''(i) in the case of a dwelling unit built before the date of enactment of this subsection and not substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this subsection is—

''(I) hardwired; or

''(II) uses 10-year non rechargeable, nonreplaceable primary batteries and—

''(aa) is sealed;

''(bb) is tamper resistant;

''(cc) contains silencing means; and

''(dd) provides notification for persons with hearing loss as required by the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard; or

''(ii) in the case of a dwelling unit built or substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this subsection, is hardwired.''.

(e) RURAL HOUSING.—Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 514 (42 U.S.C. 1484), by adding at the end the following:

''(k) QUALIFYING SMOKE ALARMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Housing and related facilities constructed with loans under this section shall contain qualifying smoke alarms that are installed in accordance with applicable codes and standards published by the International Code Council or the National Fire Protection Association and the requirements of the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard, in each level and in or near each sleeping area in such dwelling unit, including in basements but excepting crawl spaces and unfinished attics, and in each common area in a project containing such a dwelling unit.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the following definitions shall apply:

''(A) SMOKE ALARM DEFINED.—The term 'smoke alarm' has the meaning given the term 'smoke detector' in section 29(d) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2225(d)).

''(B) QUALIFYING SMOKE ALARM DEFINED.—The term 'qualifying smoke alarm' means a smoke alarm that—

''(i) in the case of a dwelling unit built before the date of enactment of this subsection and not substantially rehabilitated after the date enactment of this subsection is—

''(I) hardwired; or

''(II) uses 10-year non rechargeable, nonreplaceable primary batteries and—

''(aa) is sealed;

''(bb) is tamper resistant;

''(cc) contains silencing means; and

''(dd) provides notification for persons with hearing loss as required by the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard; or

''(ii) in the case of a dwelling unit built or substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this subsection, is hardwired.''; and

(2) in section 515(m) (42 U.S.C. 1485(m)) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) QUALIFYING SMOKE ALARMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Housing and related facilities rehabilitated or repaired with amounts received under a loan made or insured under this section shall contain qualifying smoke alarms that are installed in accordance with applicable codes and standards published by the International Code Council or the National Fire Protection Association and the requirements of the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard, in each level and in or near each sleeping area in such dwelling unit, including in basements but excepting crawl spaces and unfinished attics, and in each common area in a project containing such a dwelling unit.

''(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the following definitions shall apply:

''(i) SMOKE ALARM DEFINED.—The term 'smoke alarm' has the meaning given the term 'smoke detector' in section 29(d) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2225(d)).

''(ii) QUALIFYING SMOKE ALARM DEFINED.—The term 'qualifying smoke alarm' means a smoke alarm that—

''(I) in the case of a dwelling unit built before the date of enactment of this paragraph and not substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this paragraph is—

''(aa) hardwired; or

''(bb) uses 10-year non rechargeable, nonreplaceable primary batteries and—

''(AA) is sealed;

''(BB) is tamper resistant;

''(CC) contains silencing means; and

''(DD) provides notification for persons with hearing loss as required by the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard; or

''(II) in the case of a dwelling unit built or substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this paragraph, is hardwired.''.

(f) FARM LABOR HOUSING DIRECT LOANS & GRANTS.—Section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1486) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) that such housing shall contain qualifying smoke alarms that are installed in accordance with applicable codes and standards published by the International Code Council or the National Fire Protection Association and the requirements of the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard, in each level and in or near each sleeping area in such dwelling unit, including in basements but excepting crawl spaces and unfinished attics, and in each common area in a project containing such a dwelling unit.''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) the term 'smoke alarm' has the meaning given the term 'smoke detector' in section 29(d) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2225(d)); and

''(6) the term 'qualifying smoke alarm' means a smoke alarm that—

''(A) in the case of a dwelling unit built before the date of enactment of this paragraph and not substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this paragraph is—

''(i) hardwired; or

''(ii) uses 10-year non rechargeable, nonreplaceable primary batteries and—

''(I) is sealed;

''(II) is tamper resistant;

''(III) contains silencing means; and

''(IV) provides notification for persons with hearing loss as required by the National Fire Protection Association Standard 72, or any successor standard; or

''(B) in the case of a dwelling unit built or substantially rehabilitated after the date of enactment of this paragraph, is hardwired.''.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the amendments made by this section such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) through (f) shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(i) NO PREEMPTION.—Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to preempt or limit the applicability of any State or local law relating to the installation and maintenance of smoke alarms in housing that requires standards that are more stringent than the standards described in the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 3. FIRE SAFETY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, complete a national educational campaign that educates the general public about health and safety requirements in housing and how to properly use safety features in housing, including self-closing doors, smoke alarms, and carbon monoxide detectors.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out this section, $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1254, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bills.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. 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 motion will be postponed.

SUSAN MUFFLEY ACT OF 2022

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1254, I call up the bill (H.R. 6929) to increase the benefits guaranteed in connection with certain pension plans, 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 1254, the amendment printed in part D of House Report 117–432 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6929

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 ''Susan Muffley Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. GUARANTEED BENEFIT CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCREASE TO FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining what benefits are guaranteed under section 4022 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (in this section referred to as ''ERISA'') with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary under a covered plan specified in paragraph (4) in connection with the termination of such plan, the amount of monthly benefits shall be equal to the full vested plan benefit with respect to the participant.

(B) NO EFFECT ON PREVIOUS DETERMINATIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the allocation of assets and recoveries under sections 4044(a) and 4022(c) of ERISA as previously determined by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (in the section referred to as the ''corporation'') for the covered plans specified in paragraph (4), and the corporation's applicable rules, practices, and policies on benefits payable in terminated single-employer plans shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, continue to apply with respect to such covered plans.

(2) RECALCULATION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the amount of monthly benefits with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary described in paragraph (1) was calculated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the corporation shall recalculate such amount pursuant to paragraph (1), and shall adjust any subsequent payments of such monthly benefits accordingly, as soon as practicable after such date.

(B) LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS OF PAST-DUE BENEFITS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a lump-sum payment to each eligible participant or beneficiary whose guaranteed benefits are recalculated under subparagraph (A) in an amount equal to—

(i) in the case of an eligible participant, the excess of—

(I) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the participant for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

(II) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible participant; and

(ii) in the case of an eligible beneficiary, the sum of—

(I) the amount that would be determined under clause (i) with respect to the participant of which the eligible beneficiary is a beneficiary if such participant were still in pay status; plus

(II) the excess of—

(aa) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the eligible beneficiary for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

(bb) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible beneficiary.

Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the corporation shall increase each lump-sum payment made under this subparagraph to account for foregone interest in an amount determined by the corporation designed to reflect a 6 percent annual interest rate on each past-due amount attributable to the underpayment of guaranteed benefits for each month prior to such recalculation.

(C) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS AND BENEFICIARIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, an eligible participant or beneficiary is a participant or beneficiary who—

(I) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is in pay status under a covered plan or is eligible for future payments under such plan;

(II) has received or will receive applicable payments in connection with such plan (within the meaning of clause (ii)) that does not exceed the full vested plan benefits of such participant or beneficiary; and

(III) is not covered by the 1999 agreements between General Motors and various unions providing a top-up benefit to certain hourly employees who were transferred from the General Motors Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan to the Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

(ii) APPLICABLE PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this paragraph, applicable payments to a participant or beneficiary in connection with a plan consist of the following:

(I) Payments under the plan equal to the normal benefit guarantee of the participant or beneficiary.

(II) Payments to the participant or beneficiary made pursuant to section 4022(c) or otherwise received from the corporation in connection with the termination of the plan.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—The term ''full vested plan benefit'' means the amount of monthly benefits that would be guaranteed under section 4022 of ERISA as of the date of plan termination with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary if such section were applied without regard to the phase-in limit in subsection (b)(1) of such Act and the maximum guaranteed benefit limitation in subsection (b)(3) of such Act (including the accrued-at-normal limitation).

(B) NORMAL BENEFIT GUARANTEE.—The term ''normal benefit guarantee'' means the amount of monthly benefits guaranteed under such section with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary without regard to this Act.

(4) COVERED PLANS.—The covered plans specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

(B) The Delphi Retirement Program for Salaried Employees.

(C) The PHI Non-Bargaining Retirement Plan.

(D) The ASEC Manufacturing Retirement Program.

(E) The PHI Bargaining Retirement Plan.

(F) The Delphi Mechatronic Systems Retirement Program.

(5) TREATMENT OF PBGC DETERMINATIONS.—Any determination made by the corporation under this section concerning a recalculation of benefits or lump-sum payment of past-due benefits shall be subject to administrative review by the corporation. Any new determination made by the corporation under this section shall be governed by the same administrative review process as any other benefit determination by the corporation.

(b) TRUST FUND FOR PAYMENT OF INCREASED BENEFITS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the ''Delphi Full Vested Plan Benefit Trust Fund'' (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the ''Fund''), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Fund as provided in this section.

(2) FUNDING.—There is appropriated from the general fund such amounts as are necessary for the costs of the payment of the portion of monthly benefits guaranteed to a participant or beneficiary pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payment. The Fund shall be credited with amounts from time to time as the Secretary of the Treasury, in conjunction with the Director of the corporation, determines appropriate, from the general fund of the Treasury.

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for the payment of the portion of monthly benefits guaranteed to a participant or beneficiary pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payment.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may issue such regulations as necessary to carry out this section.

(d) TAX TREATMENT OF LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless the taxpayer elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) to have this paragraph not apply with respect to any lump-sum payment under subsection (a)(2)(B), the amount of such payment shall be included in the taxpayer's gross income ratably over the 3-taxable-year period beginning with the taxable year in which such payment is received.

(2) SPECIAL RULES RELATED TO DEATH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer dies before the end of the 3-taxable-year period described in paragraph (1), any amount to which paragraph (1) applies which has not been included in gross income for a taxable year ending before the taxable year in which such death occurs shall be included in gross income for such taxable year.

(B) SPECIAL ELECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES OF ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—If—

(i) a taxpayer with respect to whom paragraph (1) applies dies,

(ii) such taxpayer is an eligible participant,

(iii) the surviving spouse of such eligible participant is entitled to a survivor benefit from the corporation with respect to such eligible participant, and

(iv) such surviving spouse elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) the application of this subparagraph,

subparagraph (A) shall not apply and any amount which would have (but for such taxpayer's death) been included in the gross income of such taxpayer under paragraph (1) for any taxable year beginning after the date of such death shall be included in the gross income of such surviving spouse for the taxable year of such surviving spouse ending with or within such taxable year of the taxpayer.

SEC. 3. PENSION VARIABLE RATE PREMIUM PAYMENT ACCELERATION.

Notwithstanding section 4007(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1307(a)) and section 4007.11 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, any additional premium determined under subparagraph (E) of section 4006(a)(3) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1306(a)(3)) the due date for which is (but for this section) after September 15, 2032, and before November 1, 2032, shall be due not later than September 15, 2032.

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

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part E of House Report 117–432, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

□ 1545

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 6929, the Susan Muffley Act of 2022, will restore the hard-earned pensions of more than 20,000 Delphi salaried retirees, including 5,000 in my home State of Michigan.

The Susan Muffley Act is a bipartisan bill supported by Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate. I worked most particularly with Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. TURNER of Ohio on this legislation along with the other cosponsors. It is endorsed by the AARP, the AFL–CIO, and the UAW. I am glad we can come together finally to do what is right for these workers. These are workers who lost their pensions through no fault of their own.

In this country, Madam Speaker, if you work hard and play by the rules, you should be able to retire with dignity and with peace of mind. Instead, these workers had the rug ripped out from underneath them and lost their hard-earned benefits. When General Motors filed for bankruptcy during the Great Recession the Federal Government—I repeat, the Federal Government—made the unprecedented step to move in and save the auto industry. At the direction of the Federal Government, however, the U.S. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the PBGC, assumed responsibility for the Delphi salaried retiree pensions. After negotiations with the Federal Government, the PBGC cut those hard-earned benefits by as much as 70 percent for 20,000 Delphi salaried retirees.

These retirees were treated differently than other retirees impacted by the GM bankruptcy. They suffered significant cuts to their benefits, upending the lives of thousands and thousands of families.

In September of 2019, the Delphi Salaried Retirees Association filed suit against the PBGC to have their pension benefits restored. It went all the way to the Supreme Court until the Court declined to hear the case, making it clear that only congressional action could restore these earned pension benefits.

Our legislation would make this unique group of retirees who had their pensions unfairly and disproportionately cut will make them whole again. This means that beneficiaries will receive a payment of the difference of what was actually paid to them by the PBGC and what they would have earned had they been able to keep their pensions like everyone else did. Moving forward, beneficiaries will receive their full earned pension.

This bill is fully paid for and will not add to the deficit.

Delphi salaried retirees deserve to have their pensions made whole because it was the Federal Government that singled these workers out. It was the Federal Government who stepped in to rescue General Motors but decided to treat these workers differently and cut their earned pensions. It was the Federal Government, not General Motors, who directly negotiated with the PBGC.

What happened to these hardworking retirees was wrong, and now it is the Federal Government who has the responsibility to fix the mess that itself created.

We need to get this legislation done for people like Susan Muffley for whom this bill is named. David Muffley, Susan's husband, worked at Delphi as an electronics technician for 31 years but lost the full value of his pension in 2009. His wife, Susan Muffley, was a core part of the Delphi Salaried Retirees Association's leadership team fighting to restore these pensions.

Because of the financial difficulties of losing their pension, Susan avoided seeing her doctor because they couldn't afford it. Sadly, she was ultimately diagnosed with pancreatic cancer and passed away.

After working hard for 30 years to earn a pension to support your family through retirement, no worker and no family member should be forced to forgo medical treatment to make ends meet. These workers need the Susan Muffley Act. The last 13 years have been an absolute nightmare for these families. These are people I know.

During the Obama Administration, the problem was created but never addressed. During the Trump administration, the former President talked about fixing the issue but never acted. He ran out of time before that moment could occur. But now, today, after lots of talk and not so much action, Congress can finally act to provide relief and justice for these workers, these Delphi salaried retirees.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, when it comes to bailouts, Congress just can't seem to help itself. Under President Biden, taxpayers have been forced to bankroll the so-called American Rescue Plan which included an uncapped bailout for failing and insolvent multi-employer pensions.

From footing the bill for this excessive government spending to record-high gas prices, taxpayers can't catch a break in Biden's America, and today we are considering another bailout that will force taxpayers to cover the tab for failed, privately run pensions.

What message does this send to the men and women who have their own retirement accounts to worry about or have no retirement accounts at all?

More pension bailouts set a damning precedent. In case anyone has forgotten, we work for hardworking taxpayers in this country. As Members of Congress we have an obligation to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent as efficiently and effectively as possible. Unfortunately, too many ignore this important duty and are happy to mortgage the future of the next generation with reckless spending.

On top of the price tag, there have been no hearings and no markups on H.R. 6929.

Is this the standard the House wants to operate under—one where any piece of legislation can be fast-tracked to the floor without due consideration and scrutiny?

Under Democrat control, good governance has long been abandoned in the people's House.

In 2009, when Delphi Corporation completed its 4-year bankruptcy, its defined benefit pension plans were terminated and taken over by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, PBGC, a process that has been well-established. At that time, the Delphi pension plans were collectively underfunded by $7.2 billion. Delphi did not make required contributions to its pension plans in the 4 years it was moving through bankruptcy. The salaried employee plan, in particular, was only 48 percent funded with $2.4 billion in assets and liabilities of $5 billion.

Fast forward to today, and we are considering a bill that would dole out money like candy. Under this bill, participants would receive a retroactive lump-sum payment, or ''top-up,'' of the difference between what was paid by PBGC and what the plans would have paid had they not been terminated.

But here is the kicker, Madam Speaker: this top-up would come with an additional 6 percent interest, and all participants would receive their original monthly benefits moving forward.

Let's turn our attention to the precedent that this bill sets for the entire single-employer pension system. Currently, PBGC's single-employer insurance program is funded exclusively by premiums paid by employer plan sponsors and does not—does not—receive taxpayer dollars. PBGC is the trustee of over 5,000 terminated single-employer plans.

Madam Speaker, please pay attention to this next part. By topping up one plan, Congress will be pressured and expected to top up the remaining 5,000 terminated plans and every future terminated plan.

How many plans does PBGC currently insure?

More than 23,000 active, single-employer plans are currently insured.

So, Madam Speaker, what is next on the docket?

Should Congress roll up its sleeves and make whole every American's 401(k) plan that took a few hits?

Again, how about Americans who do not have a pension plan?

There are many of those. Imagine the harebrained schemes that Congress could start pulling out of its hat if given this encouragement. We should be protecting taxpayers, not feeding them to the wolves.

This bill is a slap in the face to fiscal responsibility. H.R. 6929's cash giveaway will force taxpayers to shoulder a cost of $800 million over the next decade and $1.3 billion in all to bail out underfunded, privately run pension plans.

Another bailout of failing pension plans does nothing but stick it to hardworking taxpayers. This bill simply underscores the fact that Congress is too misguided to focus on real issues.

Madam Speaker, hardworking taxpayers cannot afford more senseless bailouts. Enough is enough.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague. I disagree with the conclusions that she makes, and I would only challenge a couple of things.

One is on the issue of precedent. There is no precedent, unless the precedent is when the Federal Government intervenes and takes control of a company, takes ownership of a company, it buys the problem. It then owns the solution. It owns responsibility for the solution.

So the only precedent that I think this sets is one that I learned a long time ago: if you broke it, you bought it. The Federal Government intervened and made these decisions disproportionately affecting these particular employees.

The rest of the employees got their pensions topped up, why wouldn't this particular set?

Secondly, I disagree with the reference that this is candy. For these taxpayers, these families, this is rent, this is food on the table, it is their mortgage payment, it is a car payment, and it is medicine—medicines that, sadly, Susan Muffley didn't have the ability to get to because her pension was cut. This is about justice.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), who unfortunately is spending her last months in Congress. I wish that weren't the case.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Susan Muffley Act. This bill would restore pension benefits to over 20,000 Delphi salaried retirees, including over 5,000 Michiganders.

When GM filed for bankruptcy during the Great Recession, these families lost up to 70 percent of their earned benefits. They need and deserve the attention and action of this body.

This bill is named after Susan Muffley, whose husband worked at Delphi for 31 years and could not seek medical treatment when their family lost the pension.

Mrs. Muffley spent years fighting to have all these pensions restored.

Let me be absolutely clear: Michiganders and all Americans who have worked hard their entire lives to support their families deserve the right to retire with dignity and financial security. This is simply the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman KILDEE, for introducing this bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.'' In America we are better than this, and we need to pass this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Dr. Foxx, of North Carolina for yielding.

Unlike the multi-employer pension program, which was recently injected with billions of taxpayer dollars, the single-employer insurance program is self-sufficient. It is funded by premiums paid by employer sponsors to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. By most accounts, PBGC's single-employer insurance system is healthy and not in need of bailouts. Yet a bailout is exactly what H.R. 6929 is. You cannot give public money out to one person without first taking it from another.

This bill does not help Pennsylvanians without a pension plan or with losses in their personal retirement accounts. On the contrary, this bill is an irresponsible giveaway that sets a dangerous precedent for the Federal Government's involvement in pension plans going forward.

□ 1600

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bailout will cost taxpayers nearly $800 million over 10 years; not including the lifetime cost of the bill, which could reach $1.3 billion. I wonder how the people that have to pay that in the next generation are going to pay their rent, afford their college, and afford their groceries.

Congressional Democrats and the Biden administration have already spent tens of billions on insolvent and failing multi-employer plans, without holding trustees accountable for failing workers or retirees, or meaningfully reforming the pension system to prevent future insolvency.

Once again, the Federal Government is offering a pension bailout.

Hardworking taxpayers who have their own retirements to worry about cannot continue to shoulder this burden. We cannot set this kind of precedent for a single-employer system. If Congress gives special treatment to this plan covered by today's bill, the other 5,000 single-employer plans also managed by PBGC will pressure Congress to do the same for all.

Is Congress then expected to top up or provide a lump sum to every future terminated plan? These are serious implications that cannot be ignored.

The vast majority of participants in terminated plans receive their full benefits. The Delphi plans are no exception. Nearly three-fourths of participants were not subject to the PBGC's statutory guarantee limits.

This body must remember it works for the taxpayers, not political interest groups. Americans don't work hard each and every day to fund irresponsible pet projects. We need more fiscal sanity, not more pension bailouts.

On top of all these issues, the manager's amendment is simply a budget gimmick to make the bill appear to cost nothing.

In reality, it accelerates the time period in which single-employer plans are required to pay their variable rate premiums to the PBGC to fit within the budget window, and it adds nothing to the PBGC's bottom line.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLER. PBGC is going to receive the same amount of money with or without the manager's amendment.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this legislation and the dangerous, fiscally irresponsible precedent it sets.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. I rise today in support of H.R. 6929, the Susan Muffley Act.

Madam Speaker, this House has been one of the strongest advocates for workers and worker families in recent history.

We passed legislation to increase the minimum wage; to support the right to organize; to decrease the cost of drugs and health insurance. And we protected and restored pensions. But as this bill shows, our work is not complete.

My community in Buffalo and Western New York has a long history of auto-making. When the recession hit in 2009, families across my district saw their pensions evaporate.

And while we stabilized the auto sector, and the loans have been repaid, thousands of former auto company employees have been left behind, including hundreds of Delphi workers in Lockport who, due to no fault of their own, had their pensions arbitrarily cut.

This legislation will fix that longstanding error and will provide certainty so that these families can retire with the benefits they earned.

I thank Mr. KILDEE from Michigan, Mr. RYAN and Mr. TURNER from Ohio, for being champions of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6929, another Democrat bailout bill by the sponsors of the nanny state.

It is clear that ''Bidenflation'' is crushing the American people with the Biden price hike that is causing sky-high gas prices, and Americans are struggling to stay afloat as the economy limps toward recession.

Not surprisingly though, Democrats are trying to redefine the term ''recession'' to avoid recognizing the failures of their damaging policies.

Let me help them out by quoting, paraphrasing from the former President Ronald Reagan: A recession is when your neighbor loses his job. A depression is when you lose your job. But a recovery is when Democrat Members of Congress lose their jobs.

This legislation would make hardworking middle-class taxpayers reimburse pension plan participants who were employed by the now-defunct Delphi Corporation and add 6 percent interest. The Democrats insist that this is just an attempt to rightfully recover losses suffered by these former employees.

But early in my own career, I actually experienced this kind of unfortunate situation firsthand. In fact, my first employer after college ended their cash balance pension plan just a couple of years after I started with the company. But it never occurred to me that other hardworking taxpayers should have to pay me for the benefits and earnings that I missed out on.

My next employer sold my division to a competitor, and then the former parent company went under, and the value of their stock that made up a significant portion of my retirement account went to zero. But, again, it never occurred to me that other, hardworking taxpayers should have to pay me to restore my lost investment value.

In both cases, recognizing the risks and rewards associated with our nonsocialist, free enterprise economic system, I just kept working hard, saving money for retirement, with no help from Congress or confiscation of resources from other hardworking taxpayers.

To my benevolent colleagues on the other side, I have one question for you: Where does this end? And we know where it ends, with these policies carried to its logical conclusion, with the physical ruin of America.

But I should say benevolent with other people's money and with our children's financial and economic future.

Should Congress reimburse every American's investment retirement plan when it suffers a loss?

What if all Americans seek repayment for their losses in this failed Biden economy, because it does affect everyone.

But hardworking Americans have had enough. Why should the constituents of my Virginia Fifth District pay for someone else's retirement plan?

Enough with the stimulus checks; enough with the bailouts; enough with paying people not to work; enough with growing the welfare state; enough with incentivizing and rewarding the wrong behavior, while punishing those who do the right thing.

Let's get back to the Trump policies, 1 percent inflation, $2 gas prices, and put Americans back to work. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this Democrat bailout bill.

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

I appreciated the gentleman's comments. I will point out, since the gentleman did refer to the former President, Mr. Trump, that Mr. Trump saw this as an injustice and directed his administration to address it as well.

And I also think there is enough partisanship in Washington, more than enough, so let's not make something that is bipartisan just for the point of rhetorical value into something that is claimed to be partisan.

This is not a partisan piece of legislation. I see Mr. TURNER on the other side of the aisle. We have worked together on this for years; 17 of the 37 cosponsors of this legislation are Republicans, including Members with whom I don't think I have ever shared sponsorship. I don't recall, for example, being a cosponsor of any piece of legislation with Mr. MO BROOKS. We are on this one.

This is not a partisan bill, so let's not call it that. You can disagree with it. You can vote against people getting their hard-earned pensions, but let's not make it into something that it isn't.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a friend that I have known for a very long time, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6929, the Susan Muffley Act of 2022.

Every worker deserves a secure and dignified retirement. That shouldn't be negotiable, especially when they were promised a pension as part of their income and put into it.

This legislation restores the pension benefits of Delphi salaried retirees that were impacted by the Great Recession, some of whom saw their pensions cut by as much as 70 percent as a result of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's termination of their benefits unfairly.

My State of Michigan was particularly impacted, as I know the State of Ohio was—it was a good midwest company—by the termination of these plans, with thousands of retirees losing pension benefits they earned, they were promised. They deserve the full value of what they earned and were promised.

These retirees have been fighting for over a decade to receive these benefits, and it is time to make them whole.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this important bipartisan bill.

I thank my colleague for his leadership. When we are home, we listen to these people who are just in total tears. They don't know what to do. And my colleague has never stopped leading the charge for them.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member FOXX for yielding me time.

I am an original cosponsor of this bill, H.R. 6929. This legislation restores the pensions of the Delphi Salaried Retirees.

I am very proud to speak on behalf of this bipartisan bill. During the Obama administration's 2009 taxpayer-funded General Motors bankruptcy bailout, President Obama's Auto Task Force directed the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to terminate the fully funded pensions of more than 20,000 Delphi Automotive salaried retirees.

Even worse is that the pensions of the salaried retirees were terminated while the Obama Auto Task Force used the taxpayer-funded bankruptcy to top up the pensions of the Delphi union employees. The Obama administration choose winners and losers, with taxpayers' dollars.

A 2013 report published by the Special Inspector General for TARP said: "Treasury did not view the non-UAW Delphi hourly employees or the Delphi salaried employees as having leverage because they could not hold up GM's bankruptcy."

These pensions did not fail. These pensioners were robbed of their pensions by the people who were supposed to protect them.

For over 13 years now, I have worked with my colleagues to try to restore these pensions. President Trump issued a Presidential directive, a memorandum directing the PBGC to provide options for restoring through the agency calling "the plight of Delphi's salaried and non-unionized workforce a great concern to my administration."

President Biden also supports this legislation. Now, Congress must restore these pensions. There is no precedent for this bill. No one else has had the White House pick winners and losers and take away their pensions.

It is our responsibility, as Members of Congress, to address this injustice. We finally have the chance to rectify this wrong. Stand up for the 20,000 hardworking Americans who want what is rightfully theirs. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a gentleman that I have been working with on this issue for as long as I have been in Congress.

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, 13 years; 13 years. I have been in Congress now for a little while, and I cannot begin to tell you what an example that the Delphi salaried retirees have set. It is the absolute gold standard for activism and lobbying their government.

And I, you know, normally get up here and get pretty upset; but I have got to kind of laugh because when I hear our friends on the other side talk about irresponsibility and gimmicks and nanny states and socialists, I think of all my friends in the Delphi salaried retirement.

These are the most hardworking citizens that I have in my district. And they show up for work. They coach the baseball teams. They work at the church. They are veterans. They give back. They are great parents. They are great-grandparents. They are involved in the community.

□ 1615

Our job here is pretty simple. We look at the field, see what is happening in the country, and if some person or group of people are being wronged unfairly, it is our job to fix it. It is not a Democrat thing. It is not a Republican thing. It is not a left-right thing, not a free market thing, or a socialist thing.

It is about people. It is about American citizens who did everything right. They showed up one day in the middle of a bankruptcy that, as Mr. KILDEE has articulated here, the government was organizing, and reorganizing, the American auto industry. This isn't some private-sector bankruptcy. The government was in there manipulating everything, and they screwed up.

There was no one screaming louder than I was at the Obama administration, SHERROD BROWN and I, in meetings with Tim Geithner and all the rest over the last 13 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN. I thank Congressman KILDEE from the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee RICHIE NEAL, SHERROD BROWN, ROB PORTMAN, MIKE TURNER. The Members of Congress and Senators who are on the ground with these families came together and have been fighting.

Here we are, 13 years later, where we are going to vote this out of the House, and we are going to send it to the Senate. We are going to try to help people because that is our job.

What I really appreciate about this is that during the rescue package, we were able to save hundreds and hundreds of thousands of pensions for people, about 100,000 in Ohio, because there was a problem, and we tried to fix it. That happened to be unions.

This group happens to not be union, but they deserve help all the same. That is what we are doing here. I was proud that the Auto Workers and the AFL–CIO are helping to support this.

We need more of this. I think this is an example of how to try to influence your government, try to get help, try to right a wrong, and not talk about Democrat and Republican and red and blue and all that nonsense that we are all sick of.

We are ready to move forward. If you need help, if you have been wronged, we are going to stand up and fight for you.

Again, I thank Mr. KILDEE for his leadership here. We are going to send this over to the Senate.

I know there are a lot of people, again, living and working and talking to these families over the last 13 years. How many people have passed away? How many families have been harmed? How many other people have not gotten the healthcare that they needed because they couldn't afford it, or they had situations in their family, and they didn't have enough money, maybe, to help their kids or help their grandkids?

This is the right thing to do. This is the absolute right thing to do. I am glad it is bipartisan, and I am glad we finally got it done after 13 years.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, my colleagues say we are here to help people. Our first job is like the doctor's oath: First, do no harm. This bill does harm.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, Congresswoman FOXX, for yielding. We disagree from time to time, and this is one of those.

I do agree that it shouldn't be seen as a partisan issue. The Democrats may see this as precedent-setting in a way that Republicans who support it don't. The precedent here isn't that every victim of fraud, and there are many when it comes to pensions, is going to somehow be made whole. Otherwise, you would create an incentive for people to commit fraud. One person takes the fall, and everyone else gets bailed out. That is not what this is.

When I listen to my colleague, Congressman BOB GOOD from Virginia, I might feel the same way if I didn't understand the facts of this situation. What this really amounts to is pension holders who were effectively the victims of civil asset forfeiture, which is an unjust and, in my opinion, unconstitutional practice that, sadly, is still tolerated.

This wasn't an underfunded pension. They weren't victims of fraud. Their pension was funded, and the government seized the assets. They seized what they said was the property of Delphi, a company in bankruptcy, but the reality is this is property of the pension holders. This is their retirement savings that was seized 13 years ago.

Thankfully, when Vice President Joe Biden said there is nothing we can do, in the intervening years, we found a way. I want to say thanks to Congressman KILDEE from Michigan. I want to say thanks to my colleague, MIKE TURNER.

I was on Air Force One with him as we were flying from Andrews Air Force base to Dayton, Ohio. Congressman TURNER took the lead, shared the message. We continued to work with President Trump at the time. He got it. He took action, and I think that this is one of the things where we have seen continuity.

I wish it would become a trend and that President Biden would carry many more policies with continuation. I think we would see great results because we are going to see great results out of this.

It sets the right precedent. I hope the precedent it sets is this government stops civil asset forfeiture altogether. It was unjust to do that to these pension holders, and I am glad that justice is finally going to come as a result of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues, even those who thought they were opposed to it, once you understand what is really going on here, to get on board and support this just bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the longest-serving woman in the history of the United States Congress.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman KILDEE for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, a miracle is happening here. Michigan Wolverines and Ohio Buckeyes, on a bipartisan basis, are agreeing. Wow. Everybody should vote for this act, for America's sake.

I am so proud to help celebrate the passage day of the Susan Muffley Act that will restore retirement benefits for thousands of Delphi retirees. Hard work should be rewarded.

The men and women who built up Delphi were made a promise in return for their years of hard work, and they were promised a stable and secure retirement during their golden years.

Over the years, the American worker has time and again seen promises broken, and they have seen the financial security they earned and is rightfully theirs thrown away. Now, the Susan Muffley Act makes good on Delphi's original promise.

Workers in Defiance, Ohio, and Sandusky, Ohio, and throughout Michigan and the Midwest will see, by restoring their benefits, the retirees who worked hard and built America will have the future they paid for and earned.

We know that the Susan Muffley Act is a giant step forward in justice, justice for Americans who worked hard and were cast aside until now.

I thank Congressman KILDEE for his absolutely tireless and relentless efforts to bring this to the floor. To get anything out of the Ways and Means Committee is a miracle anyway.

For Ohio, this means 5,000 families—believe me, many who can't afford their medicine, many who worry about tomorrow—will be celebrating. There will be a sense of being made whole again because of what they gave to this country, what they gave to their employers, and that bargain should be kept.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Congressman KILDEE. The Wolverine State has sent a highly capable American to Congress. I thank Congressman TURNER of the great Buckeye State of Ohio, from the Dayton region, for this great partnership to help thousands and thousands of America's retirees.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 12½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, proponents of H.R. 6929 continue to cite the statistics that the salaried employee pension plan was 86 percent funded in 2009 and, therefore, should not have been terminated. This is misleading and simply not the case.

When the salaried employee plan was terminated in 2009, it was roughly 50 percent funded with $2.4 billion in assets and $5 billion in liabilities. Delphi had not made required contributions to the plan in the previous 4 years.

Further, Delphi was moving through bankruptcy proceedings, and the company stated publicly it was unable to fund its pension plans before reaching an agreement with PBGC to terminate the plans.

Delphi had not made required contributions to the pension plans in the 4 years it was in bankruptcy proceedings. Delphi was liquidating assets in bankruptcy, and the plan had only enough assets to pay for half of its benefit obligations.

Finally, if the Delphi salaried employee plan was truly as well funded as proponents suggest, then why did it not have enough assets to cover the benefits owed to workers and retirees?

Madam Speaker, this is a big problem for the taxpayers of this country when we start bailing out pension plans in this way. We have a process through the PBGC, and that process should be followed.

Madam Speaker, it is important, really important, to make sure the Record is accurate. Most Delphi salaried pension plan participants who are being discussed today either received no cuts in their pensions or saw cuts of less than 10 percent.

PBGC typically becomes a trustee of a single-employer plan when the employer that sponsors the plan declares bankruptcy and the plan has insufficient assets from which to pay all promised benefits. When PBGC becomes a trustee of a single-employer pension plan, plan participants receive their full benefits up to a statutory maximum benefit, a benefit set by Congress.

The maximum guarantee in 2009, the year of Delphi's bankruptcy, was $4,500 per month or $54,000 per year for retirees who began receiving benefits at age 65. That is a very high amount of money that many Americans will never earn per year, let alone have for retirement.

PBGC reported in 2019 that 84 percent of retirees who receive benefits from PBGC are paid the full benefit amounts they earned under their retirement plans, meaning they do not have their benefits reduced.

In the case of the Delphi salaried employee plan, 72 percent of participants were not affected by PBGC's statutory benefit limit. Of the remaining 28 percent, 36 percent saw less than a 10 percent reduction.

Madam Speaker, again, I am speaking for the Americans who will never get a pension benefit because they have worked so hard but never made enough money to have a pension or don't have employers that pay pension benefits. We are bailing out people who are making a lot of money.

Madam Speaker, wages aren't keeping up with inflation. A Washington Post economic columnist recently pointed out that workers are experiencing the biggest decline in years in inflation-adjusted pay. According to a new report, 75 percent of middle-income families say their ''income is falling behind the cost of living.''

Given persistent and rising inflation, H.R. 6929 is the last thing we should be considering. It will cost taxpayers nearly $800 million over 10 years and $1.3 billion in all to bail out Delphi's underfunded, privately run pension plan.

Americans across the country do not want to fork over their hard-earned dollars to fund a costly project that was cooked up in Congress, especially when many have their own retirement accounts to consider or have none at all.

By doubling down on an already failed strategy, taxpayers will be forced to cover the cost of this cash giveaway. This sets a terrible and troubling precedent that will embolden the Federal Government to bail out thousands of other privately run pensions.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this fiscally irresponsible catastrophe of a bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I do believe, and I agree with my colleague, that the facts ought to be correct and that the RECORD ought to be clear. That is why I want to clarify a couple of things.

Number one, I continue to hear opponents of this legislation depict it as a Democratic bill, a partisan bill. That is just not true. It is amazing to me in this body that we can still have people say things that just are patently untrue. That is not true.

Just look at the list of Republican cosponsors of this legislation. If you don't want to look at that list, don't look at that list. Just look back a couple of years when then-Republican President Donald Trump saw this as an injustice and directed his administration to solve this problem.

This is not a partisan piece of legislation. I understand the game; I get it. Everything around here somehow has to be turned into Democrats versus Republicans.

I am going to tell you something about the Delphi salaried retirees. Some are Democrats. Some are Republicans. Some are Independents. They live in every part of this country. They are people who worked really hard and did nothing wrong and lost everything that they had worked for in some cases.

Two, the other fact that I want to correct, it is true that only the losses that these pension recipients received, the losses that they experienced would be made up for. So when my colleague points out the fact that some did not receive a 70 percent cut, that is true. People will only receive what was promised to them. That is kind of an American ideal, isn't it? We keep our promises.

As to the point that this is a private pension that was mismanaged and failed and the government shouldn't become involved, that ship sailed a long time ago when the government got involved. The government took control of the company, took control of its assets, made these decisions.

So if there is a precedent to be set, the precedent is this: The Federal Government makes a mistake, the Federal Government has the obligation to fix it. I don't know what is wrong with that. I don't know what is wrong with that. I mean, that is the way I was raised.

I don't know who is watching today. I don't know how many Americans are watching, but I hope they are paying attention. I know a lot of those Delphi salaried retirees are watching. Despite some of what you heard today—because this place becomes very political, unfortunately—despite some of what you heard, what you saw and what you are about to see in a little while, we are Democrats and Republicans who disagree on a lot of things and we are coming together to fix a problem that has lasted for 13 years, a problem that occurred on the watch of a Democratic President, a problem that a Republican President was attempting to address, but who didn't get it done, and now in this moment Members of Congress—with whom I have very little in common—share one thing for sure, we represent many of the same people, people who have suffered an injustice and are looking to the Congress of the United States as the last chance they have to have that mistake made right.

That is a precedent I don't mind seeing us set. If the Federal Government makes a mistake, we fix it. That is what we are about to do here today.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6929, the ''Susan Muffley Act of 2022.''

H.R. 6929 is a bipartisan, bicameral effort to restore the retirement benefits for over 20,000 Delphi salaried retirees.

This legislation will lay out a formal procedure to pay the difference between the pension benefits earned by Delphi salaried retirees and what they received following the General Motors (GM) bankruptcy in 2009.

Moreover, it will ensure that beneficiaries who have already begun receiving benefits will receive a separate payment of the difference between what was actually paid by the U.S. Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation

(PBGC) and what would have been paid without the limitations plus interest.

Under H.R. 6929, retirees from this auto parts manufacturing company will be eligible for increased benefits in connection with the following pension plans:

The Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

The Delphi Retirement Program for Salaried Employees.

The PHI Non-Bargaining Retirement Plan.

The ASEC Manufacturing Retirement Program.

The PHI Bargaining Retirement Plan.

The Delphi Mechatronic Systems Retirement Program.

During the Great Recession of 2009, several major auto manufactuers including GM filed for bankruptcy.

As a result, the PBGC recklessly cut retirement benefits by as much as 70 percent for more than 20,000 Delphi salaried retirees, including over 500 retirees in Texas.

This is unacceptable. Social Security, pensions, and personal savings have long ensured that workers could retire with dignity.

Now, majority of these retirees are struggling to stay afloat especially those with climbing medical bills.

Therefore, I applaud the efforts of my colleagues in both the House and Senate for bringing this issue into greater focus.

Those who have worked hard their entire lives and played by the rules deserve the benefits they earned.

That is why I am proud to support this legislation that will restore the benefits that hundreds of Texans were promised.

This legislation will relieve the suffering of thousands of salaried and hourly workers who were left behind after GM's filing for bankruptcy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6929 to finally correct the mistreatment of these union members and allow them to live out the rest of days with dignity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part E of House Report 117–432.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 3. PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION REPORT.

(a) REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation shall issue a request for information to the public regarding ways to ensure the long-term solvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's insurance programs.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation shall, taking into consideration the information received in the request for information described in subsection (a), submit a report, which shall include recommendations on how to ensure the long-term solvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's insurance programs, to the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1254, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this amendment is simple and straightforward. It requires the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation within 1 year after the date of enactment to issue a public request for information regarding ways to ensure the long-term solvency of the PBGC's insurance programs, and then within 2 years after the date of enactment, the Director shall issue a report to congressional committees with recommendations on how to ensure the long-term solvency of the insurance programs.

As my colleagues know, the PBGC administers two insurance programs, one for multiemployer pensions and the other for single-employer pensions. PBGC's multiemployer program has been on the brink of insolvency. It was projected to run out of money in just a few years, but thanks to the Biden administration and congressional Democrats stepping up and passing the American Rescue Plan last year, millions of Americans' pensions have been saved.

Because the law requires participating businesses to pay into those failing plans until the businesses go broke, tens of thousands of businesses have been saved, and the solvency of the PBGC's multiemployer program has been extended for at least 30 more years.

For the single-employer program, the PBGC's most recent annual report indicates that it is financially healthy, with a positive net position of over $30 billion at the end of fiscal year 2021 compared to just over $15 billion at the end of fiscal year 2020. So, fortunately, it is not at the near-term risk of becoming insolvent.

A few years ago, I had the honor of being one of the four House Democrats selected for a special committee charged with addressing the multiemployer pension crisis. We tried to address the immediate crisis facing multiemployer pension plans with their participants and employers while also considering other long-term reforms to pension programs, but unfortunately we could not reach any agreement before the clock ran out.

Now that congressional Democrats and the Biden administration have solved the immediate crisis, and it looks like we can solve this crisis, we should take action to ensure that this doesn't happen again. We will do this by getting policy recommendations from the PBGC on how we can ensure long-term solvency of both insurance programs and avoid the possibility that 20 years from now pension plans would again be on the brink of insolvency.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The first thing I will say, I never said that the bill was a partisan bill, and I would like to clarify the record on that point.

This amendment directs the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to issue a public request for information regarding the long-term solvency of the agency's single- and multiemployer insurance programs, and to submit legislative recommendations to Congress within 2 years.

I don't question the sincerity with which my colleague from Virginia offers this amendment. However, if H.R. 6929 is signed into law, this report will be a day late and a dollar short.

Last year, under the guise of COVID relief, congressional Democrats and President Biden enacted an uncapped taxpayer-funded bailout of failing and insolvent multiemployer pension plans. While the most recent estimate of the bailout indicates taxpayers are on the hook for $90 billion, without a cap on the total amount of spending, the bailout could cost much more.

Worse yet, Democrats refused to address the structural failures of the system, refused to hold plan trustees accountable, and encouraged further plan underfunding.

The Education and Labor Committee has been wrestling with the problems facing the multiemployer pension system and the looming insolvency of PBGC's insurance program for decades. The committee has held countless hearings on the topic. Congress even established a Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans, of which Chairman SCOTT and I were members.

We already know the problems with the system, and we don't need to wait another 2 years for PBGC to issue a report with recommendations. Plans do not adequately fund their promises. A comment was made about keeping promises. Well, we need to fund the plans. They overpromise, undercontribute, and refuse to make responsible adjustments, ultimately, digging themselves into deeper holes.

Further, PBGC has submitted legislative recommendations regarding multiemployer pensions that Democrats have routinely ignored. For years, under both the Obama and Trump administrations, PBGC recommended

Congress establish a variable rate premium for multiemployer plans to align premiums better with the risk these plans pose to PBGC.

Single-employer plans pay a much higher flat rate premium as well as a variable-rate premium. Multiemployer plans should do the same. Single-employer plans are also subject to much stricter funding requirements that better protect the benefits of workers and retirees.

Meanwhile, poorly managed multiemployer plans fail to collect adequate contributions for the benefits they promise and bet on risky investments in hopes of making up the difference.

While I appreciate the amendment's implicit admission that throwing billions of dollars at multiemployer plans has not solved the problem, this fig leaf amendment does nothing to address the fundamental flaws of the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished ranking member pointed out that the saving of the multiemployer pension fund would cost about $90 billion. That is right.

What she omitted was that estimates of doing nothing with the people losing their pension, they would pay less in income taxes, they would use more social services, and the Federal Government was on the hook for $170 billion if we had done nothing. In other words, we would have to spend $80 billion more to help the people who lost their pensions and the businesses that went broke trying to save those pension plans.

But in any case, Madam Speaker, the time to fix the roof is when the Sun is shining. We have gotten past the crisis. Let's find out what we need to do to avoid the possibility that these pension funds might be back here 20 years from now in a state of failure.

We need to make sure we fix it. Let's get these recommendations. That is why this amendment is so important that it will guarantee getting the information so we can fix these plans once and for all.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Madam Speaker, again, I don't think we need another study. We don't need to delay action on this 2 years. What we need to do is increase premiums and impose stronger funding requirements.

The plans are underfunded. It doesn't take an accountant or a rocket scientist to figure that out. Pogo said, ''We have met the enemy, and he is us.'' We, in Congress, are the problem. We need to do this.

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

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of Rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

A motion to recommit H.R. 3771;

Passage of H.R. 3771, if ordered;

Motion to recommit H.R. 4040;

Passage of H.R. 4040, if ordered; and,

The motion to suspend the rules with respect to the following measures:

H.R. 623;
H.R. 3952;
H.R. 3962;
H.R. 4551;
H.R. 5313;
H.R. 6933;
H.R. 7132;
H.R. 7361;
H.R. 7569;
H.R. 7624;
H.R. 7733; and
H.R. 7981.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 175, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

YEAS—254

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Baird
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moolenaar
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rose
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Issa
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo

Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Steel
Stefanik
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—1

Hartzler

□ 1730

Mr. ROUZER and Mrs. KIM of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. HAYES, Messrs. CHABOT, PENCE, and MEIJER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Jackson)
Bass (Neguse)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Bush (Jeffries)
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Casten (Neguse)
Cherfilus-McCormick (Neguse)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Evans (Beyer)
Guthrie (Barr)
Jones (Beyer)
Kahele (Correa)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Bishop (GA))
Sires (Pallone)
Stevens (Kuster)
Stewart (Wenstrup)
Taylor (Fallon)
Thompson (CA) (Beyer)
Thompson (MS) (Bishop (GA))
Thompson (PA) (Keller)
Vargas (Correa)
Walorski (Banks)
Williams (GA) (Neguse)
Wilson (SC) (Norman)

SOUTH ASIAN HEART HEALTH AWARENESS AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3771) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and improvement of cardiovascular health among the South Asian population of the United States, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 225, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

YEAS—198

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—225

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buck
Budd
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosendale
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Gonzalez, Vicente
Grothman
Hartzler
Kaptur
Kinzinger
Nehls
O'Halleran

□ 1739

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 397.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Jackson)
Bass (Neguse)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bourdeaux (Correa)
Brown (MD) (Trone)
Bush (Jeffries)
Carter (TX) (Weber (TX))
Casten (Neguse)
Cherfilus-McCormick (Neguse)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Evans (Beyer)
Guthrie (Barr)
Jones (Beyer)
Kahele (Correa)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Bishop (GA))
Sires (Pallone)
Stevens (Kuster)
Stewart (Wenstrup)
Taylor (Fallon)
Thompson (CA) (Beyer)
Thompson (MS) (Bishop (GA))
Thompson (PA) (Keller)
Vargas (Correa)
Walorski (Banks)
Williams (GA) (Neguse)
Wilson (SC) (Norman)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALBERG. Madam 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 237, noes 192, not voting 1, as follows: