

Clark (MA) Hill
 Clarke (NY) Himes
 Cleaver Hinson
 Cline Horsford
 Cloud Houchin
 Clyburn Houlihan
 Cole Hoyle (OR)
 Collins Hudson
 Comer Huffman
 Connolly Huizenga
 Correa Hunt
 Costa Issa
 Courtney Ivey
 Craig Jackson (IL)
 Crawford Jackson (NC)
 Crenshaw Jackson (TX)
 Crockett Jacobs
 Crow James
 Cuellar Jayapal
 Curtis Jeffries
 D'Esposito Johnson (GA)
 Davids (KS) Johnson (LA)
 Davidson Johnson (SD)
 Davis (IL) Jordan
 Davis (NC) Joyce (OH)
 De La Cruz Joyce (PA)
 Dean (PA) Kamlager-Dove
 DeGette Kaptur
 DeLauro Kean (NJ)
 DeBene Keating
 Deluzio Kelly (IL)
 DeSaulnier Kelly (MS)
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA)
 Diaz-Balart Kennedy
 Dingell Khanna
 Doggett Kiggans (VA)
 Donalds Kildee
 Duarte Kiley
 Duncan Kilmer
 Dunn (FL) Kim (CA)
 Edwards Krishnamoorthi
 Ellzey Kuster
 Emmer Kustoff
 Escobar LaHood
 Eshoo LaLota
 Espaillat LaMalfa
 Estes Lamborn
 Ezell Landsman
 Fallon Langworthy
 Feenstra Larsen (WA)
 Ferguson Larson (CT)
 Finstad Latta
 Fischbach LaTurner
 Fitzgerald Lawler
 Fitzpatrick Lee (CA)
 Fleischmann Lee (FL)
 Fletcher Lee (NV)
 Flood Lee (PA)
 Fong Lee Carter
 Foster Leger Fernandez
 Foushee Lesko
 Foxx Letlow
 Frankel, Lois Levin
 Franklin, Scott Lofgren
 Frost Lopez
 Fry Loudermilk
 Fulcher Lucas
 Gallego Luetkemeyer
 Garamendi Luna
 Garbarino Luttrell
 Garcia (IL) Lynch
 Garcia (TX) Mace
 Garcia, Mike Magaziner
 Garcia, Robert Malliotakis
 Gimenez Maloy
 Golden (ME) Mann
 Goldman (NY) Manning
 Gomez Mast
 Gonzales, Tony Matsui
 Gonzalez, V. McBath
 Good (VA) McClain
 Gooden (TX) McClellan
 Gosar McClintock
 Gottheimer McCollum
 Graves (LA) McCormick
 Graves (MO) McGarvey
 Green (TN) McGovern
 Green, Al (TX) McHenry
 Griffith McIver
 Grothman Meeks
 Guest Menendez
 Guthrie Meng
 Hageman Meuser
 Harder (CA) Mfume
 Harris Miller (IL)
 Harshbarger Miller (OH)
 Hayes Miller (WV)
 Hern Miller-Meeks
 Higgins (LA) Mills

Molinaro
 Moolenaar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran
 Morelle
 Moskowitz
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Mullin
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Nehls
 Nickel
 Norcross
 Nunn (IA)
 Obernolte
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Ogles
 Omar
 Owens
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pelosi
 Peltola
 Pence
 Perez
 Perry
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Pfluger
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Quigley
 Ramirez
 Raskin
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Ross
 Rouzer
 Ruiz
 Rulli
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Salinas
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schneider
 Scholten
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Self
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Sorensen
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spartz
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Strong
 Suozzi
 Swalwell

Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Wexton
 Wied
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Williams (NY)
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yakym
 Zinke

The text of the bill is as follows:
 H.R. 7673

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 “Liberty in Laundry Act”.

SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING AND ENFORCING ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR CLOTHES WASHERS.

(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 clothes washer 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 clothes washer 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 clothes washer 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 clothes washer 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 clothes washer 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 clothes washer 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

NAYS—6

Brecheen Clyde
 Burlison Crane
 Norman Roy

NOT VOTING—15

Burgess Grijalva Newhouse
 Cohen Hoyer Rutherford
 Evans Lieu Scott, David
 Granger Massie Steel
 Greene (GA) McCaul Waltz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1421

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, December 9, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
 Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 9, 2024, at 4:35 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 1868.

That the Senate passed S. 3606.

That the Senate passed S. 4212.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. McCUMBER,
 Acting Clerk.

LIBERTY IN LAUNDRY ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1612, I call up the bill (H.R. 7673) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for clothes washers 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. MOLINARO). Pursuant to House Resolution 1612, the bill is considered read.

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 include extraneous material on H.R. 7673.

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. 7673, the Liberty in Laundry Act, and I thank Congressman OGLES for leading on this issue.

Throughout the 118th Congress, the Energy and Commerce Committee has been on the front lines for defending the needs of everyday Americans against the radical climate agenda of the Biden administration.

This administration has prioritized expensive and unreliable energy policies that have diminished the quality of life for our friends and neighbors across the country.

These harmful policies have sought to direct the energy we use and even the appliances we buy. We stood on this floor and we talked about gas stoves, dishwashers, and HVACs. In Congress, we talked about the push to electrification and the mandates from the U.S. Government to Americans to tell them what kind of cars they have to drive—not what they want to drive, but cars they have to drive. Today, we are addressing the assault on clothes washers.

This bill protects the affordability and quality and choice for Americans to decide for themselves what suits their needs best.

Thanks to radical climate policies, Americans will spend 34 percent more on appliances today than they did just a decade ago. These appliances are not only more expensive, they offer a lesser quality with fewer features Americans rely on and shorter lifespans.

This legislation will prevent the DOE from enforcing standards for clothes washers unless they are technologically feasible and economically justified, are not likely to result in additional cost to the consumer, and will result in significant conservation of energy.

The American people have spoken. They cannot afford and they don't want more of the same. They have overwhelmingly rejected the Democratic Party and their pandering to the radical climate lobby.

Everyday Americans are tired of record inflation, high-energy costs, and just the struggle they have every day to make ends meet.

□ 1430

This legislation addresses kitchen-table issues for Americans and their families. The out-of-touch policies of the Biden administration are why the American people decided to elect President Donald J. Trump to a second term.

In the 119th Congress, House Republicans will continue to fight for hard-working Americans and unleash our energy to lower costs and improve the quality of life for those across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 7673, the Liberty in Laundry Act. I thank Representative OGLES 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, we are quickly approaching the final days of this Congress, and after spending a year on the campaign trail promising to lower prices for working families, today House Republicans are bringing up a bill that will raise energy bills for those very same families.

H.R. 7673 guts popular energy efficiency standards for laundry machines, standards that save Americans money on their utility bills and reduce dangerous greenhouse gas pollution at the same time.

These efficiency standards create certainty for manufacturers, and they protect consumers from rising costs. In the case of these laundry machine standards, they also reduce water use, a benefit that could greatly aid drought-prone regions around the Nation.

What is more, Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration's energy efficiency actions are projected to save Americans \$1 trillion and reduce greenhouse gas pollution by more than 2.5 billion metric tons over the next 30 years. The laundry machine standard that this bill guts is on track to save Americans \$18 billion on their utility bills over the next 30 years, as well.

However, today's Republican Party is unpersuaded by things like facts and cost savings. With this bill, Republicans are proving that their vow to lower costs was nothing more than an empty campaign promise. This legislation actively works to raise Americans' energy bills, all so they can curry favor with their special interest friends and do the bidding of their fossil fuel industry friends. Absolutely no one else stands to benefit from this legislation, proving once and for all that Republicans only pay lip service to lowering costs when it is campaign season.

That is why this bill conveniently ignores the efficiency standards-setting process that already exists at the Department of Energy, which already requires that these standards result in significant savings, be technologically feasible, and economically justifiable.

In fact, DOE's process works so well that the laundry machine standard tar-

geted by this bill was actually the result of a consensus agreement between the appliance industry, efficiency advocates, and consumer advocates. They actually embrace reality. The reality is that laundry machine standards haven't been updated in more than a decade, many models that meet the new standard already exist, and appliance manufacturers have said they do not feel burdened by it at all.

All this begs the question—why are Republicans trying to undermine a process that brings everyone to the table to lower costs? Who, exactly, is asking for this bill?

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7673 would effectively overturn the Department of Energy's recently finalized efficiency standards and prohibit the Department from enforcing any standard that increases upfront costs by even a single penny, completely ignoring the massive savings that Americans would enjoy on their home energy bills over the long run.

I oppose the bill because it will increase energy costs for American families and undermine our ongoing efforts to combat the worsening climate crisis. Republicans will go out of their way to cut taxes for their wealthy billionaire friends, but when it comes to taking actions that actually lower costs for everyday Americans, they are nowhere to be found.

Mr. Speaker, I urge 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 remind Americans that this mandate by the Biden administration on washing machines will only save them about \$9 total over the lifespan of the unit itself, which is about 13½ years, a savings of only \$9 over 13½ years. Unbelievable.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), my friend.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Liberty in Laundry Act, which defends the American people against rogue and out-of-touch D.C. bureaucrats.

There might only be 41 days remaining in the current administration, but this administration is still doing its best to make household appliances unaffordable. If he wanted to limit consumer choice, undercut quality, and raise costs for Americans, then Joe Biden couldn't have done a better job.

First it was gas stoves, then it was water heaters and HVAC. Go down the list. Now the Biden-Harris administration is going after your washing machines.

When the government tries to micro-manage something as basic as your laundry routine, including which washing machines you can buy and how much you will pay for them, my Republican colleagues and I will take a stand.

The Biden Energy Department doesn't even believe in the value of its

own rulemaking. As the chairman said, \$9 over the lifespan of this device. The upfront cost of the machine is outweighed by this so-called savings.

They are imposing energy standards that often mean higher costs on the appliances themselves, longer wash cycles, and perhaps even using more water. The American people pay more for their appliances upfront because of these efficiency standards.

Worse, the Biden administration repealed better efficiency rules implemented by the Trump administration with the Fifth Circuit ruling earlier this year that DOE's repeal of President Trump's efficiency rules were arbitrary and capricious.

The court found that the Biden administration failed to consider—now keep in mind, this is the court—failed to consider things like appliance performance and the fact that the standards were causing Americans to use more water, not less.

Some Democrats may want to race down the world to serfdom, replacing the judgments of consumers with those of government commissars about what products best meet their needs. However, I will not allow them to drag millions of hardworking Americans, like in the rural parts of my district, who are going to go to their appliance store and pay more.

My bill prohibits the Department of Energy from imposing or enforcing standards that would increase net costs to consumers. My bill requires them to include costs related to purchase, installation, maintenance, and replacement cost, forcing them to be honest about the true cost of the rule or the regulation.

My bill safeguards the right of families to choose the appliance that best fits their needs and budget, again, without the burden of the Biden administration.

Of course, we won't stop with laundry. We will continue pursuing legislation to stop bureaucrats wherever they choose to make life harder for hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of my legislation.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7673. It is a Republican bill that is going to raise costs on American families.

Mr. Speaker, years ago, Congress directed the Department of Energy to encourage innovation and cost savings in the appliances we use by working with manufacturers and consumer advocates to routinely update energy efficiency standards. That is one of the reasons why Americans enjoy modern and cost-saving appliances when they go to replace them.

Everyone knows that higher standards do not force you to go and replace

your washing machine, but when that washer finally breaks, you have the choice to replace it with a better model, one that saves you money.

Energy efficiency across all appliances is a huge success. It helps families save money and improves our lives.

Earlier this year, the Department of Energy updated standards for clothes washers based upon the input of a wide range of stakeholders, including the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers—that is right, the manufacturers support energy efficiency standards—the Consumer Federation of America, and energy efficiency advocates. To them, I say great work and thank you because over time Americans will save big on their energy and water bills while also reducing tons of dangerous carbon dioxide pollution.

You could say that energy-efficient clothes washers will provide loads of savings, as the new models speed up the cycle to aid the household bottom line.

All together, with more efficient appliances, DOE projects that the average family could save at least \$100 a year on their utility bills, plus efficiency helps cut the pollution that is fueling costly extreme weather events like Hurricanes Helene and Milton that ruined homes and businesses back in my community just a few months ago.

If the appliance industry supports efficiency standards and consumer groups support efficiency standards, and three out of five Americans support the cost savings, why are Republicans making this a priority? Well, here is the dirty, little secret. The special interests that profit off of people using as much energy as possible and who profit when energy is wasted—like oil and gas companies and some utilities—have a lot of influence here on Capitol Hill.

You can either side with the polluters and their profits or you can side with the people and their pocketbooks. I am going to side with the people and their pocketbooks every time.

Appliance efficiency standards are one of the best tools we have to lower household energy costs, so I urge my colleagues not to fall for the rinse and spin, put this bill out to dry, and vote “no.”

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this partisan energy appliance bill. Time and time again in this Congress, we keep seeing these bills brought to the floor that are partisan messaging bills meant to rile up the American people, not really get something done, while continuing to put off the work that the American people sent us here to do.

H.R. 7673 isn't the first anti-efficiency bill we have seen on the House floor this year. I say to my Republican

colleagues and friends, I am not sure what we are really getting done. The Liberty in Laundry Act, along with other anti-efficiency bills this Congress, would delay and weaken popular energy efficiency standards, courting favor with polluters, not consumers.

The bill attacks existing standards and sends a message to the incoming Trump administration to attack existing standards and undermine the entire program. Bills like the Liberty in Laundry Act show that Republicans don't want to help save American consumers money on their energy bills.

I wish we could work together on doing things that the American people need us to do instead of going after America's household appliances. The fear-mongering continues, and it is nothing more than politics designed to scare consumers.

I am a car girl. Hey, I am not old, but I am seasoned. When the administration, Republicans and Democrats, wanted to increase fuel efficiency standards, American consumers wanted it, and yet on the floor of both houses, people stood up against it. I will tell you what, the American consumer likes those fuel efficiency standards. It saved them money.

The American people sent us here to work together in a bipartisan manner to find commonsense solutions, and that is what I want to work with my colleagues on, but we don't have much time left in this Congress, so I am just saying, can we please work together on the real issues facing the American people instead of talking about people's dirty laundry?

Let me say again, we are politicizing washing machines. Why? We have real work to do to cut costs and make life better for Americans. We need to fund the government. Attacking popular energy efficiency standards is not why our constituents sent us here. They want us to save them money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 7673. We need to work on things that will make a difference for consumers every day in the remaining days of the 118th Congress.

□ 1445

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, just a point. The payback periods for many of these appliances are uneconomical. Republicans look long term. Republicans look toward quality and value for Americans.

For example, the payback period for the Department of Energy's proposed clothes washer standard for a ventless electric combination washer and dryer is—are you ready for it?—46 years. Forty-six years for a washing machine that, if we are lucky, will last 15 years. Americans know they have to replace a lot of appliances over a period of time.

Mr. Speaker, it is sort of a bitter-sweet moment for me because this may be the very last time I get to speak from the House floor, and it is an honor to be here to represent the Energy and Commerce Committee's Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee

that I chair on this bill, but it has been an honor to work on so many other bills over time.

I have enjoyed working with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Ranking Member PALLONE has been a phenomenal ranking member for the Energy and Commerce Committee to work with. I have enjoyed it. There are so many others on the other side of the aisle, too many to name, but Representative HENRY CUELLAR is a good friend and SCOTT PETERS. Albio Sires was a good friend of mine who is no longer in Congress.

It has been an interesting ride for 14 years in the United States Congress. I have seen a lot on this House floor, from last year with the Speaker's debate from the original Speaker election that happened in this Congress back to John Boehner, Speaker Boehner, calling me a hardhead on the floor, something I wore as a badge of courage because I was representing my constituents in the Third District of South Carolina, who sent me to Washington to be that hardhead because they were tired of seeing runaway government. They were tired of seeing government spending that has created a balance of about \$35 trillion in debt that our Nation faces today. That is a number that is unfathomable.

To work on energy policy has been something that I came to Washington to work on, and I was blessed with the opportunity to become the chair of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee. We dealt with energy, grid security, and climate change in this Congress—retitled that committee—but we focus a lot on American energy, American energy independence.

There are four words that I talk about often. Those are produce, deliver, utilize, and export. We are blessed in this Nation with abundant resources that we need to produce more of because using natural gas, as an example, we have in abundance. We can't even measure the amount of natural gas we are blessed with in this Nation, and utilizing that natural gas has helped us lower our global carbon emissions.

The carbon emissions in the United States have gone down because of the use of cleaner-burning, American-produced natural gas. If we produce more, we are going to need to deliver those assets whether it is liquid fuels or gas or electricity down power lines, transmission lines. That is the delivery component.

We have to deliver that resource, whether it is electricity produced at a nuclear power plant or whether it is natural gas or liquid fuels going to the refinery. We need to produce more. We need to deliver it to where it can be utilized.

We need to utilize it to create the electricity that meets the demands of America and the globe, and energy demand in this country and globally is not going down. It is only going up, and it is going up exponentially globally.

We can help so many people around the world improve their quality of life, their standard of living, by exporting more United States-produced natural gas to help them meet their global carbon emissions goals by utilizing cleaner burning U.S. gas, taking their coal-fired power plants offline and using U.S. gas to produce the electricity that makes the lives of their constituents and their citizens much better.

These are things we have worked on, and I hope Congress in the future will continue to work on, yes, lowering our global carbon emissions because, yes, cleaner air is just the right thing. Whatever side you come down on on the global climate change aspects, cleaner air is good, and we can do that by utilizing more U.S.-produced natural gas.

Produce more, deliver more, utilize more, and export more to help our friends and allies in Eastern Europe that are facing energy security issues because they depend on Russia. They look west to the U.S. to help them meet their energy needs.

Yet, we debate things like washing machines, stoves, and dishwashers, but we have had the opportunity to work on real substantive issues for American energy policy under my tenure as an Energy and Commerce subcommittee chair, but also under CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, a great American who chaired the Energy and Commerce Committee for this Congress. She has been a great leader. She also is somebody who cares about more than just energy. She cares about the whole spectrum of energy and commerce, from children's online safety to privacy, data privacy. She also understands the need for American energy independence.

I have been blessed with the opportunity in Congress to stand here, and I give a shout-out to Representative Doc Hastings, who was the former chair of the Natural Resources Committee who gave me the opportunity twice back in the day when we actually did motions to recommit and had those speeches. Ranking Member PALLONE may remember those days. Honestly, that was some of the most fun debate on the House floor. You heard cheers. Trey Gowdy was up here, and others. I miss those days in the United States Congress when we interacted a little bit more.

I thank the Energy and Commerce Committee staff that is sitting behind me and the full committee staff that has made this job much easier, providing us the information we need to debate properly.

This is a great institution that I have been honored to be a part of. I thank the House staff because they are great. They make order out of all this chaos. It is chaos many, many days, but we are all here elected, both Republican and Democrat, to do what is best for the United States of America, a country that we love, every one of us.

We may have differences on how to get there, but making America great,

being the best nation we can be, providing for our constituents, providing for our Nation, being a strong nation, is something everybody believes in. We just have different approaches. Nobody dislikes one another, and that is what really makes the United States House of Representatives so special.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to do this today on the floor. I thank my creator for giving me the opportunity to do this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DUNCAN for all that he has done for many years in Congress, particularly on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We were at the Rules Committee last night, and we actually said that we enjoyed being at the Rules Committee and sparring back and forth. I think we really meant it. Not too many people would say that when they go to the Rules Committee, to be perfectly honest. That is because he has always been a gentleman. He is always concerned about doing the right thing.

One of the things in the Energy and Commerce Committee that we do all the time is try to come to a consensus. It is not always possible. That is certainly not possible on this bill, but we really try to get things done. We try to build a consensus and do what we think is going to make a difference to improve the lives of the American people. I thank him for the comments he made and for his service, and I know we are going to see each other after this year as well, hopefully a lot.

Mr. Speaker, maybe this bill is a good example of what I just said. I understand where the Republicans are coming from, but I just strongly disagree, frankly, because I think for many years now the Department of Energy has had the obligation to try to come up with better efficiency standards for appliances. Usually, it is done on a consensus basis with industry, and it has to, under the current law, save money.

In this case, it is not only saving money over the life of a washing machine, if you will, but also saving water, reducing the amount of greenhouse gases that go into the atmosphere. I think the one thing where we differ is Mr. DUNCAN has talked about maybe—I don't want to put words in his mouth—the price goes up a dollar or a few dollars from where it is right now, but over the life of a machine, you actually are saving money. That is exactly what the Department is supposed to look at when they look at not only the energy savings but the reduced costs to the consumer. That is maybe where the difference lies here.

The bottom line is that this standard doesn't go into effect until 2028. It certainly is my experience—and you know they have done focus groups and other things on this to show that people actually want more efficient machines

and the new technology that goes with it.

I think it really makes no sense to simply say we are going to wipe away these efficiency standards for laundry machines. We have had similar bills on refrigerators and other appliances because what we are all about in this country is using technology to make things more efficient, make things cheaper, and make things better for the future.

That is essentially why I oppose the bill and would ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think the difference between the Republican Party and administration and Democrats comes down to government mandating certain choices and Republicans believing in free markets, market choices, and market opportunities.

If Americans want to buy something that, in their mind, is more efficient and that can save them money, maybe will last longer, that is up to the Americans. The market will step up and provide those opportunities and products. If you want an electric vehicle, the market is going to provide that. It shouldn't be mandated.

I thank my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) for approaching this bill that is dealing with washing machines, but the broader picture is the mandates from the administration to tell Americans the only choices they have aren't going to save them that much money in the long run, as we pointed out.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit and vote in favor of this legislation, H.R. 7673.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1612, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

STRENGTHENING CYBER RESILIENCE AGAINST STATE-SPONSORED THREATS ACT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9769) to ensure the security and integrity of United States critical infrastructure by establishing an interagency task force and requiring a comprehensive report on the targeting of United States critical infrastructure by People's Republic of China state-sponsored cyber actors, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9769

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 “Strengthening Cyber Resilience Against State-Sponsored Threats Act”.

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE AND REPORT ON THE TARGETING OF UNITED STATES CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE BY PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA STATE-SPONSORED CYBER ACTORS.

(a) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the heads of appropriate Sector Risk Management Agencies as determined by the Director of CISA, shall establish a joint interagency task force (in this section referred to as the “task force”) to facilitate collaboration and coordination among the Sector Risk Management Agencies assigned a Federal role or responsibility in National Security Memorandum–22, issued April 30, 2024 (relating to critical infrastructure security and resilience), or any successor document, to detect, analyze, and respond to the cybersecurity threat posed by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China by ensuring that such agencies' actions are aligned and mutually reinforcing.

(b) CHAIRS.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—The Director of CISA (or the Director of CISA's designee) shall serve as the chairperson of the task force.

(2) VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (or such Director's designee) shall serve as the vice chairperson of the task force.

(c) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The task force shall consist of appropriate representatives of the departments and agencies specified in subsection (a).

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—To materially assist in the activities of the task force, representatives under paragraph (1) should be subject matter experts who have familiarity and technical expertise regarding cybersecurity, digital forensics, or threat intelligence analysis, or in-depth knowledge of the tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs) com-

monly used by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China.

(d) VACANCY.—Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the task force shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) ESTABLISHMENT FLEXIBILITY.—To avoid redundancy, the task force may coordinate with any preexisting task force, working group, or cross-intelligence effort within the Homeland Security Enterprise or the intelligence community that has examined or responded to the cybersecurity threat posed by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China.

(f) TASK FORCE REPORTS; BRIEFING.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 540 days after the establishment of the task force, the task force shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the first report containing the initial findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the task force.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the submission of the initial report under paragraph (1) and annually thereafter for five years, the task force shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report containing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the task force.

(3) CONTENTS.—The reports under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment at the lowest classification feasible of the sector-specific risks, trends relating to incidents impacting sectors, and tactics, techniques, and procedures utilized by or relating to State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China.

(B) An assessment of additional resources and authorities needed by Federal departments and agencies to better counter the cybersecurity threat posed by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China.

(C) A classified assessment of the extent of potential destruction, compromise, or disruption to United States critical infrastructure by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China in the event of a major crisis or future conflict between the People's Republic of China and the United States.

(D) A classified assessment of the ability of the United States to counter the cybersecurity threat posed by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China in the event of a major crisis or future conflict between the People's Republic of China and the United States, including with respect to different cybersecurity measures and recommendations that could mitigate such a threat.

(E) A classified assessment of the ability of State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China to disrupt operations of the United States Armed Forces by hindering mobility across critical infrastructure such as rail, aviation, and ports, including how such would impair the ability of the United States Armed Forces to deploy and maneuver forces effectively.

(F) A classified assessment of the economic and social ramifications of a disruption to one or multiple United States critical infrastructure sectors by State-sponsored cyber actors, including Volt Typhoon, of the People's Republic of China in the event of a major crisis or future conflict between the People's Republic of China and the United States.

(G) Such recommendations as the task force may have for the Homeland Security Enterprise, the intelligence community, or critical infrastructure owners and operators