ensure that the standards are economically justifiable, technically feasible, and result in energy savings. Before the standards are put in place by the Department of Energy, it has to meet those standards.

In fact, the process works so well that the dishwasher standard targeted by this bill was actually the result of a consensus agreement between industry, efficiency advocates, and consumer advocates. Industry supports the standards. I don't know who supports the repeal, essentially, of these standards.

If my colleagues look at the details of the dishwasher efficiency standard, they will understand why there is so much support for it. The standard hasn't been updated in over a decade, and the new rules are expected to save Americans over \$3 billion on utility bills over 30 years. That is real savings, and the standards are attainable.

Dishwashers that meet the new standards are already on the market. People can buy them now. It doesn't even go into effect until 2027, but consumers can already buy these now because people want them.

It is clear that the appliance manufacturing industry doesn't feel burdened by the new standards. They support them.

Therefore, one has to question, again, why Republicans continue to fight against these commonsense standards. I have no idea other than their corporate and polluter friends.

The bill, along with the next bill we are debating, would not just impact the Department of Energy's ability to im-

plement the recently finalized standards, but it would also effectively overturn them. I want to stress that. These absurd bills include a provision that prohibits DOE from enforcing new or existing standards if they increase costs by even a penny, completely disregarding the massive consumer savings on future monthly home energy bills.

My point is, over a period of time, consumers will save a lot of money. My colleagues are saying if it just costs an extra penny at any point, then it shouldn't be allowed. This simply defies logic.

Again, the bill is designed to protect the interests of Republicans' oil and gas friends. The bill would create market uncertainty and threaten real savings for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill because it will increase home energy costs for American families and undermine our ongoing efforts to combat the worsening climate crisis. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the legislation would prevent the Department from enforcing standards on dishwashers unless they are technologically feasible and economically justified, unless they are not likely to result in additional costs to a consumer, and unless they will result in significant conservation of energy.

Americans know that this new standard and even older standards are not working. They are having to wash their dishes multiple times.

We have seen over and over agencies overreaching the constitutional mandate they were given. Thank goodness the Supreme Court last week overturned the Chevron deference, and now Congress can use other tools like pieces of legislation to direct agencies on what they should do and the limits they can do it under.

Sure, there is other legislation we ought to take up, but we have had to use Congressional Review Act legislation. We have had to use legislation like this to push back against these agencies and their overreach.

Thankfully, Mr. LANGWORTHY knows a lot about this. He filed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act, which will put the brakes on the Biden administration's relentless assault on efficient, affordable, and reliable appliances for everyday Americans through overbearing regulations.

When Congress enacted the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, the goal was straightforward: encourage a more efficient use of energy that is both practical and cost-efficient. Yet, the Biden administration has

abused and twisted this law beyond recognition to serve the radical, woke environmentalist agenda of the far left.

They are not just out of touch. They are making life more expensive for hardworking Americans. In fact, the Biden administration's own analysis of the proposed rule for the new efficiency standards admits that it would take more than 12 years for an American family to see \$17 in savings—\$17 over 12 years, and that is if their dishwasher lasts that long, which is really doubtful. This is a textbook example of Big Government overreach.

Here is the bottom line: Our country is in the midst of a historic affordability crisis. Millions of Americans cannot afford to buy their first home or even save for a rainy day. What does this Biden administration do? They pile on more regulations, more requirements, and higher standards onto the most basic household appliances.

To my friends across the aisle who disparage this legislation here today as trivial and unimportant, I encourage them to go explain right now to the average American family, already crushed by this Biden economy, that their daily struggles with skyrocketing costs don't matter. Go explain to seniors in my district living on fixed incomes why they should shell out thousands more to replace their basic home appliances to satisfy some radical environmentalist pipe dream. Go tell them that they should take a back seat to the Green New Deal agenda. Go tell them that the Biden administration knows better about what is best for them.

Why should Americans who are putting their groceries on credit cards be forced to deal with more out-of-touch, expensive regulations? The hard-working families, seniors, and constituents in my district might not matter to the Biden administration, but they matter to me.

That is why I introduced this legislation. By stripping away consumer choice and imposing draconian new regulations and standards that make absolutely no sense from an affordability and efficiency standpoint, this administration is making life harder for the American people, pure and simple.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. We cannot tackle this affordability crisis facing our country today if we don't stop the Biden administration's regulatory agenda dead in its tracks. I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 7700.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7637 and H.R. 7700, both of which are being considered this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that Republicans went home for Independence

Day, reflected upon all that great holiday means, and, as their first order of business back in D.C., brought up these redundant, anticonsumer bills.

Let it not be said that House Republicans don't care about people's rights. These bills support the rights of Chinese manufacturers to dump cheap, inferior products into the U.S. market. These bills support the right for utilities to bill Americans more just for keeping their refrigerators plugged in or running their dishwashers.

Strong efficiency standards reduce energy use and are proven to save Americans hundreds of dollars each and every year. These bills support the right of landlords to stick their renters with low-performing appliances.

Strong efficiency standards raise the bar for everyone. DOE's efficiency standards are required by law to be cost-effective, and they result in major savings for every American household. They also reduce energy demand, which makes our electric grid more reliable.

The refrigerator and dishwasher standards, which would be undone by the bills before us today, reflect the consensus of energy efficiency advocates, consumer advocates, and American home appliance manufacturers. That is right: Our own domestic manufacturers recognize the benefits of these standards and truly support DOE's rules.

We have wasted enough time. We have wasted enough energy already. Let's not stand in the way of the Department of Energy and American manufacturers that want to support the development of the next generation of innovative, cost-effective, and energy efficient appliances.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Members to do the proconsumer and patriotic thing by rejecting these bills today.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7700, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act or the SUDS Act.

Time and again, we have seen the Biden administration's radical rush-to-green agenda negatively impact the lives of hardworking Americans, including their freedom to choose what household appliances meet their needs—first, gas stoves, and now, dishwashers and refrigerators. It is hard to believe that under this administration, the most regulated space in America is the kitchen and laundry room.

Under the guise of energy efficiency, this administration is issuing new standards that will significantly drive up costs, reduce reliability, and jeopardize the availability of numerous home appliances.

House Republicans will continue to lead on legislative solutions that protect American families from out-of-touch, top-down rules. The American people want choice.

When I talk to my constituents in Georgia's 12th District, they want relief from record inflation and rising prices. Yet, the Biden administration is moving forward with issuing standards that could increase the upfront cost of dishwashers by 28 percent and the upfront cost of refrigerators by 25 percent, according to the DOE's own analysis.

President Biden's war on American energy is crushing families' budgets nationwide, which is why I am proud to support the SUDS Act, as well as legislation being debated later today that will protect affordability, quality, and choice for residential dishwashers, refrigerators, and freezers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on these bills.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7700. It is a bill that will saddle American families with higher costs.

This is not a serious bill, but it is rather emblematic of the least protective Congress in modern times. Rather than focus on improving the lives of our neighbors back home and lowering costs, Republicans, as my colleague from New York said, went home for the Fourth of July recess and talked to their neighbors about what the Congress could do to improve their lives, and the first bill that they bring up on the floor is one to gut energy efficient dishwashers.

Let's talk about energy efficiency because it is popular. Where does it come from? Years ago, the Congress acted in a bipartisan way and directed the Department of Energy to every few years update efficiency standards for the appliances that power our lives: our air-conditioners, dishwashers, refrigerators. American manufacturers have responded.

Americans know this. Our appliances have gotten better and better over time. They save us money. They save us water. That is really important right now, that we can put a little bit more money back into our pockets. It is a win-win-win for us.

I have already heard some misleading statements on the floor today, and I think we need to clear those up.

When the Department of Energy creates new efficiency standards, whether it is for dishwashers or other appliances, it does so in collaboration with industry, with the support of industry and appliance manufacturers. The final standards for dishwashers were adopted in April, and they reflect the recommendations from the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers. That is a trade association of 30 leading appliance makers.

□ 1430

Second, they have said that this is a mandate and that all Americans have to go buy these dishwashers.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are smart. They know that is not true. If you want an inefficient dishwasher or if you want to return to the days of hand-washing your dishes, then that is your right to do so. However, it is important that we prod appliance makers to be more innovative and to be more efficient. The guiding star—in fact, it is called Energy Star—is to save consumers money, to cut pollution, and to help put a little more money back in their pockets.

In creating new energy efficiency standards, DOE does so with consumer savings as its guiding force. According to the agency calculations, consumers will save \$3.2 billion on utility bills over 30 years from the dishwasher standards alone.

For my neighbors back home in Florida who are paying exorbitant electric bills right now because they don't use the power of the sunshine, they are mostly on gas, boy, this is a godsend for them to be able to put some money back into their pockets.

Since we have so much time to debate dishwashers today, I will spend a little time on a public service announcement.

Mr. Speaker, if you go to energy.gov/save, there are additional savings for you and your family. There are rebates on appliances and new heat pumps. There are tax credits for various appliances and upgrading your home. Many of these were adopted by Democrats in a Democratic-led Congress in the Inflation Reduction Act. That is our historic clean energy and climate resilience law. It has been difficult to get through the noise of this chaotic Congress to make sure that families understand the cost savings that are available to them, but that is at energy.gov/save. There are enormous rebates and tax credits to help you with the cost of living.

The Consumer Federation of America, a consumer advocacy group, said about the new dishwasher efficiency standard: The Department of Energy's new efficiency standards for dishwashers are a significant victory for both consumers and the environment. The standards require simple changes that will positively impact most households.

If the appliance makers, consumer advocacy groups, and environmental organizations all support the Department of Energy's energy efficiency standards, I know many of you are wondering, then why do House Republicans oppose them?

Another common theme in this chaotic Congress has been the Republicans' allegiance to polluters and utility companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I was about to answer the question on everyone's mind: Why would anyone oppose put-

ting money back into the pockets of hardworking American families?

It is because the GOP is so aligned with oil and gas companies that they want you to use as much energy as possible. The utility companies want you to use as much energy as possible, Mr. Speaker, because that benefits their bottom line and not yours.

Rather than do the dirty work for polluters and electric utilities, I would say: Let's stand up for the families we represent and put money back into their pockets. Whether it is a dishwasher, a refrigerator, an AC, or whatever it is, they need a little bit of relief. We are here to serve them and not the special interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, we often talk about kitchen table issues, and what better time to elevate those issues than this week, which you all have declared in honor of refrigerator freedom.

Specifically, as I was walking around July Fourth, I heard a lot of issues from my constituents about refrigerators.

Some of them asked: Who put the meat in the crisper drawer?

That was a big fight.

Why aren't you using the egg holder for your eggs?

If you use the last of the mustard, don't just put it back in the fridge; go to the store and get some more mustard.

That is a fight.

There is the always controversial: Should we or should we not replace a perfectly good refrigerator just because it doesn't match our cabinets?

These are the real issues that are bothering Americans around their kitchen table when they talk about refrigerators. If those sound silly, I will only point out that those issues are vastly more important, more substantive, and are legitimate points of debate. You can argue both sides of any of those issues more than anything in this bill because this bill doesn't address those issues. All it does is gut efficiency standards that if left in place will save American consumers more than \$3 billion on their utility bills over the next three decades.

I am going to say this very slowly so everybody across the aisle can understand: If you save energy, then you don't have to pay for energy.

I think you all know this, Mr. Speaker, because some of you have probably at some point said to your kids: Shut the window. I have got the AC on. I don't want to waste energy. I don't want to waste money when I cool my house.

That is the same thing here in these standards.

Also, I think, as anybody who has ever sat around a kitchen table knows, Americans kind of like to save money on their energy bills. Here we find ourselves with efficiency standards in place that lower Americans' utility bills, and Republicans are proposing legislation to block Americans from access to cheaper energy in the name of refrigerator freedom. God bless refrigerators.

I oppose this bill because it is bad for consumers, it is bad for the environment, and, quite honestly, it is bad for this institution because it is a waste of our time.

Furthermore, at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If House rules permitted, I would have offered this motion with an important amendment to this bill, and my amendment would require that the act not take effect until the Secretary of Energy submits to Congress a certification that this act, including amendments made by this act, will not result in higher energy costs for American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration's own Department of Energy in their analysis finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront costs by 28 percent and it could take consumers 12 years to pay back the increased cost on a product like a dishwasher that may only last 7 to 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to take you 12 years to pay for something that may wear out in 7 years based on DOE's own analysis. That makes no sense.

The gentlewoman mentioned earlier that Republicans were not wanting to help American consumers, that they want to take money out of their pocket. This is actually the opposite of that. We are wanting to help save the American public money over time by stopping these reckless rush-to-green regulations like we are voting on today dealing with both refrigerators and dishwashers and then gas stoves but only because they have a green agenda that really wants to do away with fossil fuels. Let's just call it what it is. That is their agenda, to end the use of fossils fuels in the United States of America at a time when we, as a growing nation, growing population, and growing metropolitan centers, need more energy. The demand for energy is only going up. It is not going down. The continued war against American-

produced fossil fuels is costing Americans' ability to improve their quality of life and their standard of living.

We need to continue debating the need for efficient, reliable, affordable, and dispatchable energy resources, something that is 24/7/365 always on, always ready, always available, not weather-dependent, and not sunlight-dependent, intermittent energy sources. We need to continue debating that. Instead, we are having to push back against an administration that, under broad legislation passed by the United States Congress, has given them the ability to write rules and make regulations without the necessary congressional oversight in many cases. That is why, I believe, the Supreme Court overturned the Chevron deference to say that these agencies don't just have carte blanche to do whatever political agenda pushes them in the mindset to do.

I think Congress needs to focus on really defining what those rules are in the legislation we pass here, and I think that is what the Supreme Court is ultimately going to force us to do. They it made very clear with no ambivalence and no ambiguity.

We have a Nation that is hurting because of the Biden economic factors that are causing inflation. It started with energy on day one by stopping the Keystone pipeline, ending lease sales on the Outer Continental Shelf, destroying the American energy base.

The Democrats will say: Well, energy production is up.

It is, but it is up because of past administration policies that expanded oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf and on Federal land. These things don't pop up out of the ground overnight. It takes decades sometimes to get an energy product to producing. The permitting process alone takes years. Then you have to find the resource and produce the resource and get it online where Americans can benefit from it.

Guess who else can benefit from it, Mr. Speaker. The world can. With the abundance of natural gas we have in this country, we could be a tremendous exporter. We export a lot, but we could do a lot more because of the abundance of natural gas we have here to help the quality of life and standard of living of people all over the globe. Yet this administration says we are going to put this pause, which was basically a ban, on LNG exports.

That hurts our allies in Europe who are facing Vladimir Putin's cutting on and off the spigot of natural gas. It hurts folks around the world who are in energy poverty, and America could help raise them out of that poverty.

Americans know they are hurting because it started with energy. We talk a lot about that. Americans also see a border that is wide open and 16-plus million people who have crossed our southern border who are raping and killing American citizens. The crime rates are going up in cities. They are

straining our social services at the State level and in our own communities causing our property taxes to go up and our State income taxes to go up to pay for folks who aren't even legally in the United States of America. That is because of Joe Biden's open-border policies.

Sure, we ought to debate a lot of things in this Congress instead of debating regulations on efficiency standards on dishwashers, gas stoves, refrigerators, freezers, and all these things, but the Biden administration has definitely overreached in these areas. It is because they have a green agenda that they are pushing.

Republicans want to help Americans maintain their standard of living, improve their standard of living, and improve their quality of life. We can do that by lowering taxes. We can do that by improving the economy which the Biden economic policies have not done. We saw tremendous spending in the IRA and other things. More government spending equates to higher inflation. That is not me saying it. That is economists all over the globe who understand that simple concept.

We want to improve the quality of life of people and not make their appliances that they rely on every day be less efficient, cost more, and in the case of dishwashers, having to pay for something that wore out 3 or 4 years ago and they are still paying on it. If you factor in the cost savings, it is pennies a day. In fact, it is probably pennies a year. It gets into less than a \$20 savings over the life of the appliance. That is not saving the American people money.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7700, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act. Let's protect affordability, and let's preserve the quality of life for Americans.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. PORTER. I think it is important before we legislate on something to know something about it. I know a lot about dishwashers because I am a single mom, and I load, unload, load, unload, rinse, and buy detergent.

So I wonder if the gentleman who is supporting this legislation about dishwashers and proposing to be an expert in what the American people want in their dishwashers would be willing to engage in a little colloquy with me about dishwashers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Are you willing to engage in this?

Representative DUNCAN, I would like to know if you know what the average utility cost is per month to run a dishwasher?

No. He doesn't know. It is \$2 to \$4 a month.

In other words, about one-third of a frappuccino: \$2 to \$4 a month.

□ 1445

Mr. DUNCAN, do you know about how much a dishwasher costs, Representative DUNCAN, like a mid-range dishwasher?

Nope, he doesn't know. About \$800, \$900. If you want to get fancier, like a thousand.

Representative DUNCAN, do you know the best ways and the most important things you can do to make your dishwasher get the dishes clean?

Nope. The gentleman is not a dishwasher expert. Loading it correctly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member will be reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, do you know what the most important technique is to load a dishwasher correctly? It is loading it correctly.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot about the Biden so-called border crisis. What I haven't heard about is anything about dishwashers. As somebody who saved and scrimped and was so proud to get a new dishwasher and can tell you a lot about them, what they cost, what kinds of features they have, how to load it properly, which I wish every person, every man and child in America, would listen to their wife—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. I wish everyone would listen to their spouse about how to load the dishwasher correctly. Those are the most important things that make your dishes get clean.

This bill is ridiculous. It is Congress at its worst, a bunch of people who haven't unloaded a dishwasher ever telling the American people with legislation what kind of dishwashers they should or should not be able to buy.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, to address the gentlewoman, I wasn't going to engage in a colloquy on the floor during a debate on this issue, but I do load and unload the dishwasher.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that, many times, I have opened the dishwasher, loaded properly, with the right amount of dishwashing liquid or pod put in, that all the dishes aren't clean. They were rinsed off before they were put in, to the gentlewoman.

I would run it again. Americans know this. This isn't just me and my household. Americans know they have to run the dishwasher oftentimes more than once.

How is that a cost savings? How is it a cost savings when you have to run it more than once?

Americans know you open that dishwasher after its cycle, and apparently the heating component of the efficiency standards didn't dry the dishes, so they get them out before they put them in the cabinet because you don't want to put wet dishes up. You get a towel down, and you dry every one of them off. Cup, knife, fork, plate, pan, you dry it off before you put it up.

Mr. Speaker, you might as well have just washed it in the sink versus using an inefficient dishwasher that is becoming more and more inefficient based on these standards. I am not going to stand here and be lectured by someone who seemed very pious about dishwashers or washing laundry or loading a refrigerator properly to stay away from the hotspots because we are going to go to refrigerators next.

I am sure some of these same comments are going to be brought up. Guess what, I don't have to because the American people know. The American people know what they deal with every day, and they know they are going to pay more for an appliance that is less efficient, and they may still be paying for it when the thing is worn out. That is unfair to the American people. We should be about improving the standard of living and quality of life of Americans.

I will address one other thing that the gentlewoman said: the so-called border crisis. Every American knows we have a border crisis. We have had over 16 million people in our country not with a visa, not with a permission slip, to come here illegally. They reside in our communities because guess what? Every State is a border State now, even California and even South Carolina, where I come from because these migrants have been bussed or flown at taxpayer expense into our communities.

I won't stand here and hear it be called a so-called border crisis because Americans know it is a border crisis when 16 million people illegally enter. We are not talking about 6, but 16 million or more. Those are just the ones we know about.

What about the ones that the Border Patrol see cross the border, who go into the bushes, and they go after them? They can't find them, and they are not counted in the got-away numbers because they have been told that those migrants may have gone back across the border, so they are not counting those numbers.

What about the ones who cross the border in areas that aren't patrolled currently, those people who come through who have no encounter with law enforcement at all, who are never counted. They may have nefarious goals in mind because all of these illegal aliens that have crossed our border aren't just from Mexico or Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Latin-American countries. A lot of them are com-

ing from China and Russia and the Middle East. America knows we have no idea who is in our country.

Let me say that again: Americans, we have no idea who is in our country.

When I got into this conversation about energy prices and the border and economics and inflation, high interest rates, cost of goods costing more now than they did 4 years ago, oftentimes 28, 30, 35 percent more, Americans know. They don't want to pay more for an appliance that is inefficient. That is the gist of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to the dishwashers and clarify some of the facts here. Republicans are throwing around a lot of numbers that I believe are not true. Yesterday, at the Rules Committee, we heard from Republicans that the new dishwasher standards will take 12 years for consumers to break even, and Members cited Department of Energy as a source for this number.

However, the 12-year payback period is in reference to a DOE evaluation of a proposed standard from May of last year. Department of Energy didn't actually adopt that rule. The actual payback period for the rule that was finalized is 3.9 years, and the estimated average lifetime of the dishwasher is way longer.

DOE estimates that the price increase for dishwashers going from the lowest efficiency to the new minimum efficiency standard required will be \$26, and these \$26 will be paid back in less than 4 years.

Additionally, the price of most dishwashers is not expected to increase at all. Many models already meet the standards or only require small adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are using old data to trivialize the savings from the standards and exaggerate the costs. As we have said over and over, the Department of Energy considers the technology, the costs, and the savings in this process. This bill is about gutting agencies and deregulating everything and trying to sell it to the American people as a consumer protection, which it is not.

I clear up a few other misconceptions which seemed to be circulating on the Republican side. At yesterday's Rules meeting, my Republican colleagues expressed outrage that the Department of Energy employees are setting appliance efficiency standards, implying that this isn't their job and that this is just another example of the Biden administration overreach, but the truth is this is their job.

These efficiency standards are congressionally mandated. The Energy Policy and Conservation Act requires that the Department of Energy evaluate and finalize appliance energy conservation standards and the appliance energy conservation program at the

Department of Energy was created in 1987. Who was President in 1987? Ronald Reagan. This program was created under a Republican President with a Republican-controlled Senate and a Democratic House.

Republicans are not upset about the specifics of the conservation standards, believe me. The majority is upset about the existence of standards at all. If one looks at Project 2025, their policy proposals for a second Trump administration, the excessive gutting of critical Federal programs that help all Americans will be seen all over the place.

Let me give an example. Not many Americans have heard of Project 2025, which is this shadowy effort led by former Trump administration officials and those who would staff a second Trump administration to implement far-right policies. It calls for radical ideas, such as banning abortion nationwide, cutting taxes for the rich, and ending the independence of the Department of Justice.

Front and center in Project 2025's plans for the Department of Energy is an idea "to eliminate energy efficiency standards for appliances." The war Republicans have declared on energy efficiency is not organic. It is a small part of a larger effort to attack American institutions and dismantle the parts of the government that keep us safe and save consumers money.

I want everyone to understand that what we are talking about here with energy efficiency standards is just part of a larger effort to basically eliminate all consumer protections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please not fall for the Republican framing of these issues. Energy efficiency used to be bipartisan, and it helps all Americans. It helps all Americans. Nobody is opposed to it other than this ideological crusade on the part of the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that our Members vote against the bill, this bill and the next one that follows on refrigerators, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, enacted in 1975, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act provides specific criteria for the DOE to follow in order to propose a new appliance efficiency standard. I went over those standards earlier. The Biden administration has consistently ignored these requirements by proposing and finalizing standards that violate the statute.

Mr. Speaker, I owe the gentleman from New Jersey an apology because I misspoke earlier when I said the payback period was 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a link to the Federal Register, Wednesday, April 24, 2024. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2024-04-24/pdf/2024-08211.pdf>.

This is a table in the Federal Register, and it says it is a 16-year payback for dishwashers. I said 12. I apologize for misspeaking because it is really 16 years. This is not just words. These are in the Federal Register.

Americans know that these standards will lessen the efficiency of appliances, will cost them more in upfront costs, and ultimately cost them more in inconvenience, in multiple run cycles, in cost over the lifetime when you have a 16-year payback.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right piece of legislation to push back against the administrative overreach, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7700, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Casten of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7700 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. CASTEN is as follows:

Mr. Casten moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7700 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits to Congress a certification that the implementation of this Act will not result in increasing energy costs for consumers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

□ 1500

REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1341, I call up the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-

effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7637

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Refrigerator Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING AND ENFORCING ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR REFRIGERATORS, REFRIGERATOR-FREEZERS, AND FREEZERS.

(a) TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE AND ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer under such section unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard is not technologically feasible or economically justified.

(b) PROHIBITION ON INCREASED COSTS TO CONSUMERS.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer under such section unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard is likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

(c) SIGNIFICANT ENERGY SAVINGS REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer under such section if the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of energy; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer if the Secretary of Energy

determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of energy.

(d) COVERED PRODUCT; ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARD.—In this section, the terms "covered product" and "energy conservation standard" have the meanings given such terms in section 321 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291).

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7637.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, and I thank Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS for leading these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this Congress, the Energy and Commerce Committee has heard time after time how this administration has prioritized a radical climate agenda over the needs of everyday Americans.

If you listen to the last debate, you will see a lot of that. The fact is, the American people cannot afford President Biden's energy policies. They are expensive, they are unreliable, and they are diminishing the quality of life for folks across the country.

House Republicans are tired of this administration trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people. We are tired of them putting the interests of the climate lobby over those of hardworking Americans.

The Biden administration's obsession with rationing our abundant energy is reducing the quality of life for Americans. They are making it more difficult and more expensive for you to cook your food, heat your homes, and all the other things that we talked about over the last number of debates on these issues.

With record-high inflation, out-of-control utility bills, and unaffordable home prices, the Biden administration's efficiency regulations will make household appliances more expensive. That is just the bottom line.

The Department of Energy's proposed standards for refrigerators and freezers yield nearly nonexistent savings. The life cycle cost savings for these products is only 3 cents over the course of 9.3 years.

Thanks to the Biden administration, Americans will spend 34 percent more

on appliances today than they did just a decade ago. These appliances are not only more expensive, they are of lesser quality and include fewer features that Americans rely on, and they have a shorter lifespan.

These efficiency standards reflect just how out of touch the Biden administration is with everyday Americans who are struggling to make ends meet.

This legislation will prevent the DOE from enforcing standards for refrigerators and freezers unless they are: technologically feasible and economically justified; are not likely to result in additional cost to the consumer; and will result in a significant conservation of energy.

This bill will protect affordability, quality, and choice for Americans, for the refrigerators and freezers they buy. It puts the interests of Americans first.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, and I thank Representative MILLER-MEEKS for leading this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just like our debate on the last bill, there is no reason for the House to be debating this bill today.

It already passed as part of the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act in May, and yet House Republicans are wasting all of our time by bringing it up again, and it is just another example of why they can't govern.

We are here now to debate H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act. That is right. Republicans are fighting to give refrigerators freedom. You don't hear them fighting for the same thing for American women. In fact, Republicans are trying to strip away a woman's freedom when it comes to reproductive healthcare, pushing nationwide abortion bans.

Talk about misplaced priorities. I can't imagine a more misplaced priority than this bill today.

This bill, along with the other anti-efficiency bills pushed by Republicans, are bad for Americans. It robs Americans of savings on the monthly home energy bills and ignores that even the appliance manufacturing industry supports these efficiency standards.

I am going to repeat that. The industry supports these efficiency standards, so why are you trying to repeal them?

This bill will increase energy bills for American families. H.R. 7637 targets DOE's recently finalized refrigerator efficiency standards. The bill adds burdensome and vague language to the standard setting process and creates unattainable metrics for the enforcement of standards.

If this bill becomes law, the Department of Energy will be unable to enforce its recently finalized consensus-based efficiency standards.

When setting appliance standards, DOE already has to ensure that the standards are economically justifiable, technologically feasible, and result in

energy savings. That is required under the existing bipartisan law. Just like the last standard that Republicans targeted with dishwashers, the refrigerator standard is a result of a consensus agreement between the appliance manufacturing industry, efficiency advocates, and consumer advocates, meaning that everyone supports the standard except for the Republicans here today.

It is easy to understand why. Refrigerator standards haven't been updated in over a decade, so it was time to revisit them, and this new standard is projected to save Americans more than \$36 million over 30 years. That is a significant savings to American families, and yet House Republicans are so comfortable of robbing them of these savings.

Models that meet the new standards are already on the market, so the standards are certainly achievable. The problem with this bill is that it threatens the Department of Energy's ability to do its job. It enables future administrations to chip away at efficiency standards and muddies the process so much that implementation of new standards is threatened.

This bill includes the same harmful provision that prohibits DOE from enforcing new or existing standards if they increase upfront costs even marginally.

It totally disregards a significant savings associated with energy efficient appliances that Americans see firsthand on their monthly energy bills in the months and years after they purchase the new appliance. It also ignores the fact that the Department of Energy already has a robust process to evaluate cost and savings.

In the last debate, I mentioned Project 2025, this shadowy effort by Trump administration officials and those who would staff a second Trump administration to implement far-right policies.

A lot of Republicans claim that they don't know anything about Project 2025. I think even President Trump said that. They don't want to implement some of its ideas, they claim, but this bill on the floor today just shows how phony that claim is.

The fact of the matter is, these bills, along with the other energy bills that Republicans have passed this Congress, are Project 2025. House Republicans and their leader, Donald Trump, don't just know about Project 2025, they love it. They want to pass it. They have passed it already in many aspects. They are actively working right now as we debate this bill on this floor to make Project 2025 the law of the land.

This bill is part of an orchestrated campaign not just to make you pay more at the pump and on your electric bills, but to bring America back to not just the 20th century, but the 1800s, and I oppose that.

For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I have a company in my district that makes refrigerators. The R&D, research and development, that go into designing a refrigerator is mind-boggling to me.

I thought refrigeration was pretty simple, but they optimize where the milk is stored and where the meat goes and hot spots in the refrigerator to make sure that temperatures are consistent and foods remain fresh for a longer period of time, not because some government mandate said that that refrigerators need to be more efficient but because the market demands it.

If the market demands it and they can provide that to meet the market challenge, then they will end up with more market share. That means more units sold, and this company rolls a new refrigerator off the line every 4 seconds. It is crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and also chair of the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in support of the Representative from Iowa's bill, H.R. 7637.

The Refrigerator Freedom Act will protect American consumers from unaffordable and unrealistic standards from the Department of Energy.

The Department of Energy efficiency standards for home appliances have long reached the point of overregulation and now cause more harm than good for consumers.

According to testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee, most major home appliances have been subjected to four, five, or even six rounds of successively tighter DOE efficiency standards over the decades.

We have long reached the point of diminishing our negative returns for consumers, yet DOE continues to wage a war against the American consumer. Instead of doubling down on failing climate policy pursuits, we should reexamine the existing standards that are not in the best interest of consumers with little to no so-called climate benefits.

The Refrigerator Freedom Act will stop DOE from prescribing or enforcing these arbitrary standards that are not helping consumers at all, and worse, increasing costs without added benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill on behalf of the American consumer and true efficiency.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time and for his leadership and clarity on what is truly important and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Republican's national appliance

protection day and this specific bill, the Refrigerator Freedom Act.

That is right. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using their majority and our precious floor time to protect kitchen appliances.

They are not trying to protect women's reproductive freedom. No. They are actually trying to take away a woman's freedom to control her own body.

They are not trying to protect voting rights so that every eligible voter can vote. No. This week we actually will also be voting on a bill that is trying to make it more difficult for poor and rural Americans to vote.

They are not trying to protect Americans' freedom to be who they want to be and marry whomever they want. No. Their Project 2025 platform intends to erase marriage equality for all Americans.

They are not trying to protect our children from their new leading cause of death in this country, guns. Nope. They are trying to protect every Americans' right to turn a semiautomatic weapon of war into an even deadlier automatic weapon of war.

That is right. Instead of reproductive freedom, Republicans are focused on refrigerator freedom.

In closing, I do want to give my friends on the other side of the aisle credit for one thing: They are certainly consistent. Just as they want to take our country back to the 1950s where White Christian men were in complete control, they also want to take our appliance technology back to the 1950s, as well.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, some things never change.

I woke up today and thanked God the sky was blue. There was traffic, lots of traffic, in Washington, D.C., and once again, Democrats are trying to take away appliances from hardworking Americans.

They want to take away the things that hardworking Americans do want and shove on hardworking Americans the things they don't want.

This government's out-of-control spending by Democrats has already made everyone's life hell. Americans can hardly afford to stock their refrigerators with food, and now Democrats want to take the damn refrigerator away, as well.

The state of this country's energy infrastructure is already alarming. Gas prices are above \$3.50 a gallon. Our electrical grid, sorry to say, still remains vulnerable to cyberattacks. We are draining our strategic stockpiles and relying on foreign sources for energy.

These are serious national concerns. Yet, what is President Biden and the Department of Energy focused on? Taking away the basic appliances that Americans want.

Terrorists are crossing our borders daily, China continues to grow more

emboldened, and violent crime continues to plague our streets, but if you didn't know any better, if you thought about it, you would think that refrigerators and dishwashers and stoves were the greatest enemies of the United States of America. Maybe they are in the eyes of our Democratic colleagues.

□ 1515

Let's focus on the real threats this country faces. Democrats continue their war on the American consumer in the name of some Green New Deal agenda. If enacted, these supposed energy efficiency standards by the DOE would increase costs for every single American and would take more than a decade to pay back those costs.

It is not going to stop climate change. If the left were serious about climate change, they would be better served focusing on nuclear energy and modular power plants. They would be better focusing on any other means to save energy other than taking it away from the American public, sort of like solar panels. They make sense.

The kitchen is for the family, for memories, for gatherings, for good times. It is not time to have these folks meddling in your lives to further micromanage their families. Let's leave the appliance decisions, the appliances that men and women want to buy in this country—it is a basic principle—to those who use them, not to those who wish once again to overregulate them and force things down their throats they just don't want.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support these bills.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7637. It is a Republican bill that is going to raise costs for hardworking American families. It is very emblematic of what they call this unfortunate session of Congress, the do-nothing Congress, the least productive Congress in modern times.

Like the dishwasher bill we debated before the refrigerator bill, Republicans seek to throw a wrench into the cost savings for American families. In doing so, they are not siding with the people, with the folks we represent back home, but siding with corporate special interests, the big utility companies, and the big oil companies because they make more money when you use more energy, when your refrigerator isn't as efficient, when your air-conditioner isn't as efficient.

Part of the focus of Democrats in the last Congress was putting money back into your pocket to provide new incentives for cost-saving, energy efficient upgrades to homes, more insulation for homes.

I used my time in the last debate for a public service announcement. If you

go to energy.gov/save, there is a whole host of ways to put money back into your pockets at a time when you need it.

We are about 2 years from passage of the Inflation Reduction Act, and I know a lot of folks said that they are still getting pinched by the affordability crisis, but that is the historic bill passed by a Democratic-led Congress and signed by President Biden that finally put a cap on insulin at \$35 per month. It was the first time that we beat Big Pharma by directing Medicare to negotiate drug prices. It puts a \$2,000 cap on out-of-pocket expenses for seniors who rely on prescription drugs.

It also was the law that provided these important cost savings to American families for energy efficient appliances. I know that Big Oil and the utility companies don't like it, and I know that the Republicans are closely aligned with them, but this is very important in this day and age when we have to use cleaner, cheaper appliances and cut pollution.

American families want these innovative, efficient appliances for one reason. They save money.

Take the refrigerator. Compared to refrigerators of the 1970s when the first efficiency standards were proposed, refrigerators today are cheaper. They are cheaper upfront, and they do a better job of keeping our groceries cold. Critically, they use about 75 percent less energy, and they save American families hundreds of dollars a year on their electricity bills.

This is all thanks to industry innovation that was spurred by direction of Congress to appliance manufacturers to do better over time. In fact, when the Department of Energy announced at the end of last year the updated standards for our refrigerators and freezers, they said the efficiency standards being adopted today have not been updated in over a decade.

They align with the recommendations from a diverse set of stakeholders, including manufacturers, the manufacturer trade association, environmental groups, energy groups, and consumer advocates. Compliance will be required by 2029 or 2030, depending on the year, make, and model.

DOE and the Biden administration have been laser focused in developing these strong energy efficiency standards to build on the historical success and capture even more cost savings for American families who need it right now.

As has been discussed by Ranking Member PALLONE, the Department of Energy works very closely with manufacturers. They develop a consensus during this rulemaking process on what is technically feasible and what can help save folks money. They actually estimate that these new standards will save Americans over a trillion dollars on household energy bills over the next 30 years.

Americans deserve a Congress that is going to stand up for them and their

cost savings and serve the people, not serve the bottom line of electricity companies and Big Oil and Gas companies.

This is quite a contrast. They call it the do-nothing Congress. It started out in a session where they decided the Speaker of the House should not continue to serve. There were shutdowns and showdowns here where they doubled down on some very extremist policies.

This is such a stark contrast to when Democrats controlled the House of Representatives. We didn't squander time debating dishwashers and refrigerators.

We passed the historic PACT Act to make sure that veterans who were exposed to toxic burn pits, Agent Orange, and other toxic substances would get the care and the benefits they earned. The historic PACT Act was passed by Democrats and signed by President Biden.

We passed a historic infrastructure law that is repairing our roads and bridges, delivering clean and safe water to communities across the country, cleaning up pollution, and expanding access to high-speed internet.

Two weeks ago, I was able to announce a \$25 million grant for a neighborhood in the city of Tampa that has not gotten the investment it has deserved for decades. Thanks to the infrastructure law, we are going to make ADA-compliant sidewalks, make the streets—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the additional time.

That neighborhood needs this investment. Have we debated any way to help the neighborhoods during this Republican-led Congress? No, we haven't.

Today, we are able to announce a \$24 million grant for my local transit agency back in St. Petersburg and Pinellas County that is going to upgrade their buses, expand service, and create workforce development initiatives to train people who are interested in these good-paying jobs.

The Democratic-led Congress passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act in a country now where death by firearm is the leading cause of death for children aged 0–18.

We also passed the historic Inflation Reduction Act, the historic law that, yes, capped the price of insulin at \$35 if you are on Medicare and finally directed Medicare to negotiate drug prices, standing up to Big Pharma for a change.

It is estimated that over 106,000 of my neighbors will save over \$500 if they rely on the Affordable Care Act for their health insurance. That was also a part of the Inflation Reduction Act.

I wanted to call out the contrasts of refrigerators and dishwashers, squan-

dering time, and wasting time with my colleagues who are really here for the people, to fight for lower costs, and to put money back into our families.

I think Mr. GOLDMAN had it right when he said it is time for this House to get serious. Instead of refrigerator freedom, how about the freedom for women to make their own healthcare decisions rather than our bodies being controlled by politicians here in Washington, D.C., or back home? These are decisions that should be between a woman, her doctor, and her family.

Refrigerator freedom? How about we get back to working on reproductive freedom, lowering costs for families, working on safer communities, good-paying jobs, and delivering for people rather than the special interests that have all too much influence here in Washington, D.C. Please vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the funny thing is, if manufacturers wanted to make a more efficient appliance, they could, and I would tell them to go for it. The manufacturing alliance and all the trade groups that were mentioned don't need something from the government to tell them to do something more efficient. If they think there is a market for it or they think that they have some desire to be more efficient, they can do it. They don't need the government to tell them to do it.

The way government operates around here, especially under a Democratic administration, is that they are coming up with a solution that is looking for a problem. If a problem doesn't exist, they create one, and they create a regulation to manage it and grow government.

Ronald Reagan, talking about Democratic government, said that their solution is: "I am from the government, and I am here to help."

Democrats continue to want to throw more money at problems that they see. The gentlewoman from Florida went through a whole litany of things the Democrats would focus on, but do you know what, America? She left the border out of that. Over 16 million people have crossed the border. That wasn't on her list.

She wasn't talking about lowering interest rates on mortgages so people can actually buy their first home. Right now, they can't because it is out of reach. It is unaffordable.

She didn't talk about lowering prices at the grocery store or Walmart or anywhere else you shop because the Biden administration's inflationary practices have driven up costs everywhere on everything since day one of the administration, from energy costs to food and other items that you purchase.

I kind of chuckled at her little sign there, but I am reminded of Will Rogers. He was talking about government spending, I think, but he said that really the only time the taxpayer is safe is when Congress isn't in session because Congress seems to muck it up by grow-

ing government and wanting to tax to get money to feed that growing government. Will Rogers was probably right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), the author of this legislation.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding me time.

As I am listening to this debate, it is astounding to hear about the \$17 a year that I may save so that I can perhaps stop at the local convenience store to get a coffee once a month when the reason why prices are high right now is the Biden-Harris administration and the last Congress have made prices higher. Inflation is over 20 percent.

First, it was tackling America's energy independence and restricting consumer choice. They started imposing draconian rules such as the tailpipe emission rule, not leasing for oil and gas drilling on Federal lands or public lands, and forcing automakers to have less efficient vehicles that Americans do not want and even vehicles that can't hold a charge in the winter such as in a State like Iowa.

Prices are up everywhere in the United States. Energy prices are up. They are up at the gas pump. Electricity prices are up. That relates to food prices, which are also up.

At a time when record-high inflation and gas prices are hurting families, the Biden-Harris administration again pushes policies that restrict imports of liquefied natural gas that would have provided a much-needed boost to the economy and helped our allies around the world.

Now, because of dismantling American energy production, undermining our national security, and restricting what cars people can drive wasn't enough, this administration has decided to dictate what home appliances Americans can have in their homes.

When I go to look for an appliance, I look at the little sticker, and I determine if saving \$12 a month or \$30 a month is worth the increased cost for an appliance that doesn't have the life of the refrigerator or the appliance that I have now. In addition, are any efficiencies based on the energy prices that we are now paying? The Biden-Harris administration has increased energy prices across the board, and they will continue to increase them because of their ill-founded policies that are benefiting their allies as well, their special interest groups.

□ 1530

On January 17, the Biden-Harris administration issued a final rule to regulate refrigerators and freezers. It is interesting that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said this is already in the rule. Why on Earth would you be here arguing about a bill if it is already implemented in a rule, if the agency is already following it?

We want to codify what it is that they are doing. If it truly is feasible, if it is economically justified, if it is

technologically feasible, and if it helps to lower emissions and lead to a better environment, they already have the authority to do that. Why would you oppose codifying it into law if the agency is already doing it?

The reality is they are not doing it. Their practices are egregious and overreaching, and they want to force themselves into every aspect of our lives and dictate.

It is interesting. I thought about this as I was sitting here listening to this debate. One of the things that would help the energy efficiency of refrigerators is not to open and close the door so much. Maybe the EPA and the DOE should issue a rule mandating how often you—oh, I better not say that because they may, in fact, do it.

The Department of Energy argues that these energy mandates will save consumers money, but according to DOE's own supporting documentation, the payback period could take over 10 years.

Refrigerator and freezer appliances have an average 14- to 15-year lifespan, and those numbers are drawn from existing appliances, not hypothetical future appliances that meet the Department's new standards.

Further, any cost savings realized to consumers over time are likely to be offset, as we have already said, by rising electric bills that are facing households across the country.

This rule marks another way of manipulating the market to push an environmental agenda and eliminate consumer choice. My bill, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, prohibits the Department of Energy from enforcing unrealistic energy standards for refrigerators that are not energy efficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, which I enthusiastically support.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. STRICKLAND).

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, the majority has decided to protect household appliances. That is the most important thing we can focus on in this House in 2024, the year of our Lord, with so much happening. Instead of doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, we are protecting household appliances.

In 2022, we saw the Supreme Court end a woman's right to reproductive choice, and 21 States have followed suit with even greater attempts to limit women's reproductive healthcare.

This bill, which I introduced with my colleagues, Representatives Fletcher and Raskin, would make sure that individuals crossing State lines are constitutionally protected when seeking

safe and legal reproductive healthcare, or those traveling with them are protected from receiving criminal punishment.

Impeding a woman's right to travel for healthcare is an assault on her freedom. Criminalizing women for crossing State lines to get reproductive care is a violation of the 14th Amendment.

Being denied an abortion disproportionately affects women of color, especially Black women. Black women in the U.S. are more likely to die from pregnancy or childbirth than women in any other racial group. Women deserve to be prioritized over household appliances.

It is well past time for Congress to pass real legislation to protect real people, not household appliances.

I urge you to pass my motion to recommit and do the real work that the American people sent us here to do.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would bring up H.R. 782, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional Members on our side of the aisle, and I am ready to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, we have had a number of arguments that have been made today on the other side of the aisle, but one that is really infuriating to me, and it should be to everyone, in my opinion, is this Republican argument for freedom of appliance choice.

Let the people choose. This is what the Republicans say. They want choice when it comes to refrigerators and dishwashers. Let the people choose what goes into their homes and keep the government's hands off it.

That Republican argument of freedom of choice with refrigerators and dishwashers doesn't hold when it comes to more important issues, life or death issues, like women's reproductive rights.

Choice goes out the window for them when we talk about women's reproductive rights. Small government goes out the window. The right to decide and do what is best for you simply goes out the window.

With the repeal of Roe v. Wade, the systematic dismantling of women's reproductive rights across the country and the attacks on IVF show that Re-

publicans are only serious about choice when it comes to things like appliances. This bill shows us where Republican priorities really are.

I mentioned several times today Project 2025. President Trump says it is not his idea, it is The Heritage Foundation, but the reality is that what the Republicans are trying to do today is implement Project 2025 when it comes to efficiency standards for appliances, which is in Project 2025.

Let me tell you some of the other things that are in Project 2025: A complete ban on abortions without exceptions, a ban on contraceptives, additional tax breaks for corporations, elimination of unions and worker protections, raise the retirement age, cut Social Security, cut Medicare, end the Affordable Care Act, raise prescription drug prices, eliminate the Department of Education, end climate protection, end marriage equality, defund the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security, and most importantly, because it relates to what they are doing today, eliminate Federal agencies like the FDA, the EPA, NOAA, and many, many more.

Now, one of the most important aspects of Project 2025 is to gut any consumer protections and let the large corporations do whatever they want. I said that Project 2025 takes us back to the 1800s. If you go back to the 1800s, there were no protections for food or for drugs. Consumer be damned. We don't care. We will sell whatever, fake medicine, fake food that is going to kill you. It doesn't matter. That is not the Federal Government's role.

That is what the advocates of Project 2025 believe. They don't believe there should be any standards, any regulation for anything, for that matter. Consumer be damned.

Now, there are a lot of misleading statements that were made today about the refrigerator efficiency standards just as there were about the dishwasher standards earlier.

I just want to set the record straight before I conclude. DOE finalized refrigerator standards. The ones that they finalized will result in life cycle savings ranging from \$50 to \$140, depending on the product.

The payback periods for these savings range from 1.6 years to 5.6 years, again, depending on the actual product. The average lifetime of a refrigerator is about 14½ years. That means that those who buy new models will save significantly more on utility bills than any increase in purchase price.

I think the Republicans are clearly distorting the facts in order to make it sound like the new standards will result in increased costs and limited savings when in reality, the opposite is true.

I can't say I am surprised by this tactic. This bill is about gutting agencies and deregulating everything. It is just an example of the larger Project 2025 that would just gut agencies, deregulate everything, and let corporations

do whatever they want. Adulterated food, bad drugs, doesn't matter. We don't need an FDA. We don't need an EPA. We don't need any kind of consumer protection agency.

I want my colleagues to understand what this is really about. This isn't just about refrigerators and dishwashers. This is about letting large corporations do whatever they want and not caring at all about the consumer and whether they drink clean water or they breathe clean air or they eat food that they can depend on or drugs that they can depend on that will actually help them.

For all those reasons, I reject this bill, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will say it again. Enacted in 1975, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act provides specific criteria for DOE to follow in order to propose a new appliance efficiency standard. They may only propose a new standard if it results in a significant conservation of energy, is technologically feasible, and is economically justified.

The new regulations are not economically justified, they are not necessarily technologically feasible, and there is not a significant conservation of energy.

The Biden administration has consistently ignored these requirements by proposing and finalizing standards that violate this statute.

The gentleman from New Jersey is younger than I am, but I grew up during the seventies' energy crisis. I was being flattering. I don't know how old Frank is, but we both grew up during the seventies' energy crisis, and we did some things around the house that my dad mandated. They weren't government mandates.

When you left the house in the summertime, you turned the thermostat up so the air wouldn't run at whatever temperature you wanted it, 72, 70, whatever, when nobody was home.

We combined trips to the store so that you would go by the gas station and by the grocery store and other stops and make one trip versus going in and out.

He ingrained in me to cut the lights off, much to the chagrin of my children and what I have tried to teach them. When you leave the room, you flip the switch off, so the lights weren't on when you weren't there.

I will say this: The agencies in Washington, D.C., could learn a lesson from that. When I ride down Independence Avenue at night, all the lights are on at the Department of Energy, and I know most of the employees are gone.

In the wintertime, we turned the thermostat down, and we put something warmer on.

I grew up poor. Not poor poor; we lived on a mill hill, a textile community, when I was little. These were dad

mandates. These weren't government mandates.

Now we see the government really becoming Big Brother. There are State governments, in most instances, which tell you where you can set your thermostat, when you can water your yard, and when you can charge your EV.

Big Brother is telling you to do more and more things, telling you what kind of car you can drive by really pushing EV mandates down on America when the consumer choice isn't that. We are seeing that kind of reverse trend in this country and the demand rise for traditional gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles.

Here again, we see a government mandate telling manufacturers you have to create an appliance that is inefficient. It is going to cost the consumer more money on the front end, and it will take them a lot longer to pay it back for an appliance that is usually worn out before they have gotten the repayment back.

My dad taught us not to stand there with the refrigerator door open. In fact, smart refrigerators, I think, ding now if you hold the door open too long because it loses that coolness. It creates inefficiency. I don't think that was a government mandate either. I think that was technology the industry came up with.

We don't need more Big Government. We don't need more government regulation like this. It is going to cost the consumers more money and affect their quality of life.

This is simple legislation just to push back against this administration and the mandates that the American public does not need and will lower their quality of life, their standard of living, cost them more money, and will not yield the cost savings that will be mandated.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Strickland of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7637 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Ms. STRICKLAND is as follows:

Ms. Strickland moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7637 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike sections 1 and 2 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE ABORTION SERVICES PROHIBITED.

(a) INTERFERENCE PROHIBITED.—No person acting under color of State law, including any person who, by operation of a provision of State law, is permitted to implement or enforce State law, may prevent, restrict, or impede, or retaliate against, in any manner—

(1) a health care provider's ability to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State;

(2) any person or entity's ability to assist a health care provider to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State, if such assistance does not violate the law of that State;

(3) any person's ability to travel across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided;

(4) any person's or entity's ability to assist another person traveling across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided; or

(5) the movement in interstate commerce, in accordance with Federal law or regulation, of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief, and for such compensatory damages as the court determines appropriate, including for economic losses and for emotional pain and suffering. The court may, in addition, award reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action to a prevailing plaintiff.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "abortion service" means—
(A) an abortion, including the use of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy; and

(B) any health care service related to or provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) The term "health care provider" means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, physician's assistant, or pharmacist) that is—

(A) engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) licensed or certified to perform such service under applicable State law.

(3) The term "drug" has the meaning given such term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, each Indian tribe,

Thompson (MS) Trahan Wasserman
 Titus Trone Schultz
 Tlaib Underwood Waters
 Tokuda Vargas Watson Coleman
 Tonko Vasquez Wild
 Torres (CA) Veasey Williams (GA)
 Torres (NY) Velázquez Wilson (FL)

NAYS—207

Aderholt Gaetz Mills
 Alford Garbarino Molinaro
 Allen Garcia, Mike Moolenaar
 Amodei Gonzales, Tony Mooney
 Armstrong Good (VA) Moore (AL)
 Arrington Gooden (TX) Moore (UT)
 Babineau Gasar Moran
 Bacon Graves (LA) Murphy
 Baird Graves (MO) Nehls
 Balderson Green (TN) Newhouse
 Banks Greene (GA) Norman
 Barr Grothman Nunn (IA)
 Bean (FL) Guthrie Obernolte
 Bentz Hagedorn Ogles
 Bergman Harris Owens
 Bice Harshbarger Palmer
 Biggs Hern Pence
 Bilirakis Higgins (LA) Perry
 Bishop (NC) Hill Pfluger
 Boebert Hinson Posey
 Bost Houchin Reschenthaler
 Brecheen Hudson Rodgers (WA)
 Buchanan Huizenga Rogers (AL)
 Bucshon Issa Rogers (KY)
 Burchett Jackson (TX) Rose
 Burgess James Rosendale
 Burlison Johnson (LA) Rouzer
 Calvert Johnson (SD) Roy
 Cammack Jordan Rulli
 Carey Joyce (OH) Rutherford
 Carl Joyce (PA) Scalise
 Carter (GA) Kean (NJ) Schweikert
 Carter (TX) Kelly (MS) Scott, Austin
 Chavez-DeRemer Kelly (PA) Self
 Ciscomani Kiggans (VA) Sessions
 Cline Kiley Simpson
 Cloud Kim (CA) Smith (MO)
 Clyde Kustoff Smith (NE)
 Cole LaHood Smith (NJ)
 Collins LaLota Smucker
 Comer LaMalfa Spatz
 Crane Lamborn Stauber
 Crawford Langworthy Steel
 Curtis Latta Stefanik
 D'Esposito LaTurner Steil
 De La Cruz Lawler Steube
 DesJarlais Lee (FL) Strong
 Duarte Lesko Tenney
 Duncan Letlow Thompson (PA)
 Dunn (FL) Lopez Tiffany
 Edwards Loudermilk Timmons
 Ellzey Lucas Valadado
 Emmer Luetkemeyer Van Drew
 Estes Luna Van Duyne
 Ezell Luttrell Van Orden
 Fallon Mace Wagner
 Feenstra Malliotakis Walberg
 Ferguson Maloy Waltz
 Finstad Mann Weber (TX)
 Fischbach McCaul Webster (FL)
 Fitzgerald McClain Wenstrup
 Fitzpatrick McClintock Westerman
 Fleischmann McCormick Williams (NY)
 Flood McHenry Williams (TX)
 Fong Meuser Wilson (SC)
 Foxx Miller (IL) Wittman
 Franklin, Scott Miller (OH) Womack
 Fry Miller (WV) Yakym
 Fulcher Miller-Meeks Zinke

NOT VOTING—27

Cherilus-
 McCormick Gimenez Moore (WI)
 Granger Moskowitz
 Connolly Griffith Norcross
 Crenshaw Grijalva Peltola
 Davidson Guest Salazar
 Davis (IL) Harder (CA) Sanchez
 Diaz-Balart Hunt Turner
 Donalds Jackson Lee Franklin, Scott
 Evans Massie Wexton
 Garamendi Mast

□ 1657

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 192, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—214

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Aderholt | Gaetz | Mills | Miller-Meeks |
| Alford | Garbarino | Molinaro | Davids (KS) |
| Allen | Garcia, Mike | Moolenaar | Allen |
| Amodei | Gonzales, Tony | Mooney | Alford |
| Armstrong | Good (VA) | Moore (AL) | Gallego |
| Arrington | Gooden (TX) | Moore (UT) | Moore (VA) |
| Babineau | Gasar | Moran | DeGette |
| Bacon | Graves (LA) | Murphy | Banks |
| Baird | Graves (MO) | Nehls | Garcia, Mike |
| Balderson | Green (TN) | Newhouse | Moore (ME) |
| Banks | Greene (GA) | Norman | Golden (ME) |
| Barr | Grothman | Nunn (IA) | Gonzales, Tony |
| Bean (FL) | Guthrie | Obernolte | Moore (AL) |
| Bentz | Hagedorn | Ogles | Moore (UT) |
| Bergman | Harris | Owens | Bacon |
| Bice | Harshbarger | Palmer | Vicente |
| Biggs | Hern | Pence | Moran |
| Bilirakis | Higgins (LA) | Perry | Good (VA) |
| Bishop (NC) | Hill | Pfluger | Balderson |
| Boebert | Hinson | Posey | Gooden (TX) |
| Bost | Houchin | Reschenthaler | Banks |
| Brecheen | Hudson | Rodgers (WA) | Garcia (LA) |
| Buchanan | Huizenga | Rogers (AL) | Green (TN) |
| Bucshon | Issa | Rogers (KY) | Obernolte |
| Burchett | Jackson (TX) | Rose | Bergman |
| Burgess | James | Rosendale | Greene (GA) |
| Burlison | Johnson (LA) | Rouzer | Biggs |
| Calvert | Johnson (SD) | Rodgers (WA) | Guthrie |
| Cammack | Jordan | Rodgers (WA) | Reschenthaler |
| Carey | Joyce (OH) | Rutherford | Bean (FL) |
| Carl | Joyce (PA) | Scalise | Buchanan |
| Carter (GA) | Kean (NJ) | Schweikert | Hill |
| Carter (TX) | Kelly (MS) | Scott, Austin | Reschenthaler |
| Chavez-DeRemer | Kelly (PA) | Self | Harris |
| Ciscomani | Kiggans (VA) | Sessions | Boebert |
| Cline | Kiley | Simpson | Harshbarger |
| Cloud | Kim (CA) | Calvert | Hern |
| Clyde | Kustoff | Smith (MO) | Bost |
| Cole | LaHood | Smith (NE) | Brecheen |
| Collins | LaLota | Smith (NJ) | Higgins (LA) |
| Comer | LaMalfa | Smith (NJ) | Buchanan |
| Crane | Lamborn | Stauber | Hill |
| Crawford | Langworthy | Steel | Reschenthaler |
| Curtis | Latta | Stefanik | Harris |
| D'Esposito | LaTurner | Steil | Boebert |
| De La Cruz | Lawler | Steube | Harshbarger |
| DesJarlais | Lee (FL) | Strong | Hern |
| Duarte | Lesko | Tenney | Burgess |
| Duncan | Letlow | Thompson (PA) | Hudson |
| Dunn (FL) | Lopez | Tiffany | Rogers (KY) |
| Edwards | Loudermilk | Timmons | Burlison |
| Ellzey | Lucas | Calvert | Huizenga |
| Emmer | Luetkemeyer | Van Drew | Rosendale |
| Estes | Luna | Van Duyne | Rosendale |
| Ezell | Luttrell | Van Orden | Rouzer |
| Fallon | Mace | Wagner | Buchanan |
| Feenstra | Malliotakis | Walberg | Hill |
| Ferguson | Maloy | Waltz | Reschenthaler |
| Finstad | Mann | Weber (TX) | Harris |
| Fischbach | McCaul | Webster (FL) | Boebert |
| Fitzgerald | McClain | Wenstrup | Harshbarger |
| Fitzpatrick | McClintock | Westerman | Hern |
| Fleischmann | McCormick | Williams (NY) | Burgess |
| Flood | McHenry | Williams (TX) | Strong |
| Fong | Meuser | Wilson (SC) | Tenney |
| Foxx | Miller (IL) | Wittman | Thompson (PA) |
| Franklin, Scott | Miller (OH) | Womack | Lee (FL) |
| Fry | Miller (WV) | Yakym | Duarte |
| Fulcher | Miller-Meeks | Zinke | Lesko |

NAYS—192

| | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Adams | Bera | Brown | Cartwright |
| Aguilar | Beyer | Brownley | Kaptur |
| Allred | Bishop (GA) | Budzinski | Raskin |
| Amo | Blumenauer | Bush | Kelly (IL) |
| Auchincloss | Blunt Rochester | Carbajal | Ross |
| Balint | Bonamici | Cárdenas | Ruiz |
| Barragán | Bowman | Carson | Ruppersberger |
| Beatty | Boyle (PA) | Carter (LA) | Salinas |

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| Casper | Keating | Kaptur | Ramirez |
| Case | Kelly (IL) | Raskin | Scanlon |
| Casten | Kennedy | Ross | Schakowsky |
| Castor (FL) | Khanna | Ruiz | Schiff |
| Castro (TX) | Kildee | Ryan | Schneider |
| Chu | Kilmer | Rubin | Scanlon |
| Clark (MA) | Kim (NJ) | Ruppersberger | Scanlon |
| Clarke (NY) | Krishnamoorthi | Salinas | Shakowsky |
| Cleaver | Kuster | Sarbanes | Sherrill |
| Clyburn | Landsman | Scanlon | Slotkin |
| Cohen | Larsen (WA) | Schiff | Sherrill |
| Correa | Larson (CT) | Schneider | Sherrill |
| Costa | Costa | Scholten | Sherrill |
| Courtney | Lee (CA) | Schrader | Sherrill |
| Craig | Lee (NV) | Scott (VA) | Sherrill |
| Crockett | Lee (PA) | Scott, David | Sherrill |
| Crow | Levin | Sewell | Sherrill |
| Davids (KS) | Lieu | Sherman | Sherrill |
| Dean (PA) | Lofgren | Sherrill | Sherrill |
| DeGette | Lynch | Sherrill | Sherrill |
| DeLauro | Magaziner | Smith (WA) | Sherrill |
| DelBene | Manning | Sorensen | Sherrill |
| Deluzio | Matsui | Soto | Sherrill |
| DeSaulnier | McBath | Spanberger | Sherrill |
| Dingell | McClellan | Stansbury | Sherrill |
| Doggett | McCollum | Stanton | Sherrill |
| Escobar | McGarvey | Strickland | Sherrill |
| Frost | McGovern | Thompson (CA) | Sherrill |
| Garcia, Robert | Meeks | Thompson (MS) | Sherrill |
| Garcia, Robert | Nadler | Titus | Sherrill |
| Goldman (NY) | Napolitano | Tlaib | Sherrill |
| Gomez | Panetta | Tokuda | Sherrill |
| Gotheimer | Morelle | Underwood | Sherrill |
| Green, Al (TX) | Neal | Vargas | Sherrill |
| Garcia (TX) | Neguse | Vasquez | Sherrill |
| Harris | Takano | Velazquez | Sherrill |
| Heller | Thompson (CA) | Wasserman | Sherrill |
| Hoyer | Thompson (MS) | Wasserman | Sherrill |
| Hoyle (OR) | Pascarella | Watson Coleman | Sherrill |
| Huffman | Pelosi | Williams (GA) | Sherrill |
| Ivey | Peters | Wilson (FL) | Sherrill |
| Jackson (IL) | Pettersen | Wexton | Sherrill |
| Jackson (NC) | Phillips | Wexton | Sherrill |
| Jacobs | Pingree | Wexton | Sherrill |
| Jayapal | Pocan | Wexton | Sherrill |
| Jeffries | Porter | Wild | Sherrill |
| Johnson (GA) | Pressley | Williams (GA) | Sherrill |
| Kamlager-Dove | Quigley | Wilson (FL) | Sherrill |

NOT VOTING—27

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Cherilus- | Gimenez | Moore (WI) |
| McCormick | Granger | Moskowitz |
| Connolly | Griffith | Moskowitz |
| Crenshaw | Grijalva | Norcross |
| Davidson | Harder (CA) | Peltola |
| Davis (IL) | Guest | Salazar |
| Diaz-Balart | Harder (CA) | Sánchez |
| Donalds | Hunt | Turner |
| Jackson Lee | Jackson Lee | Wexton |
| Evans | Massie | Wexton |
| Garamendi | Mast | Wexton |

□ 1703

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the second vote series today due to NATO summit engagements. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 340, NAY on Roll Call No. 341, YEA on Roll Call No. 342, and NAY on Roll Call No. 343.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 341 and YEA on Roll Call No. 343.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1342

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Lopez.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Lopez.

Mrs. MCCLAIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING PARKER'S CONVENIENCE STORES ON 40 YEARS IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Parker's Convenience Stores for celebrating 40 years in business.

Patrick Parker opened his first location in 1986 under the name Three Little Birds. Today, it has grown to 11 convenience stores throughout coastal Georgia.

All Parker's locations tailor their products to meet customers' needs. Some stores are known for their gourmet food or beach items while other stores are better known for their homestyle cooking.

Part of the local chain's success is due to the Parker family's continuous involvement in both their business and the community. From supporting their children's schools to giving back to other charities, the Parkers are pillars of coastal Georgia. This tradition will certainly continue as Jack Parker, Patrick's son, is moving home to take over and expand the family business.

I congratulate Parker's Convenience Stores on 40 years of successful business and wish them well in the future.

HONORING STELLA WHITNEY-WEST ON HER RETIREMENT

(Ms. OMAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the remarkable career of Stella Whitney-West, who is retiring after 17 years as the CEO of NorthPoint Health and Wellness Center in Minneapolis.

NorthPoint, one of my district's federally qualified health centers, serves thousands of my constituents every single year. It was the first FQHC to be designated as a health care home by the Minnesota Department of Public Health.

NorthPoint's role in serving our community during the COVID-19 pandemic was immeasurable, not only providing critical care and information but also access to countless other resources like food and housing support.

The positive impact that NorthPoint has had on my district cannot be overstated, and it is all due to Stella Whitney-West's incredible leadership. While Ms. Whitney-West will be truly missed at NorthPoint, the strong foundation she leaves will have a positive impact on the generations to come. Her dedication to public health is invaluable. Her life's work serving others has made Minneapolis a healthier and more equitable place for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor and thank Stella Whitney-West for her distinguished career and faithful service to our community.

CONGRATULATING ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER KEITH RATTAY ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Mission Viejo assistant city manager, Keith Rattay, for his 29 years of dedicated service to our Mission Viejo community.

As a landscape architect, he etched his artistic mark across the city, including at the Oso Creek Trail and at all city parks, facilities, and recreation centers. Keith also helped with the Civic Center, Animal Services Center, amazing holiday lighting displays, and business designs. Literally, Keith's fingerprints are imprinted all over the city.

He has been a great resource to me, my office, and Mission Viejo at large. I thank Keith for making Mission Viejo as beautiful as it is today. I wish him a very happy and wonderful retirement.

ALEXANDRIA BROWN NAMED OHIO'S 13TH DISTRICT CHAMPION OF THE WEEK

(Mrs. SYKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Alexandria Brown as Ohio's 13th Congressional District Champion of the Week.

Alexandria is a fire medic for the city of Green and the founder of Female Firefighters of Ohio, a nonprofit dedicated to providing resources to aspiring female firefighters through training, mentorship, and preparation for the fire service.

Today, fewer than 10 percent of firefighters are women. In order to increase the number of women in her field, Brown reaches out to aspiring female firefighters to provide support, including access to mentorship programs and monthly training sessions to gain critical experience and necessary certifications.

Alexandria cultivates a supportive training environment that allows women to enter the field feeling prepared, supported, capable of contributing to their departments, and, most importantly, keeping all of our communities safe.

I am thankful for all of those who are willing to run toward the fire while we all run away. They keep our community safe.

Alexandria's dedication to expanding female representation in her field is an inspiration for our community and a shining example of the spirit that makes our district the Birthplace of Champions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Alexandria Brown for her dedication to her field and the amazing work she does to keep our community safe.

□ 1715

RECOGNIZING THE TUNNELS TO TOWERS FOUNDATION

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank retired Fire Department of New York Lieutenant Jack Kielty, a dedicated board member of the Tunnel to Towers Foundation.

This foundation stands in memory of 9/11 hero Stephen Siller, and they work to support those brave individuals like Jack Kielty and Steve Siller who willingly risked their lives at a time when New York and our Nation needed them.

I have witnessed the impact of their work through my friend and constituent, retired Sergeant Major Sid Hamid. As an Army Green Beret, Sergeant Major Hamid selflessly placed himself in harm's way many times and battled through nine separate tours on behalf of the United States military.

Through the program, Tunnel to Towers Foundation, Sergeant Hamid was gifted a smart home at the beginning of the summer. Jack Kielty of the New York City Fire Department traveled down to Franklin, Texas, to personally present the home to the Hamid family.

In recognition of this selflessness, I stand here today to say thank you to Jack Kielty with a very important certificate signed by the Governor of the State of Texas, Governor Greg Abbott, proclaiming Jack Kielty to be an honorary Texan.

Mr. Speaker, our great Nation needs people who will stand up at a time of need, and this is exactly what 9/11 has produced, brave Americans but also selflessness in their service to others.

I thank Jack Kielty, Tunnel to Towers, and Sergeant Hamid for their great service to this great Nation.

CELEBRATING OCFA BEST AND BRAVEST AWARDS

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 16th annual Orange County Fire Authority Best and Bravest Awards. This program celebrates OCFA's firefighters and professional staff, highlighting the brave service that keeps our communities safe.

For California, fire season is no longer just a season; it is year-round. Climate change has intensified the frequency and severity of wildfires. In this tough environment, OCFA personnel have consistently risen to the occasion, preventing tragedy, protecting lives, and safeguarding homes and possessions.

In Congress, I have proudly championed legislation to help firefighters. My bills would boost firefighter pay and benefits and standardize national disaster research to better support their work. Showing gratitude to first responders means supporting them both on and off the job.

Congratulations to the Best and Bravest Award winners, and I thank everyone at OCFA for their outstanding courage, dedication, and resilience.

DON'T DO WHAT WE DO IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I come from California, which there is a certain amount of risk in saying that because we do a lot of wacky things there. It is a wonderful State with wonderful geography, wonderful weather, and so many great things, but the governance sometimes—I don't know.

What we are exporting currently is a lot of the work of the California Air Resources Board, which currently is trying to regulate locomotives into technology that doesn't even exist, and therefore, foist that same nontechnology onto other States. We are talking about the logistics of moving freight in California but also out of California and that can't be moved because they don't have a plan for that.

They would have them switch locomotives at the border, but with CARB's plans, they don't really care about that. They want to make everybody in the whole country buy locomotives to meet a Tier 4, they call it, which isn't even available yet. Beyond Tier 4, they want to go to zero emissions, which isn't really zero, the so-called electric trains. They are not even available. The technology isn't there, and CARB wants all of this done by the year 2030.

Imagine the logistics of getting food from California, which people rely on. Mr. Speaker, 99 percent of certain crops come from California. We won't be able to ship them out as well as the military material that might need to be moved out of our State in times of war or conflict. Anyway, don't do what we do in California.

PRESERVING A CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELD

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

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the recently established public/private partnership between the Berkeley County Commission, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation, and the Martinsburg-Berkeley County Parks and Recreation Board in West Virginia's Second Congressional District, which I am blessed to represent.

This partnership will lead to the establishment of Hoke's Run Battlefield Park near Falling Waters 163 years after the battle was fought, highlighting the importance of Berkeley County and West Virginia's role in the Civil War.

The planned preservation of the 10-acre battlefield where Union General Robert Patterson battled Confederate General Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson will educate visitors on the small battle's historic importance to the first major battle of the Civil War at Bull Run. The park will feature a recreation trail, interpretive signage, and a pavilion.

I look forward to the opening of this new park, bringing area residents and visitors alike to learn more about the rich history of Berkeley County, West Virginia, as the northern gateway to the Shenandoah Valley.

WORKING FOR VETERANS' BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here today with my friend, assistant Democratic leader JOE NEGUSE, to talk about my law, the Honoring our PACT Act.

It was signed into law by President Joe Biden in August of 2022 and has

since helped more than a million veterans and their survivors receive the healthcare and benefits that they have earned.

In the 116th Congress, we passed the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2019 that helped blue water Navy veterans receive care and benefits for exposure to Agent Orange during the Vietnam war.

These veterans waited decades for this relief. I am so glad that we could help them cut red tape and make it easier for them to receive healthcare for certain conditions, but it took way too long to get it done.

After blue water Navy, we were hearing from veterans around the country about being exposed to burn pits and other toxins when they were serving our country more recently. They were experiencing serious illnesses that they thought were connected to their toxic exposure.

Many of these servicemembers were directed to throw trash, plastic, and other items into burn pits, and this meant breathing in the toxic air, or they were exposed to jet fuel for long periods of time due to their job in the service.

It is easy to look back and think that this was not a good idea, but they did not have a choice at that time and were following orders.

It was taking the Department of Veterans Affairs too long to address these veterans' illnesses on its own due to the perceived cost and the difficulty in obtaining the scientific evidence needed in order to help.

We knew there was a strong need, and with the lessons learned from blue water, we knew we needed to act. This was the origin of the Honoring our PACT Act.

When we send our servicemembers into harm's way, we make a pact to care for them when they come home. This is one of the most sacred promises in our country and the ultimate goal of this law.

Thanks to the PACT Act, veterans no longer need to prove the connection between their service and an illness. The law outlines 23 categories of presumptive respiratory illnesses and cancers, representing over 300 individual conditions for which veterans can quickly get healthcare and benefits. Since the law was signed, several more presumptive conditions have been added to the list with more on the way.

Congress was able to work together on a bipartisan basis to get this done for veterans. Unfortunately, not much has gotten done for veterans since then, which truly troubles me. Helping those who have served should be a nonpartisan issue and one that gets due attention, no matter which party is in charge.

I will continue momentarily, but I yield to my friend from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), our assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. NEGUSE. First, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we are so grateful to the

ranking member for his steadfast leadership in leading the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and of course, his leadership with respect to the PACT Act.

I couldn't be more grateful to the colleagues that I have the privilege of serving with in the House Democratic Caucus, whom the country will hear from tonight, many of whom are veterans, people like Representative DELUZIO and Representative CARBAJAL, individuals who have given a great deal to our country, made countless sacrifices, and now are leading the charge here in Congress to protect our veterans.

I couldn't be more grateful to people like Dr. RAUL RUIZ whose leadership year after year make the case for the Congress to treat this particular issue with the urgency that it deserves, ultimately culminating in the PACT Act.

The PACT Act, as you heard from our ranking member, marked the largest expansion of benefits in a generation, cutting red tape and waiting times for veterans who were exposed to toxins and developed certain illnesses.

It was historic in that it provided benefits to generations of veterans, many of whom were long forgotten. There are one million PACT Act claims, Mr. Speaker, and we are just getting started.

For the families who have suffered the ultimate loss, the PACT Act means access to life insurance, to tuition benefits for their surviving family members, home loan assistance, monthly stipends, and more.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear from Mr. JIM COSTA and Mr. TIM KENNEDY and so many other members of our caucus the same admonition, which is that we have to do everything in our power to provide for the families of fallen servicemembers.

We have made progress in that regard, but there is much more for us to do. House Democrats stand ready, as we always are and will be, to get that job done.

I thank the ranking member again for his leadership, I thank the members of the House Democratic Caucus for their leadership, and I look forward to making more progress in the days, months, and years ahead.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. DELUZIO), a veteran, and up until recently, an esteemed member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

I think we can all agree in this body that this country has a sacred obligation to care for those that wore the uniform, who served in peace or in war or both, and that starts with adequately funding and staffing the VA to make sure that those who have earned their benefits, who have earned their care, can receive them.

That is why the Honoring our PACT Act that the ranking member and so many others got through this Congress is such a big deal. It is why it is so

powerful. It expands VA healthcare and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic chemicals across generations who have served, and it fulfills that sacred promise this country has made.

Veterans have long been exposed to some nasty stuff in service in Vietnam, the Gulf war, Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places. My generation saw burn pit exposure in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. We now know how dangerous this exposure can be and is for folks; cancers and diseases.

The PACT Act meets this moment. It adds a presumption of service-related illnesses coming from that toxic exposure. It cuts through red tape that had been blocking too many veterans from the care they have earned.

We see the numbers. Over a million veterans and survivors have already had claims approved under the PACT Act. That is a big deal. It means those veterans and their families now have access to those benefits that are hard earned that their service ought to have guaranteed.

In this body we often have hot air, debates, all the rest. Here is some practical advice. Last year, we saw veterans have a deadline to submit their intent to file, and many did. That was to get backdated benefits back to when this bill passed the Congress in 2022.

Veterans and survivors who submitted that intent to file need to submit an actual claim as soon as possible if they have not yet done that. That is to ensure they get the most out of the PACT Act for those benefits that they have earned. They have a year after submitting intent to file to submit their final claim forms to receive those backdated benefits.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, VA.gov is the website to do it, to get more information, check the status of your claim. My office and the office, I am sure, of every Member here is willing to help a veteran. Go see a VSO, a veteran service organization, an accredited claims agent, an attorney. You can find some help.

I remind my fellow veterans of this: These are earned benefits. You have earned them through your service. Make sure that you are getting what you need to take care of yourself and your family.

The PACT Act is a big deal, but it is only going to be successful if we fund it, if we make sure every veteran in this country knows what they have earned, and we give the VA the resources they need to meet veterans' demands.

That is our task in this body. I will work with everyone here to get it done. I am proud of the work we have done in this Congress.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), who helped me champion veterans last Congress, an amazing doctor, and an amazing neighbor of mine.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Honoring our PACT Act is the most significant expansion of healthcare access and benefits for veterans in generations.

Now, over 5 million veterans and family members will have the peace of mind that if they become ill due to their exposure to toxic burn pits or they are disabled and cannot work, or God forbid, they pass away, they will receive the benefits that they need to overcome an illness, the healthcare to be able to stay at home with their family because they are unable to work, and if they pass, they will have peace of mind that their family will get their benefits.

Look, for many years I have brought this issue up in committees, in the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the general public that veterans were dying of cancers, veterans were unable to breathe due to pulmonary illnesses, all of which were due to the toxic air that they breathe from the smoke from burn pits.

The initial excuses were the evidence does not show any correlation. As a scientist, I refuted that. They asked the wrong questions, and their methodologies were flawed.

Then the other excuse was that it was too expensive. Well, our values are to put the lives of our veterans first and foremost. We send them to war without consideration of the cost of war; therefore, it is our moral obligation to take care of veterans.

I fought this tooth and nail under the banner of the name of Jennifer Kepner, a veteran who served in Balad Air Base in Iraq who died of pancreatic cancer. Before she died, I met with her at home at her kitchen table. She made me promise that no other veteran should suffer what she went through in trying to get the care and the benefits for her family. We accomplished and fulfilled that promise when we introduced the presumptive benefits for warfighters exposed to burn pits and other toxins which was included in the Honoring our PACT Act, which was the heart and soul of the Honoring our PACT Act because it gave presumptive benefits to 23 illnesses and categories of illnesses which total over 300 illnesses—and that is continuing to grow.

The reason why we are here is because House Democrats continue to fight hard to ensure the implementation of the PACT Act.

Last year, I spoke very frequently about a pending deadline for veterans to file an intent to file a claim for the PACT Act, which if they did so within a year after they filed that intent to file, they would get presumptive benefits and backpay to the day that the law was enacted.

We are nearing the deadline of that intent to file, which means that veterans had a year to file their claim, to get that backpay until the day the law was signed, and if they haven't then they should do so before August 14 or before the year of when they filed that intent.

If they do so, then they will get their pay and their benefits to the date of when the law was signed. If they don't or if they miss that year after they filed that intent, they should not despair. It is not as if this is your last chance of getting the claims; the only difference will be that they will get their benefits backtracked to the date that they filed their claim from that point on.

It is very urgent that we inform our veterans that if they filed an intent to file that they file the claim before the end of the year to the date that they filed their intent to file. That is why it is very important that veterans go to VA.gov, the VA website, or call 1-800-827-1000, call their Members of Congress, work with their county veteran service organizations representative or any of the VSOs and get the information that is needed so they don't miss out on the additional full benefits that the PACT Act gave our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank everybody who was involved. I thank President Biden and Secretary McDonough who were the game changers during this long fight that we have been having that culminated in such a victory for our veterans.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, let me add that Representative RUIZ—Dr. RUIZ was instrumental in the part of this PACT Act package that dealt with the 23 presumptive illnesses.

Let's be clear that the 23 presumptive illnesses aren't just 23 diseases. They are actually buckets, Mr. Speaker, 23 buckets, we are talking more like 300 illnesses that are covered by the PACT Act.

We endeavored hard to make sure that veterans did not have to wait decades for all of the hard scientific evidence to come in. We relied on analogues, such as the 9/11 attacks on the Twin Towers, and the toxic substances that our first responders were subjected to, and we observed that those first responders had a pattern of illnesses that began to arise in numbers that did not match what would be in the general population and we could use such approaches to begin to identify those very similar kinds of diseases that were arising from exposure to toxic burn pits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), a long-time advocate for veterans.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the hard work and the efforts and the passion that Representative TAKANO, the ranking member on the committee and previous chair, has given to this issue. The hard work finally has paid off, and for that we thank him.

For far too long, our Nation has failed to honor its promise to all our veterans who are victims of toxic exposures. It is our sacred obligation, I believe, to take care of the troops we send in harm's way—that is the American way—and to take care of them and their families when they return home.

Sadly, nearly 3.5 million veterans have been exposed to the contaminants

such as burn pits, toxic fragments, radiation, and other hazardous materials during their deployment.

Until the mid-2010s, the burn pits were commonly used in Iraq and Afghanistan and other locations to dispose of waste collected at military bases.

Well, we have discovered that the aftermath has resulted in drastic impacts to those veterans. Nearly 3.5 million deployed veterans were exposed to burn pits in the last 30 years. Think about that, 3.5 million veterans. Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of the disability claims involving these toxic exposures were denied—they were denied by the Veterans Administration, and that is just wrong—leaving many of them, including 750,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans, without any benefits. That is disgraceful.

House Democrats and President Biden fought like hell to change this, and we did. The PACT Act is the largest expansion—think about this—the largest expansion of benefits for service for toxic-exposed veterans in over 30 years through the hard work of Representative TAKANO and other members on that committee joining with our Democratic Caucus.

We have added over 23 presumptive conditions, or categories as was noted before, for burn pits and Agent Orange and expanded the VA healthcare to millions of veterans, including those who served in Vietnam, the Gulf war, and post-9/11 eras.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years later, we are beginning to see the results. It is long overdue. More than 5.6 million veterans have received screenings for toxic exposures. Over 1 million veteran claims have been granted by the Veterans Administration, a 75 percent approval rate for PACT Act-related claims.

What a change.

Nearly 24,000 veterans in my district alone, the 24th District in the San Joaquin Valley, are eligible for benefits, including 2,100 processed claims and a total of over \$5.17 billion in retroactive awards for PACT Act-related benefits for veterans and their survivors. This is a sea change. It is a big deal.

I thank President Biden, and I thank Secretary McDonough for their help. I thank all those Members who have been involved in this for their hard work. I am proud to have been a cosponsor and to have voted for this historic law that has improved the lives of veterans in my district and nationwide and their families, for the families sacrifice, as well, and we should never ever forget that.

In closing, we must continue to build upon the success and to ensure that our veterans can retire with the dignity and the respect they deserve because they have earned it. They have earned it.

The bottom line is this: For those men and women who are currently serving our country, we thank you, and we think of you every day. For the veterans and their families—as I said, the

families sacrifice, as well—a grateful nation can never ever say thank you enough.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a strong advocate for veterans, a marine veteran himself and my good friend.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud marine veteran and the Representative for more than 34,000 of my fellow veterans across California's 24th Congressional District, I am proud to see the real impact that the Honoring our PACT Act has had for veterans and their families across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, we came together with President Joe Biden to pass the largest and most significant expansion of veterans benefits in more than 30 years.

Since then, we have seen more than 1.5 million claims filed for toxic exposures and other health risks resulting from service in Vietnam, the Gulf war, and wars of the post-9/11 era.

More than 2,000 of those claims have come from veterans in my own region.

We cannot give up the momentum on this important bill.

While we have seen so many already utilizing these expanded benefits, current estimates suggest that more than 5 million veterans were exposed to some amount of toxic substances during their military service.

That is why I am encouraging all veterans who submitted an intent to file last summer make sure they are following through and submitting an actual claim as soon as possible to ensure that our veterans can get backdated benefits to the date that this bill was signed into law.

I thank Ranking Member TAKANO and the House Democratic leadership for helping uplift this important deadline and reminding the American people in our veteran communities that we are still here every week fighting for their health, safety, and prosperity, all of which were earned by their years and decades of service.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have the urge to say “oorah.” I thank the gentleman for his service to our country, not only as a Representative but also as a marine veteran.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

□ 1745

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, “Our debt to the heroic men and valiant women in the service of our country can never be repaid. They have earned our undying gratitude.” These words spoken by President Harry Truman still ring true to this day.

Millions of servicemembers and veterans have answered the call to serve and protect the freedoms that we hold dear. Just as our Nation's servicemembers make a promise to leave no one behind on the battlefield, we must leave no veteran behind when they come home.

The PACT Act honors this promise. It is the largest expansion of VA benefits in a generation and ensures that millions of veterans who have been exposed to Agent Orange, burn pits, and other toxins during their military service receive the care that they have earned and deserve.

The PACT Act is one of the greatest accomplishments of the Biden-Harris administration, and it was made possible by the leadership of then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI and Chairman MARK TAKANO, among many others.

In Rhode Island, more than 3,200 veterans have already received PACT Act benefits with another 4,000 projected to be added to the program in the coming years. Over 1 million veterans and their families have received PACT Act benefits nationally.

I have been working very closely with my Rhode Island Second Congressional District military and veterans advisory committee to spread the word about the PACT Act and how veterans in our district can access those benefits.

However, there is still more work to be done. All too often, benefits claims sharks exploit veterans and their families with exorbitant fees. We must do more to protect veterans and their families from these predatory practices.

We must also ensure that veterans and their family members who were exposed to toxic PFAS chemicals on military bases and elsewhere receive the healthcare that they need, and I have cosponsored legislation to make that a reality.

We must always fight to ensure that veterans receive the care and benefits they deserve because they deserve nothing but the very best.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from North Carolina, a great champion of veterans, Representative DEBORAH ROSS.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the historic PACT Act. Thanks to this critical legislation, we are closer today than ever to ensuring every single veteran has access to the exceptional care and benefits they deserve.

In less than 2 years, I am happy to report, as my colleagues have also reported, 1 million PACT Act claims have been granted to more than 800,000 veterans and survivors across the country.

As the proud daughter of an Air Force veteran and a doctor, it is especially meaningful to recognize this milestone today.

We make a sacred promise to all of our Nation's veterans that after bravely serving our country in uniform, we will care for them when they return home. That is why we can and must do more to ensure that no veteran faces financial or logistical barriers to accessing the medical treatment and benefits they are owed.

Crucially, the PACT Act included the Camp Lejeune Justice Act, our bipar-

tisan bill to enable servicemembers from Camp Lejeune who were exposed to toxic chemicals to pursue long-overdue justice in court.

This legislation, unfortunately, did not go quite far enough, and too many veterans continue to face unacceptable barriers to accessing the remedies.

I recently introduced, with Congressman GREG MURPHY, who is also a doctor, the bipartisan Camp Lejeune Justice Corrections Act to make additional reforms, including capping attorney's fees, expanding jurisdiction to alleviate the large backlog of cases our courts are facing, and clarifying the right to a jury trial.

Today and every day, let's continue the fight to support our courageous veterans, servicemembers, and their families.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her work on the section of the PACT Act that relates to justice for those servicemembers who were in residence at Camp Lejeune. It is a decades-long effort to bring justice for those members, and I urge our government to move as expeditiously as possible to get those claims settled with all of our veterans across the country who have served at Camp Lejeune.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Ohio, a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a fierce advocate for veterans, Representative GREG LANDSMAN.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TAKANO for hosting tonight and for his leadership on the PACT Act, which has helped so many veterans.

Our veterans and servicemembers have sacrificed so much on behalf of all of us. We know now that during their service, millions were exposed to toxic substances, and these exposures have caused serious health issues for so many.

This is why, 2 years ago, Representative TAKANO and others passed the PACT Act. This landmark legislation expanded healthcare for veterans exposed to these toxic substances. Since its passage, over 32,000 Ohioans and over 1 million veterans nationwide have had their PACT Act claims granted by the VA. This means that these folks are finally getting the healthcare they deserve.

As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to serve our veterans and advocate for better benefits, more funding, and continued investment in their well-being.

In our district, we have over 30,000 veterans. By ensuring the continued acceptance of PACT Act claims, funding the VA properly, and passing important veteran legislation like our Employing Veterans to Feed America Act, which provides jobs for veterans, we are doing important work.

I am grateful for all the veterans in southwest Ohio and across the country. I promise to keep working to improve their lives and the lives of their loved ones.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LANDSMAN for his amazing advocacy for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the State of New Mexico, the Land of Enchantment, Representative MELANIE STANSBURY.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and honor our veterans and to celebrate and highlight the extraordinary passage of the PACT Act, which is the single-most significant expansion of veterans' benefits in generations. We passed that bill here in Congress under Democratic leadership with the support of President Joe Biden just 2 years ago.

It expands VA benefits to over 3 million veterans across the United States. In New Mexico, we have a long and proud tradition of service that extends across all of our communities, from the Navajo Code Talkers and the heroes of Bataan to the veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan.

The courage, valor, and dedication of our veterans are woven into the very fabric of who we are as New Mexicans. In fact, over 133,000 New Mexicans have served this great Nation, including my own veteran at home, my partner who served this country in the United States Marine Corps.

To all of our veterans and Active-Duty military, we thank them every day for their service and sacrifice. We are here because of the sacrifices they have made to defend this country and our democracy.

We must also thank those veterans who fought to pass the PACT Act itself, including, among them, New Mexico's own Master Sergeant Jessey Baca of the New Mexico Air National Guard and his wife, Maria, who fought for over a decade for our veterans exposed to burn pits and who stood on the steps of this Capitol Building to help get the PACT Act passed.

Now, it is up to us as leaders across the country to ensure that our veterans and our families are cared for. We know that when we care for our veterans, we care for New Mexicans.

Voting for the PACT Act was one of the proudest moments of my service to this country here in Congress. Today, one of my greatest and most awesome and humbling duties is to ensure that every New Mexican veteran accesses the benefits of the PACT Act.

To those who have not yet signed up who have served this country and, over the course of their service, were exposed to burn pits, toxins, and other workplace hazards, there is still time. The VA is there for them. They have their backs, and so do we.

To all of our veterans who have served this great country, they have put everything on the line. Now, it is our turn for the PACT Act to serve them. I thank them for their service and sacrifice.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another great friend from the great State of North Carolina, an amazing advocate for veterans and someone who

has been a fierce advocate for justice for our Camp Lejeune veterans, the amazing Representative KATHY MANNING.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his hard work and friendship.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, millions of veterans exposed to toxins like burn pits and contaminated water did not receive the care and benefits they earned. That is why, in the last Congress, House Democrats took action to correct this injustice.

I was proud to help pass the PACT Act, historic legislation to deliver long-overdue benefits and healthcare to 3.5 million veterans exposed to toxins while serving our country.

The PACT Act expanded eligibility for healthcare at the VA, including expanded coverage for illnesses related to Agent Orange. For veterans' families who lost their loved ones, the law may provide monthly stipends and access to life insurance, among other benefits.

Now, 2 years after President Biden signed the PACT Act into law, it is helping veterans and their families across the country. The VA has received over 1.4 million PACT Act claims, including over 4,700 claims from veterans in my home district, North Carolina's Sixth District.

Our country has an obligation to care for those who bravely serve our Nation. With the PACT Act, Democrats and the Biden administration are delivering on that promise. I was proud to help pass this deeply important legislation and support the thousands of veterans in my district who are now able to get the care they need.

Mr. Speaker, I will always work to honor the sacrifices America's veterans have made and to ensure they are treated with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the State of Minnesota, another great champion of veterans and someone who has a veteran's medical center in her district, Representative ILHAN OMAR.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, we passed the PACT Act, one of the most consequential pieces of legislation to address the severe health problems that so many of our veterans who served our great country are facing. I thank my colleague, Congressman MARK TAKANO, for his leadership in getting this bill across the finish line.

□ 1800

This bill has made it easier for veterans and their families to get the relief and the care they deserve.

I have heard from so many Minnesotans on how life-changing this legislation has been, from Brian who lost his wife to pancreatic cancer to Andrew who lost his brother to leukemia and to Amanda whose husband Rafael was diagnosed with stage IV colon cancer and is now getting the treatment he deserves because of the PACT Act.

All of the family members and veterans I have met with know this bill

could have been a game changer for them, their loved one, or just how crucial it is to help the next veteran.

Whether it was Agent Orange in Vietnam or exposure to toxic waters at Camp Lejeune or burn pits and other toxic exposures in Iraq and Afghanistan, this is a part of our military's history and legacy. I am glad we are finally addressing it in the most comprehensive way it deserves.

While I am grateful this program has been enacted to provide veterans and their loved ones with the care and benefits they have earned and deserve, only a small percentage of Minnesotans are taking advantage of this program. Less than 10,000 veterans out of more than 100,000 veterans in Minnesota who qualify under this program have enrolled. It is crucial that we continue to get the word out about this lifesaving program.

Mr. Speaker, to see if you or someone you know qualifies, please go to va.gov/pact.

I will not stop fighting until every one of my constituents who is eligible receives the care they deserve, and I will keep advocating for crucial reforms to stop future servicemen and -women from experiencing the same hardships, because when we ask young people to serve our country in uniform, we should not also be asking them to expose their bodies to toxins and to live with the consequences of those toxins for the rest of their lives.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ILHAN OMAR for all her amazing work to help the veterans in her district and across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KENNEDY), who is the newest member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the veterans who have made great personal sacrifices to serve our country.

To all those who have donned the military uniform, on behalf of a grateful nation, I say thank you.

First, I would like to express my gratitude to Assistant Leader JOE NEGUSE and Ranking Member MARK TAKANO for holding this Special Order to honor our veterans. From burn pits in Iraq and Afghanistan to Agent Orange in Vietnam, veterans exposed to toxic substances face challenges that impact their quality of life and long-term health.

We owe it to our veterans who have defended democracy and preserved our precious freedoms to deliver the benefits that they have earned and deserved. That is why Democrats passed and President Biden signed into law the PACT Act which represents the largest expansion of benefits and services for veterans exposed to toxins during their time in service in over 30 years.

To date, over 1 million PACT Act claims have been approved. People are receiving the care and benefits that they need and deserve. As an added

success, the law has led to an increase in veterans accessing medical services from VA hospitals, crucially including a generation of Vietnam veterans. Additionally, the widows of veterans will receive compensation because of this law, fulfilling the Nation's duty of care to the families of veterans.

The PACT Act is making a difference for veterans in New York and across the country in accessing the benefits that they need to lead healthy lives.

Again, I say to our veterans: our Nation is forever indebted to you for your noble service. God bless you all.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KENNEDY for hitting the ground running as one of our newest Representatives. I know he is going to be getting the message out to the veterans who live in his district to make sure that they submit their PACT Act claims and to access the benefits that they have earned through their service.

When President Biden signed the Honoring our PACT Act, he declared that every eligible veteran should be able to apply immediately. We had written the law in such a way that the healthcare and benefits would be phased in, but President Biden decided that every veteran should be able to apply for benefits as soon as it became law.

Within 24 hours, the Department of Veterans Affairs had created a website where veterans and their families could learn more about the law and how to apply for benefits. This shows how committed President Biden has been with House Democrats to support the veteran community. He understood what a difference this important law would make for veterans, and he did not want them to wait to be able to apply.

The successful implementation of the PACT Act shows that the Biden Administration was invested in helping veterans and implemented this law far faster than most laws. We all know, and we all knew veterans and their families could not wait any longer. This was many years coming for veterans who were already facing illness or cancer from toxic exposure, and many of these veterans were able to get updated disability ratings and access to healthcare.

I find it odd that while the PACT Act is sometimes known as the burn pits bill, when we talk about veterans waiting for decades, the PACT Act actually addressed Agent Orange claims and exposure to Agent Orange that had not been covered by previous legislation. So this took care of unfinished business with Agent Orange and exposure to radiation. So those veterans who were from previous conflicts, conflicts previous to Afghanistan and Iraq, were also eligible to get their toxic exposure illnesses addressed and covered by this legislation.

In fact, this legislation covers veterans who were involved in the global war on terror around the world. It was

not just confined to those veterans who served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Before the PACT Act, veterans were likely to need to prove exposure to specific chemicals in order to receive healthcare and benefits. This is nearly impossible when talking about burn pits because of the myriad of materials that were burned in them. Over 6 million veterans and their survivors have completed a toxic exposure screening to ensure they are eligible for care and benefits now and in the future.

VA also announced recently that over 1 million veterans had been granted their disability benefits, which is tremendous news, less than 2 years since this bill became law.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the veterans service organizations who all came together to support this bill and willed it into law. They showed Congress and President Biden just how important it was that we took care of veterans and their survivors.

Democrats and President Biden have proven time and time again that we do not just say thank you for your service. Our actions show just how grateful we are for that service and that we were willing to pay for all the costs of war.

So I want to thank Assistant Leader NEGUSE and all of my colleagues who have joined me on the floor today for this Special Order hour on the Honoring our PACT Act.

I am proud to have authored this important legislation that has helped thousands of veterans.

I am grateful to Speaker Emerita PELOSI who understood that we needed to deliver for veterans in the 117th Congress and who was a key player in getting this legislation over the finish line.

I want to thank President Biden for his continued support of the veteran community. I don't know of a President who has any greater love for veterans than President Biden. It is who he is. So it is with great sincerity and great emotion that I thank him for his decades of service to our veterans. As I said much earlier, he decided that all eligible veterans would be immediately able to apply for benefits instead of the original phased-in approach. He knew how critical this would be for countless veterans and their families.

We put partisanship aside and came together to help veterans and their families. More than 1 million veterans and survivors have already received benefits, and thousands more veterans have signed up for VA healthcare.

However, as I said earlier, there are some 300,000 veterans who have submitted an intent to file at some point last year who have 365 days to actually submit their claim. For most of these veterans, this 365-day window is this month or early August. In order to receive backdated benefits back to 2022, these veterans need to submit their claims as soon as possible.

However, we are not going to stop here. While we celebrate the Honor the

PACT Act and the more than 1 million veterans who have benefited from it, we know there is more work to do. As ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am working to end veteran homelessness and to make the VA an even more welcome place for women and LGBTQ+ veterans and stop attempts at more privatization of VA healthcare.

We made a solemn promise to our servicemembers that if they serve our country, then we will take care of them. This means every veteran.

We also ensure and will ensure they get the best possible care at VA facilities. We will honor our pact with them, and we will honor the promise that we made to them with my legislation, but I will not stop working to improve the lives and livelihoods of veterans around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), who is the assistant leader, to have the last word for tonight's Special Order hour.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, again, for his leadership, his clarity of conviction, and the steadfast commitment that he has shown to our Nation's veterans time and time again. I certainly could not say it any better than he has, as you have heard, Mr. Speaker, from a wide cross section of the House Democratic Caucus, Members representing every community in our great country.

Our commitment to our Nation's veterans is rock solid. It is evidenced by the work that Ranking Member TAKANO and House Democrats, in partnership with President Biden, were able to ultimately accomplish in the last Congress, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, 1 million claims under the PACT Act, real families, real stories, and real impacts for countless veterans who have made incredible sacrifices for our country. We are indebted to them, and we will continue our commitment to them in the weeks, the months, and the years ahead led by Ranking Member TAKANO and by the leadership of the Members whom you have heard from this evening.

I thank the ranking member for yielding.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Office of Assistant Leader JOE NEGUSE and Ranking Member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee MARK TAKANO for hosting this special order hour and helping to raise awareness about the extended efforts made to secure and expand PACT Act benefits for over 1 million veterans and survivors.

The landmark bipartisan Sergeant First Class Health Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act, otherwise known as the PACT Act, was signed into law in 2022, enacting perhaps the largest health care and benefit expansion in VA history.

This law provides expanded benefits to Veterans exposed to burn pits, Agent Orange, and other toxic substances, helping generations of Veterans—and their survivors, receive the critical care they deserve.

And as of 2024, these VA health care benefits were expanded to millions of Veterans—years earlier than initially called for by the 2022 passage of the PACT Act.

As a senior member of this Congress and a longtime supporter of Veterans, I know the passage of this law has been a step in the right direction to address all harms Veterans in America sadly face and continue to face, particularly Black and minority Veterans.

There is a long and painful history of denial of service-related toxic exposure that dates back to nuclear testing conducted during and in the decades following WWII that cause premature deaths, cancers and other service-related injuries.

For decades, millions of Veterans have unknowingly been exposed to toxic substances and radiation during their military service.

As a result of these exposures, Veterans have had to face a range of serious health complications, including many types of cancers, cardiovascular, respiratory, and neurological disorders, and other chronic illnesses.

Although the severity of the health issues can vary, many Veterans have faced debilitating conditions that require ongoing medical care and support and can cause disability, reduced quality of life, and premature death.

Current estimates suggest that more than 5 million Veterans were exposed to toxic substances or radiation during their service.

The type and extent of exposures vary significantly, depending on the time and location of a Veterans' military service:

During World War II, service members involved in construction projects and serving on ships were exposed to asbestos.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Veterans involved in nuclear testing and handling nuclear weapons risked exposure to radioactive materials.

During the Vietnam War Veterans faced exposure to Agent Orange, a toxic herbicide containing dioxin.

In particular, the pattern of not acknowledging service-related toxic exposure includes Agent Orange service-related exposure that was not acknowledged until passage of the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

Agent Orange was a herbicide used to defoliate vegetation and kill crops over the rural landscape in Vietnam from 1961 to 1971.

The health conditions caused by this exposure were compounded by mental distress when the government denied that the conditions were linked to Vietnam era military service.

Before passage of the PACT Act, Veterans with toxic exposures had to prove a direct connection between their medical conditions and a specific toxic exposure that they faced during their military service.

Because of the difficulty connecting a condition to an exposure, the VA denied nearly 80 percent of disability claims related to burn pit exposures before the passage of the PACT Act.

The PACT Act sought to remedy this from ever happening again.

In particular, the law added a "presumptive" service connection for hundreds of conditions linked to burn pits, agent orange, and other hazards while serving our country, and thus lowered the burden of proof required to receive disability benefits.

Now, the average nationwide percent service connection rate for Veterans with these granted claims is 70 percent, meaning that

they receive more than \$20,000 in earned benefits payments from VA each year.

Additionally, nationwide, we know that Veterans have submitted over one million total claims since the PACT Act was enacted. And over 76 percent of all claims have been approved, a sharp increase from pre-PACT levels—resulting in over \$2.4 billion in benefits to Veterans and the survivors.

These benefits are also particularly important to the state of Texas, which has the largest veteran population in the U.S.

Since its enactment in 2022, Texas has led the Nation in Veterans filing disability claims associated with the PACT Act at over 161,920.

From these PACT Act-related claims, VA has delivered more than \$600,231,041.75 in earned benefits to Texas Veterans and survivors.

Importantly, since the PACT Act was signed into law, more than 68,867 Texas Veterans have also signed up for VA health care.

These numbers make clear that the PACT Act is working, ensuring that the courageous men and women who serve our country avoid having to navigate unnecessary webs of red tape to receive treatment or benefits.

Just as our Veterans made a commitment to serve our Nation, we too have a responsibility to serve them long after they take off the uniform.

With the passage of the PACT Act and the proactive steps the Administration has taken following its enactment to ensure that actual benefits are realized for over one million Veterans, Congress has done just that.

□ 1815

MATH IS UNCOMFORTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL).

HONORING BALDWIN COUNTY SHERIFF HUEY
“HOSS” MACK

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to honor Baldwin County Sheriff Huey “Hoss” Mack, who will be retiring later this year and will become the director of Alabama Sheriffs Association.

Sheriff Hoss Mack served as the county sheriff for the last 18 years. His educational background includes a degree in criminal justice and a master's degree in human resource management.

He began service in Baldwin County Sheriff's Office in 1989 before becoming sheriff and was elected in 2006. Sheriff Hoss Mack has always been heavily involved in multiple criminal justice organizations, including both the Alabama and the National Sheriffs' Association. Not only has Hoss served Baldwin County with the utmost integrity, but he has been a friend of mine, and I appreciate that.

He is a true American and a true public servant. Baldwin County is blessed

to have had Sheriff Hoss Mack for the last 35 years, and I wish him fair winds and good luck in his next endeavor.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to do something a little tricky this evening. You are going to see the continuing theme of, hey, here is where we are borrowing and here is where the borrowing is coming from.

Then I am going to hit on some of the things that—what is the next one—drive me almost insane on the questions I get here, the things I get on this stupid thing. I have come to this conclusion: We live in a world where the propaganda, the fake information, and the distortion fields around us actually do not want America to succeed.

That is a pretty dark thing to say, but let's actually walk through my theory. I am going to make the point. On some of these presentations, I have been blessed. If you go on YouTube, I had one a couple months ago, I think there is, like, 1.3 million views. Go look at the comments section. I will argue about half those comments are bots. They are fake.

You see things like: Well, if you just didn't give any money to Israel, we could balance the budget. You start to realize that there is a world out there that takes advantage of our open society, that comes at us with things that are lies, and the poor person out there who is just trying to take care of their family, on occasion, grabs their phone, tries to read little bits of news, maybe reads a comment or two, and they don't realize the information coming at them is absolute crap.

Then the other problem that I am going to show here is when I have my own President get behind a microphone, look at the American people, and say things that are absolutely not true. Then an idiot like myself tries to come up and say: I have a path. There is a path. If I can get my brothers and sisters on the left to work with us on the right, there is a path to save this country.

It is really hard when the State of the Union goes on that podium right there and says things that are absolutely not true.

Does that mean they are also a deliverer of fake information because math is hard? Math is uncomfortable. Telling the truth is hard. Maybe this place has lied for so many decades that the public says: Look, we are just going to believe whatever is comfortable.

Let's actually walk through, first, a little bit of reality here. I will start with this chart because it sort of lays out where we are at today. Do you see the red? That red area is 74 percent of the spending, and 74 percent of the spending in this place is on auto pilot. We don't get to vote on it.

Do you see the blue? That is what I get to vote on. That is defense and non-defense discretionary. I get to vote on that. Every dime of it is borrowed. Every dime a Member of Congress votes on is borrowed money. Also,

guess what—we are in so much trouble—I have net interest on this, which I think is unfair because there is this thing called net. That is the publicly borrowed. That is where the Treasury sells bonds.

I think, this week, we are selling \$111 billion—maybe it is \$112 billion or \$113 billion—in three different auctions this week just to finance our insatiable spending because, remember—this is one of the things I find is uncomfortable even at home—100 percent of the borrowing from today through the next 30 years, according to CBO, is interest, Medicare, and if we backfill Social Security in a decade from now. It is demographics.

Yet, how do you make policy? There are ways to fix it with policy. When the leader of the free world looks into a camera and says things that are just insane when it comes to being on a calculator.

Take a look one more time. Non-defense discretionary, defense, all of that is borrowed, and a wedge—I should do a chart that shows you how much is borrowed money. I originally thought we might be at \$2.5 trillion borrowing this year. Some of the tax receipts are a little bit better. Some of the spiking growth that we had in the first part of the fiscal year on healthcare costs have flattened ever so slightly, so we are probably going to end up borrowing around \$2.3 trillion this year.

What that means is even part of the mandatory spending, Medicare, because remember, Medicare isn't all on the trust fund. The trust fund only covers 38, 40 percent. The rest comes out of the general fund. Once again, look at this chart and understand your government functionally is an insurance company with an army. That is meant to be sarcastic, but it is meant to sink in.

Let's actually walk through. I am going to walk through a couple of these just to sort of lay out where we are actually at. CBO predicts by 2054, so 30 years from now, budget deficits are entirely driven by Social Security and Medicare shortfalls.

We are not allowed to say that, are we? Does anyone remember the State of the Union? There was a handful of us, Democrats and Republicans, who had been quietly working for a year trying to put together a plan to save Social Security in the long run.

The President gets there and says: Promise me you won't talk about Social Security or Medicare. People look terrified and go: Okay. Yes, good campaign issue. They care more about winning the next election than protecting seniors. It is the great lie around here. You talk about it saying: I want to find a way to modernize and save, and you will get the crap kicked out of you. You also told the truth.

You have to look at the data, the charts. Remember, the SSA, the Social Security Administration's actuary numbers are actually substantially more optimistic than the Congressional Budget Office, so we are going to

use the more optimistic numbers. When you start to realize and when the outlays are, over the next 30 years, starting to hit 17 percent of the entire economy and revenues don't come anywhere close to that, there is your crisis. We can just pretend because getting through the next election is more important.

Look, you have all seen this chart over and over and over and over and over and over that interest continues to grow, and we think actually the interest calculation—this is important. Let's do this right now. The hierarchy right now, today, Social Security will, this year, be \$1.480 trillion. The total gross interest because, remember, just a couple days ago, I think we sent \$36 billion to Social Security because we borrowed the money. Treasury had borrowed the money from the trust fund. We pay it back with interest. Total interest to the United States will approach \$1.2 trillion this year.

Then you have Medicare, and then you have defense. Defense is functionally sitting as No. 4. How do you have a society that runs around thinking, well, if we just cut some defense? I showed you the chart before. You can get rid of every dime of defense, every dime of nondefense discretionary. That is the Park Service. That is the FBI. That is the Foreign Service. That is us. If you get rid of everything, you still have to borrow money.

You look at the charts over and over, and when we have had high marginal tax rates, we get about 18 percent of GDP in taxes. When we have had low marginal tax rates, we get about 18 percent of GDP. You have a long history—and I have done floor presentation after floor presentation—that when you lowered the rates, you grew the economy, you got about the same percentage of GDP. When you raised the tax rates, the economy shrunk a bit or slowed down, and you got the same percent of GDP.

The idea is grow the economy as much as possible, and then cut spending everywhere you can. I have some charts, and I don't know if I should do them again—actually, maybe I will just jump to them in a moment—where you lay out almost every tax hike that are the dreams of the left: Let's tax rich people who are over \$400,000. Let's do this tax and that tax.

I come here with the academic papers and showed you, when you maximize all those tax rates, capital gains, income tax, estate tax, just do it all, you get about 1.5 percent of GDP.

For us on a cut side, it is brutal, but I can come up with almost \$300 billion in nondefense discretionary. That is 1 percent of GDP. So, hey, together, we came up with 2.5 percent. We are borrowing 6 or 7 percent of the entire economy, and we have used up everything.

I mean, understand what is going on here. Just another chart that basically gives you a sense: Rising Social Security and Medicare shortfalls driven en-

tirely or nearly the entire 2019 to 2034 deficit hikes. That means, in a 10-year window, almost all the growth of the debt and deficit during that time period, interest, Medicare, and then at the end of the decade, Social Security trust fund is gone. Right now, you will get a Democrat saying: Well, Social Security doesn't add anything to the deficit. They are absolutely correct until the trust fund is gone.

There is the part that enraged me the other night. If any of you were able to watch the Presidential debate the other night, my phone lit up at one point by a bunch of reporters who wanted to double check a number.

The President was asked about Social Security. I begin to make the wealthy—okay. I begin—and this is his actual quote, so it is disjointed, but this is what he said: ". . . I begin to make the wealthy begin to pay their fair share, by increasing from 1 percent beyond, to be able to guarantee the program for life."

He is talking about Social Security, so 1 percent. Then he went on to say: "Well, that one enough will keep it solvent."

The left's definition of wealthy is over \$400,000 income, right? The President just told the American people 1 percent. I will fix Social Security by taxing them 1 percent.

We have a math problem. The problem here is, the blue you see here, that is not 1 percent. I had to make it 2 percent because the 1 percent was so small we figured you couldn't even see it. I doubled what the President said.

This is the shortfall. Half of this is what the President told you would work.

I am enraged by all the fake crap that comes into my phone in my office, our phones, our publications, all the things that you see on Twitter, or X, or whatever we are supposed to call it today, that are just made up by bots particularly and foreigners.

What happens now when my own President does it? How do I show up here? How do I get my brothers and sisters here to actually make policy? How do you make policy when the leader of the free world says things that are mathematically just insane?

The immorality here, functionally 9½ years, we double senior poverty in America. If we don't fix this, we double senior poverty. The Democrats will weaponize it because they care more about winning the next election.

We have a President who could have just looked in the camera and said: Look, we haven't had the number of children, therefore, the number of workers. We started the rollovers in 1990. It is just math. It is not Republican or Democrat. Demographics are what we are.

Last year, the United States had 1.62 children fertility rate, meaning, functionally, now our math is, in about 15 years, the United States will have more deaths than births. I say that over and over trying to get people to think.

If your brain is trapped somewhere in the 1990s' policy sets, none of that math is real anymore. It hasn't been real in 30 years.

This place is absolutely immoral. I brought charts here over and over and over, the Democrat solution saying: Instead of the President's 1 percent proposal, if you do the—what is it—the 14-point-whatever percent, 14.4 or 12.4 total Social Security tax, not the Medicare, not the unemployment, those things, and you put it on all income over \$400,000—I have shown a number of charts—if you use the CBO math, it covers about 38 percent of the shortfall.

□ 1830

That is using over 12 points, both the employer and the employee's portion. I have a President who looks in the camera and says 1 percent. Now, let's come together at a townhall or a meeting here and say: Hey, guys, let's have an honest conversation because every day we wait, the on-ramp is harder to save Social Security.

Oh, DAVID, the President already told us we are doing 1 percent on rich people. I can show you with the 12.4 you are covering only about 38 percent.

Why is this place so absolutely immoral? Do they really care that much more about winning the next election?

After the President said that, I started to dig through the stories other people had sent me. I had this woman text me weeks ago saying, did you know that with the money in Ukraine that the First Lady of Ukraine bought almost a million-dollar Bugatti, or however you pronounce that car.

Well, the BBC did a very long article about how much is absolutely fake coming into the U.S. marketplace of ideas. There are bot farms. There are troll farms. They created fake photos, which turns out that is what actually helped BBC identify that this is all fake stuff.

How do you make policy in a world where we are awash in things coming in from our enemies, from the countries that want us at each other's throats, make it impossible to do basic policy to save the Republic, and then my own President is making crap up?

Article after article of disinformation that is crashing in, the things I have that come into my office about Israel that are coming in from bot farms.

We have article after article that Microsoft did an analysis of how much was coming in from Chinese bot farms, Chinese servers. Apparently, we just had a major disruption by stopping 968 Twitter accounts that were completely fake and they were all coming from a bot farm in Russia. That happened this week. The State Department just identified that bot farm and got it shut down.

Mr. Speaker, I say now to my Democrat colleagues that we have actually had a couple stories come out that have some real fun stuff. It turns out a

number of the Democrat activists are actually setting up fake newspapers. Now, if that wasn't bad enough, one of these articles in there actually has a section talking about that in American small town newspapers as many as half process this, as many as half are actually fake.

My wife pointed out to me that there was a newspaper from southern Kansas, where she grew up, that went out of business decades ago that somehow popped up in her news feed and it had this crazy stuff in it. Turns out, that was on the list of the ones that had been spoofed. A spoofed URL that looks like it is from Russia.

Think that about. In America, about half the small town online newspapers you see are actually fake.

How many of our constituents know that? It looks like the Democrats actually have decided, hey, this is a great business model. Let's make up fake newspapers online, have it laced with leftwing propaganda, and we will do it under a newspaper masthead.

How is this not a violation? Once again, the left proves they are a hell of a lot smarter than we are when it comes to being mercenary on campaigns. They figured out a way to get around the campaign finance laws. Spend money, but it is free speech. It is fake, but it is free speech. Then idiots like me get here and try to walk through the math.

Look, this is the MedPAC report. It is not that hard to read. You have quotes in here that in 2022, 13 percent of all personal and corporate income taxes collected by the Federal Government were transferred to the Medicare trust fund.

By 2030—so that is how many years? 5 budget years? 4 budget years?—22 percent of all tax receipts from corporate and individual income tax, 22 percent will just go to Medicare.

Functionally in a decade, you have gone from 13 to 22 percent of all tax receipts. It is demographics.

Why isn't this what we talk about around this place, how are we going to save these programs? Oh, you can't do that because you are going to have a President who is going to knife you by saying crazy things.

The Joint Economic Report we published a couple weeks ago, we tried to provide brutally honest math, brutal detail with actual solutions. Will anyone actually read it?

This one my staff was particularly fond of. It turns out that one of the new spoofings out there that are coming into young people's phones are celebrities with quotes that the celebrities have never said.

Are you all ready for this election cycle where you have AI memes looking like a Member of Congress, looking like a President, looking like a Senator, looking like a celebrity, saying things that are completely fake?

Now come here and try to do difficult policy where you are going to have to take on some bureaucracies, take on

certain business models, adopt technology to crash the price of healthcare. Are you going to get hit by an army of bots, an army of fake videos, an army of fake postings, saying they can't do that, because some group has figured out that winning the election is stopping us from saving the country from its debt spiral?

I am trying to explain it is bad enough having to take on the bureaucracy, it is bad enough having to take on the calcified intellect, of particularly some of my friends here, that say we can just fix everything by taxing people more.

What happens when our voters have to face millions of absolutely fake information videos that are crashing at them? I can't wait to see the bots and the comments they put in the video below this posting.

Take a look here: "Not touching Social Security means large benefit cuts."

When you start to actually take a look—and I think we did this before. Remember, the number goes up and down depending on employment, but we were working on one the other day from last year's CBO number that basically showed the average couple would take about a \$17,400 cut in their Social Security a decade from now when the trust fund is gone.

This is immoral. Shouldn't this actually be a place where we actually work on these things? Then you start to actually look at the lies—excuse me—the misinformation that our brothers and sisters on the left keep saying.

Oh, when we did tax reform, it was a gift to the rich. Okay. You got a math problem. The higher income, the top 20 percent today pay 69 percent of all income taxes. It is more progressive today than the tax code has ever been. The wealthy pay a higher percentage of Federal income taxes today than ever before. The lower quartiles today pay the lowest Federal income tax rates since income taxes, 16th amendment.

How often do you hear this? But that doesn't fit the narrative. Then you have the jerks actually say things like this: Well, you guys had \$1.7 trillion spending. Yes. We got \$900 billion more revenue than expected, but that was horrible. We are going to spend about \$2 trillion in grants and gifts and those things to big business because they do clean energy stuff. It is like they don't look at themselves in the mirror.

Once again, I have done entire presentations here going through every leftwing tax idea trying to add it up. Even when you don't do economic effects—if you do economic effects, these numbers—and then try to say, hey, you guys are only getting about a point and a half or so of GDP out of these numbers, you are not getting anywhere close. You got to do it through policy.

Then the fragility that no one was prepared for—well, some of us were prepared for—are interest rates. How many of you think interest rates are going back down, particularly in the long end of the curve?

Remember, what the Federal Reserve does is on the short end of the curve, meaning shorter term bonds. When you start to look at 10-year debt and up, some of the best bond traders and economists right now are saying it is not going down. You might get a little bit of a tick.

The United States is now number 14 on the credit stack, meaning Greece today can sell a 10-year bond cheaper than we can. You read the notes on the S&P's and the Moody's, it is not—we have one of the healthiest economies in the industrialized world, but one of the things that is going on is they don't trust us.

Will our governance be disciplined enough to actually take on the spending and the debt? The fact of the matter is, we are paying a premium now. The United States now pays a premium on our debt.

This week, I told you we are borrowing about—there are three auctions this week—\$111 billion, and we are going to pay a premium on that debt. Sometimes this place doesn't look like we are serious about taking the debt on and managing our fiscal affairs.

First off, we are having great difficulties selling long-term bonds. Do you remember a few months ago we had sort of a bond tantrum? Why do you think Treasury moved things down to sell short-term, short-term, short-term? A lot of investors out there don't even trust this government enough to say, I am going to buy a 30-year U.S. savings bond and I am going to be safe.

Once again, even a 100 percent tax rate on small businesses and upper-income families could not come close to balancing the long-term budget in this country.

Stop thinking you are going to do it with tax hikes or even for those of us who want to cut the size of government, you need to have revolutionized the cost of this government. Stop being afraid of technology. Stop being afraid of the things where we could change the cost of this government because it might affect your business model.

Look, I was going to try to put up one or two slides last for happy talk, until I realized one of the slides I wanted to show you was, once again, another concept of why the Democrats' Inflation Reduction Act is the most Orwellian named piece of legislation in modern history.

They are very proud, saying we are subsidizing electric cars. My wife has an electric car. She loves it, but the data basically said—when they passed that, I came here to the floor and showed, hey, here is the survey data. Almost everyone that is going to buy an electric car is buying them with the subsidy, without the subsidy. It is a lifestyle. It is almost a status symbol, but let's give away billions and billions of dollars.

Now you actually have breakthroughs. Could you imagine if just a fraction of a fraction of a fraction of that resource had gone more into primary research? Looks like there has

been a breakthrough on solar cells, an additional 25.7 percent efficiency, except the problem is it was developed in China.

The very people who preach at us to subsidize all this stuff, but let's subsidize less generations or maybe even the generation before that's technology.

You want me to put solar panels on my house, you want us to drive electric cars, make it so economically sensible and make it so economically affordable that it is the disruption.

Why did you stop going to Blockbuster Video? Because you had this button you could hit at home and stream videos right to your home. Was that subsidized by the government?

□ 1845

The fact of the matter is that there are technology disruptions. Why didn't we fixate on that? Well, it turns out that maybe the disruptions don't write checks to your campaign.

The Democrats' planned economy, the control of the marketplace, the arrogance that somehow they think they know what the future looks like instead of building a tax system or regulatory system that is competitive, that is disruptive. Some are winning; some are losing. That is the way the American economy is supposed to work.

In many ways, we have now built a society of oligopolies, thanks to Dodd-Frank and Democratic policies. They have made the big bigger, the big really powerful, and the really big and powerful now your constituency.

It turns out now that if you look at who votes for Republicans, it is entrepreneurs, working people, and those who are being crushed by those they have to compete with who now get subsidies from their political allies.

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

REQUIRE VOTERS TO PROVE CITIZENSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for his willingness to come to the floor and talk about these important issues that, frankly, all of us should be talking about. He does so with regularity, and it is important.

The average American is hurting because they watch the price of goods going up and all the things that are happening as a direct consequence of what we are doing and not doing here—as the gentleman points out, our inability and lack of willingness or fortitude to focus on the issues that matter.

Right now, I think something the American people need to understand, as we head into the fall season, is that we are heading into the time of elections.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle come down to give a whole lot of rhetoric about the lack of agenda or lack of things that we are doing. We have legislation on the floor of the House this week to ensure that only citizens vote, something we call the SAVE Act. That legislation is necessary because anybody with eyes knows that we are getting overrun by open borders that are endangering the American people. We have millions of people flooding into the country and have thousands and thousands of people who are on the voter rolls who are not supposed to be. Those are facts. It is true.

We know States that are starting to cleanse their voter rolls are finding people who are noncitizens and are registered to vote. We saw it in Virginia. We have seen it in North Carolina. We have seen it in Texas. We have seen it across the country. The truth is, it goes far deeper than that.

The question that we have to ask ourselves is: What does it mean to be an American? What does citizenship even mean anymore?

We have an administration—Joe Biden, the people who work for him, and our Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle—that is at war with the whole idea of American exceptionalism and what it means to be an American. They are at war with the whole idea of what it means to be an American citizen. They are undermining the whole purpose, the whole intent, behind citizenship. Citizenship is supposed to matter.

This week, we are going to be voting on the floor on a bill to require a simple thing: that we know that only American citizens are voting in our American elections. That is what we are voting on this week, tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that some number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be willing to work with us on such legislation. They bemoan that they are not getting an amendment offered. Let's be very clear: They offered one amendment—one—in the committee of jurisdiction, the House Administration Committee. Do you know how many Democrats were present? One, the ranking member. The ranking member offered the amendment. It went down 6–1. There was no real debate from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle because the only purpose of the amendment was to gut the bill. That was the only purpose.

Then, I heard bemoaning from our Democratic colleagues and the ranking member of the Rules Committee when we were up in the Rules Committee, and he said they should be able to offer this amendment. Why? His Democratic colleagues didn't even show up to the debate in the committee, and the whole purpose of the amendment was to gut the bill.

The bill has been strongly supported by the Speaker on down, strongly supported by his staff, strongly supported

by the people who have worked on it hard, but none of that matters to the American people. The only thing that matters to the American people is that it is legislation that would protect their constitutional right as a citizen to be the one who has a say in his or her government.

What is happening right now is we are undermining the integrity of our elections and undermining our very Republic by allowing noncitizens to vote. Indeed, some jurisdictions—Oakland, San Francisco, New York, and, indeed, our Nation's Capital—are purposely registering noncitizens to vote.

They say, wink, wink, nod, nod, don't worry about it. We are only going to do that in State and local elections. We will not, of course, put them over in Federal elections because that is against the law. My Democratic colleagues want to say we don't need this bill because it is already against the law for a noncitizen to vote in Federal elections. True.

However, number one, then what are you worried about? Why are you concerned? What is so problematic that you think it is bad that we try to put procedures in place to carry out the law you say is already in place?

The truth is you don't like that that law is in place. That is the truth about our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We know this because Democratic jurisdictions across the country, as I said a minute ago, are registering noncitizens to vote in State and local elections.

They want them to vote in Federal elections. The problem is, they have this pesky little issue with the American people, 81 to 87 percent of whom believe that only citizens should vote in American elections.

We have a bill before us on the floor of the House tomorrow that I believe is going to be opposed by virtually all or all of our Democratic colleagues. We will see. I kind of dare them to vote "no" on a bill supported by 81 to 87 percent of the American people. I dare them to vote "no" against a bill that says that only American citizens should vote in American elections. I am going to dare them to go ahead and follow a President who has put out a policy against a bill, the purpose of which is to guarantee citizens are the ones who get to vote in American elections.

We will see if our Democratic colleagues want to go to the polls in November having rejected what clearly the vast majority of their constituents, even in the most liberal jurisdictions in the country, believe is right. That is what is likely to occur tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, if you believe the news, believe the accounts, look at what the President has done, and look at the posturing of the House Democratic leadership, they are on the precipice of staking out a position of belief that noncitizens should be able to vote in our elections.

That, of course, is not too surprising, given the extent to which a number of

our Democratic colleagues have repeatedly talked about how it is beneficial for them to have noncitizens—indeed, sometimes illegal aliens—voting in elections.

The fact of the matter is, we know what has happened in the Biden administration as the American people have been endangered, as Americans have died, as Laken Riley has died, and as numerous individuals have been killed, raped, murdered, and assaulted across this country by people who have been let into this country illegally.

We know that some 8 million illegal aliens have crossed the border under Biden's tenure. We know that some 5.3 million illegal aliens have been released by Joe Biden. We know that we have had massive numbers of criminal gang members, massive numbers of people affiliated with terrorist organizations, and thousands of numbers of Chinese nationals who have come into our country.

We know that our domestic crime is increasing. We know that we are being endangered. We know that people are being released. We know that we have criminals coming to our country, yet we want to do one simple thing. We have been fighting them, trying to stop what they are doing by releasing people into the country. We passed H.R. 2. Democrats refused to do anything about it. They refused to move it. CHUCK SCHUMER refuses to do it. Joe Biden doesn't even know what we are talking about.

Here, our Democratic colleagues are poised to reject a bill to protect our elections, to ensure that only Americans vote in our elections. That should give everybody in this country pause and give them a glimpse into the soul of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and what they think about citizenship. They don't respect citizenship.

Our Democratic colleagues don't believe that citizenship matters. They don't believe that sovereignty matters because if they did, they wouldn't do this. If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, our Democratic colleagues, had some small fix or even significant fix to believe that we could make our system better, we would be all ears.

If it was a legitimate exercise to say, yes, of course, we want to not only have it against the law for noncitizens to vote in our elections, as is currently the case, but we also want to make sure that we remove all Federal barriers and, indeed, improve the situation and have requirements in place to guarantee that we can check, know, and ensure that only citizens vote. That is not what they are doing.

The legislation that we put forward is pretty simple, the SAVE Act. It will allow you to come forward, prospectively. If you are going to vote this fall, you can go vote. You are in the system. If you move, your address changes, you get married, if something changes at some point over the next few years, we require States to clean their voter rolls.

If you want to register to vote, take a passport, take a military ID, take a Real ID, all of which demonstrate your citizenship. If you don't have one of those, take your regular driver's license, get a copy of your birth certificate, get a copy of an adoption certificate or naturalization papers and go down to say that you can register and are a citizen.

There are 400,000 tombstones on the other side of the Potomac River. They either gave the last full measure of devotion or risked the last full measure of devotion. I think you can take a few seconds to make sure that you demonstrate your citizenship to vote.

More than that, we put in massive safeguards. We give flexibility to States. We say that if they want to come up with a better way to do it, they can balance and check the Federal systems. They can sign an affidavit as a government official saying that they believe this is a citizen. They checked, and this is a citizen. They provided all the information necessary. Great.

There are no barriers, no undue burdens, no restrictions on the ability of an American citizen to vote under our plan. What it will do is give not just increased confidence but a return of belief in our system, a belief that they can actually trust elections, a belief that it is, in fact, their country.

Shouldn't we want this to be our country? Shouldn't we want to be proud and say this is our country, these are our rules, and that anyone is welcome to come here under the terms of our invitation only and will follow the rules. Criminals are not going to be allowed here, and they are not going to be allowed to carry out criminal activities. They are not going to be allowed to murder, rape, maim, or steal. However, if someone is coming here and is hardworking and follows our rules, God bless them, come on in, but they are going to vote only if they are a citizen.

The fact that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to guarantee that tells us everything we need to know. It gives up the whole game. It gives up the fact that our colleagues don't want sovereignty and security, and that is the truth.

There is a reason our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to continue to throw money at international organizations, want to send an endless supply of funds and blank checks to the United Nations, the World Health Organization, and all the NGOs that are funneling people into our country, endangering our own citizens, and putting children into the sex trafficking trade.

All of that is being done on purpose. All of that is being done because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want it all to occur. There is no other explanation for it.

I am tired. I have been sitting here watching for my entire time in Congress, watching this President—to the extent he even knows where the hell he is—destroy this country and endanger

the people who I represent, destroy and endanger Texans. That is what has happened, nothing less.

The President of the United States and the people who work for him have endangered our country. The Secretary of Homeland Secretary has endangered our country.

□ 1900

Ask the now probably thousands, certainly hundreds of parents who are sitting there having lost loved ones, killed, raped, or maimed, the tens of thousands of parents who have lost their kids to fentanyl poisoning, ask any of them. Ask the cops. Ask the Border Patrol who want to do their job but are being told they can't and being accused of whipping Haitian migrants. That is what is happening. Here we are again.

We are not even talking about securing the border in this bill. We are not talking about doing the things we should be doing as a sovereign Nation. We are talking about doing the simplest thing if you are a sovereign Nation, and that is ensure the integrity of your elections and that only citizens can vote.

I am proud of the job the Republican Party has done and my Republican colleagues have done, and the Speaker of the House has done in putting forward legislation that will solve the problem, that follows the law, defers where appropriate to States, sets a Federal standard where it is appropriate with respect to Federal elections only, follows the constitutional parameters, and lays it all out in a way to protect our elections.

This is what we are supposed to do. We are supposed to protect our country. We are, in fact, the guardians of our country. When we sit in this hallowed Chamber, what on Earth are we supposed to do but do the work of protecting the country, which leads me to another point.

Our country is in danger right now because the President of the United States no longer has the mental capacity to carry out the powers and the duties of the office. I get no great joy in saying that. It is true.

It is appalling to watch the news media and my Democrat colleagues in this Chamber, in the Senate, and in the administration ignore the reality of the state of the President's mental acuity, endangering the American people, and now suddenly wake up because there is an election in a few months and suddenly go, oh, we need to do something about this. Why? Because there is an election in a few months.

Even at that, they are unwilling to call the question. I would posit that they are unwilling to call the question because the Democrats in the White House, indeed, the First Lady and the Vice President of the United States, are all complicit in covering up the lack of mental ability of the President, covering up the health, the mental health, the physical health of the

President. By doing this, they are endangering the American people. Indeed, they are unconstitutionally calling for President by committee.

I heard the former Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson; I have heard numerous current administration staffers; I have heard numerous Democrat colleagues in the House and the Senate talk about: Don't worry. The President has some good people around him. Don't worry. There are a lot of really good people that are advising him. There are committees of people.

First of all, I am not blown away by the quality of the people surrounding the President. Second of all, that is not how it works.

The Founders firmly rejected, from memory, I think it is Alexander Hamilton in Federalist 70, the notion of President by committee, that it would endanger us, that you needed an executive, you needed a Commander in Chief to make the decisions.

A brief note to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who are saying CHIP, shhhh. Don't say anything. Don't bring it up. We are in election season. They are falling on their own sword. They are blowing up. Let them blow up.

What I am concerned about blowing up is our country if we are attacked and we have a President in the White House who can't respond. That job is not just from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. This matters. It matters that the President of the United States is, at best, questionable to make decisions when it matters.

It is why the 25th Amendment exists, which, of course, requires the Vice President to take action, which I do not believe the Vice President will do because the Vice President knows she is complicit in having hid from the American people the mental state of the President of the United States for years.

This is not a political statement. As I have just noted, some people on my side of the aisle would rather I not say it. Shhhh. Let's just get to November. I just want our country to get to November. I want our country to get to December. I want our country to get to the next century.

When the President of the United States can't carry out the powers and the duties of the office without a committee of staff around him, when the press secretary at the White House today literally answered the question when asked by a reporter what would happen at 11 p.m. if nuclear weapons were fired at the United States, and her answer was: Well, there are some really good people around him that would come and talk to him. That gives me a lot of pause.

All of us who are in elected office have advisers, people we trust, seek their advice, seek their counsel, but I can promise you, when you know what hits the fan, if I have to come down here and make a decision, I walk down here and make a decision because that

is what we are hired to do. When you have to have a vote, you have to vote. When you have to come down and take action, you have to take action. The President of the United States is uniquely in that position.

The fact of the matter is this administration has been propped up, effectively, a Manchurian candidate, being propped up with committees of people around the President, hiding and obfuscating the truth, making decisions. That, frankly, should give all of us pause.

It is no wonder that the country is in such bad shape at the moment. Our country is being impoverished by the day. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found over the last year almost a million native-born Americans lost jobs on net.

Americans are spending over \$12,800 more annually to buy the basics because of the inflation under this administration. Mortgage rates are up to 7 percent. Housing affordability has plummeted to record lows. Gasoline is up 55 percent, eggs up 40 percent, flour up 35 percent, electricity up 29 percent, baby food up 29 percent, breakfast cereal up 25 percent, bread up 25 percent, chicken and poultry up 25 percent, lunch meat up 24 percent, eating out up 23 percent, rent up 21 percent, used cars up 20 percent. Americans have lost over \$4,400 paying higher energy costs under the President.

The Biden administration announced they paused all non-FTA exports for liquefied natural gas. What do you think that does? It doesn't help us. We are involved in endless conflicts, funding them. Nobody in this Chamber wants Ukraine to lose to Russia, but nobody in this Chamber wants to continue to fund a perpetual war by an administration that is out of touch while the American people are suffering. Biden has sold off more than 40 percent of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and in 2023, the SPR stockpile plunged to 40-year lows.

The fact of the matter is this administration is failing the American people. Republicans have for the last 18 months in this Congress for sure, if not the duration of the Biden administration, but certainly the last 18 months been putting forward responsible, strong policies that the President of the United States and my Democrat colleagues are rejecting.

We have worked hard to put forward Limit, Save, Grow, which would dramatically turn around the economic situation, dramatically reduce spending, dramatically reduce the size of the bureaucracy, dramatically improve our energy prices and competition around the globe, which, by the way, which would have had an impact in Ukraine, which would have helped us push back on Russia.

We passed responsible appropriations bills. We got caps enacted and put in place. The defense bill is funded. The increase in defense spending is funded out of taking cuts to the IRS expansion

the Democrats wanted to foist on hard-working Americans and we took money out of remaining COVID funds. Non-defense was then held flat.

We passed H.R. 2, a responsible border security bill, which would have ended the release of people into the United States. It would have tightened down on parole and asylum. It would have ended the release of unaccompanied children. It would have treated them responsibly. It would have reduced the power of cartels. It would have reduced sex trafficking, and it would have kept people like Laken Riley alive. We did that. We passed H.R. 2. Our Democrat colleagues opposed it. They opposed it in the Senate, and they opposed it here.

This Republican Conference has passed appropriation bill after appropriation bill to be rejected by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We have passed thousands of amendments. We passed seven appropriations bills last year. We passed a number of appropriations bills this year, and we are continuing to pass them.

We are doing the work the American people sent us here to do with zero help from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and, frankly, I am proud of the work that we have been putting forward that has been rejected by our Democrat colleagues.

I haven't always agreed. I have been very clear on this floor. You have to deliver results. You have to get some things across the finish line. You have to be willing to hold the line and fight and use the power of the purse. There is more that we can do but make no mistake about it. We have been putting forward good bills to make our economy stronger.

If our legislation had been adopted by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President, inflation would be down. The border would be secure. People would be enjoying much more affordable energy. Job creation would be up. People's lives and quality of life would be better. More Americans would be secure on the streets.

This week, we have on the floor a bill that would protect voting and ensure that only citizens vote. Again, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would work with us, we could do that. We could restore belief in our system. These are all the things that we have been working on, working to try to do.

Right now, our Democrat colleagues are wrapped around the axle trying to figure out what to do about their President because with all due respect, they are not putting America first. The President of the United States right now is not putting America first. The Vice President of the United States is not putting America first. The Cabinet is not putting America first.

If you were going to put America first, if you were going to put Americans first, then you would call it like you see it. You would act. You would lead. You would do what everyone in America knows needs to be done.

Everyone with eyes who has been watching the President—and again, I take no joy in saying it. He is our President. I disagree with him a lot, but he is our President, and the President of the United States needs to be strong and coherent and capable and able to lead in an increasingly dangerous world.

Notwithstanding the horrible policies that have been promoted and pushed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, can we not just agree that the President of the United States should be mentally aware and competent to carry out the powers and duties of the office?

Will our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in the administration not look at this the way every American is seeing this right now?

Even the most politically biased people in the media and around the country are looking at this and throwing their hands up and saying what is going on?

Admittedly, it is because they are panicking about the election in November when what it should be is that they are panicked about the state of our country and whether or not we can be safe and secure.

In the Book of Acts, it is noted that Paul was a Roman citizen. The Roman authorities put him in chains and were about to flog him without a trial, but when he said that he was born a citizen, they let him go even though he was spreading the message of hate and distrust of a religious minority, but citizenship meant a great deal.

One of the things that eventually led to the downfall of the Roman Empire was the fact that over the next few centuries after that, citizenship meant less and less and less until it meant almost nothing. Its people no longer knew how to preserve the civilization their ancestors had built. We cannot let the same thing happen here.

□ 1915

Citizenship matters. Being a citizen of this country matters. It matters in observing the White House. It matters in citizens voting in elections. It matters in the policies we put forward to put the American people first. Citizenship has to matter again.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for July 8 and July 9 on account of a funeral in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 10, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4739. A letter from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Information Security Controls: Cybersecurity Items [Docket No.: 220520-0118] (RIN: 0694-AH56) received May 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4740. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation/RMA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expanding Options for Specialty and Organic Growers (EOSOG) [Docket ID: FCIC-24-0003] (RIN: 0563-AC85) received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4741. A letter from the Program Analyst, Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Grade Standards for Pecans in the Shell and Shelled Pecans [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-21-0039] received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4742. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonel Robert J. Schreiner, United States Space Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(8)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4743. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonels Terri J. Erisman and Steven M. Ranieri, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4744. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 31 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general or major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4745. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing seven officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4746. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing eight officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to

10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4747. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Limitation on the Acquisition of Certain Goods Other Than United States Goods (DFARS Case 2021-D022) [Docket: DARS-2023-0042] (RIN: 0750-AL40) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4748. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Restriction on Certain Metal Products (DFARS Case 2021-D015) [Docket: DARS-2023-0018] (RIN: 0750-AL33) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4749. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Architect and Engineering Service Fees (DFARS Case 2024-D019) [Docket: DARS-2024-0019] (RIN: 0750-AM16) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4750. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Privacy Act of 1974: Implementation [Docket ID: DoD-2024-OS-0047] (RIN: 0790-AL77) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4751. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — TRICARE: Removal of Certain Temporary Regulation Changes Made in Response to COVID-19 [Docket ID: DOD-2023-HA-0049] (RIN: 0720-AB89) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4752. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Data Requirements for Commercial Products for Major Weapon Systems (DFARS Case 2023-D010) [Docket: DARS-2023-0047] (RIN: 0750-AL83) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4753. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Revision of Limitations on Subcontracting [FAC 2021-07; FAR Case 2016-011; Item II; Docket No.: 2016-0011; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN35) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4754. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's 2023 Fair Lending Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5493(c)(2)(D); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1013(c)(2)(D); (124 Stat. 1970); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4755. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's advisory opinion — Consumer Information Requests to Large Banks and Credit Unions received June 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4756. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's letter — Use of Federal Work-Study Funds for Voter Registration received June 21, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-4757. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Service, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Rulemaking and Guidance Procedures [Docket ID: ED-2020-OGC-0150] (RIN: 1801-AA22) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-4758. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Valuation Assumptions and Methods (RIN: 1212-AA55) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-4759. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Mattoon, Illinois) [MB Docket No.: 24-83] received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4760. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's regulatory issue summary — Required Assessment of U.S. Department of Energy Laboratories by Licensees, Applicants, and Suppliers To Verify the Effective Implementation of Their Quality Assurance Programs [Regulatory Issue Summary 2024-02] received June 18, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4761. A letter from the Associate Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's safety evaluation — Safety Evaluation for EPRI Technical Report 3002023774, EPRI MOV Performance Prediction Methodology (PPM), Version 4.1 received June 18, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4762. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Regulatory Guide: Qualification of Class 1E Battery Chargers, Inverters, and Uninterruptible Power Supply Systems for Production and Utilization Facilities [Regulation 1.210, Revision 1], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4763. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Anti-Doping Agency, transmitting the Agency's 2023 Annual Report and Financial Audit, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 2002(b); Public Law 109-469, Sec. 702(b); (120 Stat.

3534); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4764. A letter from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Securing the Information and Communications Technology and Services Supply Chain; Connected Software Applications [Docket No.: 230125-0025] (RIN: 0605-AA62) received May 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4765. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, transmitting the 2023 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco including financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4766. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, transmitting the 2022 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco including financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4767. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4768. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress, covering the period ending March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4769. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Increasing the Minimum Wage for Contractors [FAC 2022-04; FAR Case 2021-014, Docket No.: FAR-2021-0014, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AO31) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4770. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Amendments to the FAR Buy American Act Requirements [FAC 2022-05; FAR Case 2021-008, Docket No.: 2021-0008, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AO22) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4771. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2023 to March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4772. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Guidance Procedures (RIN: 3206-AO63) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4773. A letter from the President and CEO, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the 2023 management re-

port and financial statements of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4774. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2023 management report and financial statements of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4775. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2023 management report and financial statements of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4776. A letter from the Executive Assistant to the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cape Hatteras National Seashore; Bicycling [NPS-CAHA-NPS37329; Docket No.: NPS-2023-0003; 233P103601-PPSECAHAS0-PPMPSPD1Z.YM0000] (RIN: 1024-AE83) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4777. A letter from the Congressional Affairs Specialist, Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary: Establishment of Temporary Special Use Area for Coral Nursery [Docket No.: 240618-0166] (RIN: 0648-BN10) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4778. A letter from the Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Lake Ontario National Marine Sanctuary: Final Regulations [Docket No.: 240329-0091] (RIN: 0648-BJ62) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4779. A letter from the Agency Representative, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules Governing Pre-Issuance Internal Circulation and Review of Decisions Within the Patent Trial and Appeal Board [Docket No.: PTO-P-2023-0012] (RIN: 0651-AD68) received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4780. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Program Fraud Civil Remedies: Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment (RIN: 3206-AO65) received June 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4781. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program and Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act Program Regulations [Docket Number: DOT-OST-2024-0006] (RIN: 2105-AE69) received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4782. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs [Docket: DOT-OST-2021-0093] (RIN: 2105-AE94) received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4783. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs: Technical Amendments [Docket: DOT-OST-2021-0093] (RIN: 2105-AE94) received June 28, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4784. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treatment of certain relief payments made to individuals affected by the East Palestine, Ohio train derailment [Notice 2024-46] received July 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-4785. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Flight Training Security Program [Docket No.: TSA-2004-19147; Amendment No.: 1652-1] (RIN: 1652-AA35) received June 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1341. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.R. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance", providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8772) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-578). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 8954. A bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8955. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to ensure that, whenever the Indian Health Service undertakes an investigation into the professional conduct of a licensee of a State, the Service notifies the relevant State medical board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 8956. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act for the development and implementation of a centralized system to credential licensed health professionals who seek to provide health care services at any Indian Health Service unit; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. SORENSEN, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MALOY, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 8957. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study and submit a report on the greenhouse gas emissions intensity of certain products produced in the United States and in certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. SORENSEN):

H.R. 8958. A bill to reauthorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ALLRED (for himself, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LINAS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 8959. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to ensure DACA recipients are eligible for educational awards; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8960. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow participation in

certain Fulbright programs to qualify for the repayment plan for public service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8961. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on Federal agency use of renewable energy certificates; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8962. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a methane border adjustment mechanism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELUZIO:

H.R. 8963. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 521 Thorn Street in Sewickley, Pennsylvania, as the "Mary Elizabeth 'Bettie' Cole Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 8964. A bill to amend the HITECH Act to allow an individual to obtain a copy of such individual's protected health information at no cost unless certain circumstances apply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FROST (for himself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 8965. A bill to promote the development of certain plans, policies, and standards for managing cybersecurity risks and protecting sensitive technology relating to National Aeronautics and Space Administration spacecraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8966. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia (for herself and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 8967. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to enter into a contract, partnership, or grant with a non-profit organization for the purpose of providing financial support for the maintenance and sustainment of infrastructure and facilities at military service memorials and museums that highlight the role of women in the military; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 8968. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require annual reports on generation and load capacity by Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators, to establish reliability markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUTTRELL (for himself, Mr. McCaul, Mr. ARRINGTON, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 8969. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who have been convicted of or who have committed an offense related to entering military, naval, or coast guard property, are inadmissible and deportable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLINARO (for himself, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. LANGWORTHY):

H.R. 8970. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a publicly available database that includes information regarding aliens without lawful status in the United States who have been convicted of felonies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa (for himself and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 8971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an investment credit for certain domestic infant formula manufacturing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 8972. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to update certain regulations to allow for expanded use of lap held child restraints during flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. TOKUDA (for herself, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 8973. A bill to amend the American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Culture and Art Development Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 8974. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a Blue Campaign Certification Program to encourage employers in covered industries to encourage employees to complete training to recognize and respond to suspected human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MANNING, Mr. CARSON, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. FOUSHÉE, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. WILD, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to men and to Black women; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESSION:

H. Res. 1341. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance"; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8772) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the

Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H. Res. 1342. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. Res. 1343. A resolution expressing that the United States should not enter into any bilateral or multilateral agreement to provide security guarantees or long-term security assistance to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LUNA (for herself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. ALFORD):

H. Res. 1344. A resolution finding that Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, is in contempt of the House of Representatives for disobeying a certain subpoena; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. AMO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H. Res. 1345. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WILD:

H. Res. 1346. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7056) to prohibit the limitation of access to assisted reproductive technology, and all medical care surrounding such technology; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H. Res. 1347. A resolution calling for the immediate release of George Glezmán, a United States citizen who was wrongfully detained by the Taliban on December 5, 2022, and condemning the wrongful detention of all Americans by the Taliban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 8954. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. (The Property Clause.)

The single subject of this legislation is: Federal lands

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to ensure that, whenever the Indian Health Service undertakes an investigation into the professional conduct of a licensee of a State, the Service notifies the relevant State medical board, and for other purposes.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 8956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act for the Development and Implementation of a centralized system to credential licensed health professionals who seek to provide health care services at any Indian Health Service Unit

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 8957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study and submit a report on the greenhouse gas emissions intensity of certain products produced in the United States and in certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 8958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reauthorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 8959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor and Employment

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Public Service Loan Forgiveness Reform

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy Policy

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Fair Trade

By Mr. DELUZIO:

H.R. 8963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:
Postal

By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 8964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:
health care.

By Mr. FROST:
H.R. 8965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To promote the development of certain plans, policies, and standards for managing cybersecurity risks and protecting sensitive technology relating to National Aeronautics and Space Administration spacecraft systems, and for other purposes.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:
H.R. 8966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:
H.R. 8967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to use appropriated funds to maintain certain memorials.

By Mrs. LESKO:
H.R. 8968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To lower energy costs by increasing American energy production and restoring energy leadership.

By Mr. LUTTRELL:
H.R. 8969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. To make laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

National Security

By Mr. MOLINARO:
H.R. 8970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa:
H.R. 8971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an investment credit for certain domestic infant formula manufacturing facilities.

By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 8972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Transportation and Public Works

By Ms. TOKUDA:
H.R. 8973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amending the American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Culture and Art Development Act.

By Mr. VALADAO:
H.R. 8974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a Blue Campaign Certification Program to encourage employers in covered industries to encourage employees to complete training to recognize and respond to suspected human trafficking.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 33: Ms. BALINT.

H.R. 549: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 553: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 802: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 884: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CARAVEO, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 906: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 957: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 1003: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1008: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1015: Ms. STANSBURY and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1088: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California.

H.R. 1118: Mrs. PELTOLA and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1269: Ms. BALINT.

H.R. 1425: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1507: Ms. WILD, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1572: Ms. BUDZINSKI and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1624: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1699: Mrs. MCBATHE.

H.R. 1705: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1708: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1723: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. McGARVEY.

H.R. 1759: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 1787: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 1831: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. DUARTE.

H.R. 2413: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 2474: Ms. BALINT, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2744: Mr. FINSTAD.

H.R. 2827: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 2870: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 2923: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2955: Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 3042: Mr. BERA and Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 3090: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3106: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3170: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. CHERFILUS-

MCCORMICK, and Mr. CARL.

H.R. 3225: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3366: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 3432: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 3445: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3470: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3475: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3537: Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. AMO.

H.R. 3539: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 3790: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 3826: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3851: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.

H.R. 3962: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 4020: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4070: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4335: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 4355: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 4384: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4426: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4519: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 4538: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 4699: Mr. CASAR.

H.R. 4769: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 4886: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. STANTON, and Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 4893: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BERA, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4933: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4963: Mr. VAN ORDEN and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 4987: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 5048: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 5074: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 5103: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 5177: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 5247: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 5300: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 5399: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 5456: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 5532: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 5540: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 5583: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 5840: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5908: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 5909: Mr. TONKO, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 5995: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 6003: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 6041: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 6242: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 6328: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 6416: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 6451: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 6600: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 6654: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 6860: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 6950: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 6951: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 7002: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER and Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 7039: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 7056: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 7132: Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 7138: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 7165: Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 7213: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 7222: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.

H.R. 7274: Mr. CASE and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 7342: Ms. PETTERSEN and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 7359: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 7365: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 7373: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 7378: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 7388: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 7398: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 7438: Ms. BUSH and Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 7495: Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 7508: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
 H.R. 7546: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 7600: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 7618: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 7629: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 7670: Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 7725: Mrs. HOUCHIN and Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 7764: Mr. CISCOMANI and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
 H.R. 7772: Mr. BURLISON.
 H.R. 7814: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 7914: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK and Mr. MAGAZINER.
 H.R. 7977: Mr. ARRINGTON.
 H.R. 7999: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
 H.R. 8018: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. GARBARINO.
 H.R. 8025: Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 8042: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 8061: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 8193: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 8232: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 8300: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 8307: Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLON, and Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
 H.R. 8314: Mr. GALLEGOS.
 H.R. 8336: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
 H.R. 8341: Mr. HUIZENGA.
 H.R. 8345: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 8358: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 8370: Mrs. PEITOLA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MRVAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.
 H.R. 8371: Mr. GARBARINO.
 H.R. 8407: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 8419: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 8426: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 8427: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 8442: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 8469: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 8492: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 8501: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 8530: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
 H.R. 8536: Mr. CASAR.
 H.R. 8554: Mr. CASAR.
 H.R. 8566: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey and Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 8575: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 8588: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 8679: Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 8693: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 8702: Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. MOONEY.
 H.R. 8704: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8706: Mr. FLOOD and Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 8734: Mr. FULCHER.
 H.R. 8765: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 8770: Mr. MOYLAN.
 H.R. 8777: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OGLES, Mr. WALTZ, and Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 8784: Mr. CISCOMANI.
 H.R. 8801: Mr. FINSTAD.
 H.R. 8807: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MRVAN.
 H.R. 8821: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
 H.R. 8828: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 8830: Mr. DELUZIO and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 8878: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8880: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
 H.R. 8883: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 8892: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 8899: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 8906: Mr. SELF.
 H.R. 8913: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 8915: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
 H.R. 8924: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 8926: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. LAWLER, and Mrs. KIM of California.
 H.R. 8932: Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs. BICE, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 8936: Mr. LAWLER and Mrs. KIM of California.
 H.R. 8937: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 8941: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
 H.J. Res. 82: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.J. Res. 117: Mr. LATURNER.
 H.J. Res. 133: Mr. FITZGERALD.
 H.J. Res. 142: Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. ESTES.
 H.J. Res. 144: Mr. FALLON.
 H.J. Res. 148: Ms. VAN DUYNE and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
 H.J. Res. 150: Mr. PERRY.
 H.J. Res. 161: Mr. DONALDS.
 H.J. Res. 181: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OWENS.
 H. Con. Res. 115: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H. Res. 439: Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. STEVENS.
 H. Res. 530: Ms. PETTERSEN.
 H. Res. 561: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H. Res. 1003: Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H. Res. 1012: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H. Res. 1063: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina and Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H. Res. 1131: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 1198: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H. Res. 1279: Ms. STEVENS.
 H. Res. 1286: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H. Res. 1323: Mr. BOST, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H. Res. 1327: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. MAGAZINER.
 H. Res. 1328: Mr. LAWLER.
 H. Res. 1329: Mr. TORRES of New York.
 H. Res. 1332: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.