

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 31, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "REVIEW OF FINAL RULE RECLASSIFICATION OF MAJOR SOURCES AS AREA SOURCES UNDER SECTION 112 OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT"; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 426

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of May 23,

2025, relating to a measure providing for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 426 provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 13 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 31 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their designees. It provides for one motion to commit.

Finally, the rule provides for the flexibility to consider a rule related to reconciliation on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee in order to expeditiously enact President Trump's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

The rule before us presents an important opportunity for Congress to continue its work to reverse the last-minute attempts at regulatory overreach by the former Biden-Harris administration.

The rule includes consideration of S.J. 13, to provide for congressional disapproval of a Biden-era Office of the Comptroller of the Currency regulation titled "Business Combinations Under the Bank Merger Act."

In September of 2024, the OCC and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, FDIC, revised their approach to evaluating bank merger applications. The updated rule restricts a bank's ability to scale, manage risk effectively, and broaden product offerings, ultimately discouraging mergers altogether.

By dismantling a longstanding standard, and eliminating automatic approval for certain applications, the Biden administration's actions risk stifling competition and innovation in the financial sector. These changes will

delay strategic decisionmaking among financial institutions and limit access to innovative financial services for everyday Americans.

For small- and mid-sized banks in particular, the rule imposes additional red tape and bureaucratic hurdles that hinder their ability to merge and compete with larger financial institutions. Despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may claim, the Biden administration's rule strengthens the dominance of the largest market players while undermining smaller, community-focused institutions, limiting consumer choice and consumer access.

We should strive for a regulatory environment that is streamlined, balanced, and rooted in practical oversight, one that protects consumers without obstructing innovation and competition. What we don't need are more Biden-era regulations that distort the market and smother opportunity with overreach.

S.J. Res. 13 will ensure that future bank regulators cannot repeat this ill-conceived rulemaking, and that financial institutions can continue to make strategic, innovative decisions that will ultimately benefit American consumers.

Also, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 31, providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Biden EPA relating to review of final rule classification of major sources as area sources under the Clean Air Act.

Section 112 of the Clean Air Act lays out stringent compliance standards for facilities emitting over 10 tons of a single hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons of an aggregate. Facilities below those thresholds are classified as area sources and subject to more flexible requirements.

In 2020, under President Trump, the EPA adopted a more rational approach allowing facilities that significantly reduced their emissions to be reclassified as area sources. This commonsense change rewarded emissions improvements and reduced unnecessary regulatory burdens on American manufacturers and energy producers.

To no one's surprise, the Biden administration reversed course by reimposing the outdated and rigid "once in, always in" policy. This framework permanently locks facilities into strict major-source status, even if they make substantial efforts to reduce harmful emissions. That is not only unfair, it discourages environmental progress.

Whom did the Biden administration hurt?

They hurt the chemical manufacturing sector, which includes thousands of mid-sized companies representing hundreds of thousands of jobs. These companies have invested millions in cleaner technologies and equipment upgrades. Under this Biden-era EPA rule, their investments will not be rewarded with a lighter regulatory touch. In fact, despite upgrades

to reduce emissions, they will continue to face the same higher regulatory costs.

Moreover, there is the pulp and paper industry, a critical employer in States like Georgia, Wisconsin, and Maine. Mills that switch to cleaner fuels or have implemented advanced scrubber systems will receive no regulatory relief under the Biden-era EPA's "once in, always in" rule. In a sector that already faces stiff foreign competition and very narrow margins, the Biden administration heaped further unnecessary burdens onto this industry, jeopardizing the jobs of thousands of American workers in the process.

Additionally, there is the independent and smaller scale refiner that often lack the scale of larger competitors but serve critical regional fuel markets. They may have made substantial environmental progress in reducing hazardous air pollutant emissions, but the Biden-era "once in, always in" rule locks them into compliance regimes that do not reflect their improved emissions profile.

Finally, let's not forget our small and rural manufacturing facilities in communities across this country, including in my own district in New York's southern tier. These facilities include metal fabricators and food processors, many of whom have taken proactive steps to cut emissions in very good faith. Under the Biden-era EPA "once in, always in" rule, these improvements to reduce hazardous emissions do not matter. They will still be treated with the same costly and burdensome regulatory regime. Simply put, the Biden EPA and its "once in, always in" rule not only disincentivizes innovation and cleaner operations, but it also threatens plant closures and kills jobs.

Mr. Speaker, you would have to be more concerned with appeasing environmental extremists than protecting American workers to support this punitive and counterproductive regulatory framework.

Through S.J. Res. 31, House Republicans stand up for the American workers and job creators. The CRA, ensures regulatory fairness and restores real incentives for emissions reduction. Without this CRA, even the most environmentally responsible facilities are punished, trapped under heavyhanded rules that do not reflect their cleaner operation.

Upon returning to office, President Trump and House Republicans focused on restoring commonsense governance: prioritizing American jobs, economic strength, and practical solutions. S.J. Res. 31, like other measures undoing ill-advised Biden-era policies, represents a decisive step in the right direction.

Let's get back to smart, forward-thinking policies that actually serve the American people, not far left activists and D.C. bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for a rule on two measures, two lousy measures doubling down on the Republicans' agenda to help big banks and big polluters.

S.J. Res. 13 is a gift-wrapped giveaway to Wall Street, plain and simple. It would make it easier for big banks to get even bigger, hurting small businesses and communities in the process.

S.J. Res. 31 is even worse, a blatant handout to big polluters, putting corporate profits ahead of our constituents' health and safety.

This isn't new, Mr. Speaker. That has been the Republican playbook all Congress long: Help the polluters. Help the banks. Help Wall Street, and help the CEOs. They want to help everyone except the working people who actually need it.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask: Why?

I would say: Follow the money. Look at the donations.

One of the things we need to get serious about in this Congress and hopefully when Democrats take control of the House after the next election, this will be a priority, and that is campaign finance reform.

All this excessive money from big industries, from big banks, from corporations, and from people like Elon Musk pollute this Chamber in a way where the needs and the wants of regular people get put to the side.

It is disgraceful, if we are being honest here, Mr. Speaker. As bad as these two bills are—and I can't emphasize enough that they are really bad—they are just the warm-up act. In fact, this is filler. We weren't even supposed to be dealing with these bills. We were supposed to be dealing with the budget reconciliation bill. Mr. Speaker, because of the disarray within the Republican Conference, all of a sudden, these bills appeared.

That is because in just over 13 hours, Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee will meet starting at 1 o'clock in the morning to debate a bill that steals from the American people so they can help out the billionaire donors who write them big checks.

Now, let me ask: If this bill is so great, so big, and so beautiful as Donald Trump says it is, then why the hell are we debating it in the middle of the night?

Why not debate it in broad daylight where the American people can tune in and hear what it is really about?

We all know the answer.

I encourage the American people to pay attention to what is happening very, very, very early in the morning here in the United States Capitol. Watch what happens in the Rules Committee at 1 o'clock in the morning.

To all the insomniacs out there: Tune in at 1 o'clock in the morning and watch what unfolds in that committee.

Republicans do not want you to pay attention to their tax scam.

Hell, Trump doesn't even want Republicans to pay attention to what is in this bill. Mr. Speaker, he told you guys to close your eyes and vote for this garbage.

Republicans were ordered not to say a word in committee, just fall in line and rubber-stamp it.

Now listen to this: Now they are sneaking a change into the rules buried in the fine print of this rule to give themselves same-day authority to bring the bill to the floor with a moment's notice. This bill is over 1,000 pages long.

They want to ram it through the Rules Committee, potentially changing it, and we know that there are changes coming, and then vote on it just hours later. It is a bill that adds trillions to the deficit and kicks millions of people off their healthcare.

Republicans once bragged about requiring 72 hours to review legislation.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember that?

Now Republicans are ready to toss that promise in the trash to serve Trump's demands.

If my colleagues in the Freedom Caucus vote for this rule, then they will have reached a new height of hypocrisy. It is unbelievable to me that they cry and whine about passing bills without the time to read them, and then they come down here and support ramming a bill through committee in the middle of the night and bringing it straight to the floor.

It is unbelievable and hypocritical.

Let's be real, Mr. Speaker. This budget reconciliation bill is a disaster. It is unpopular, and it is indefensible. This is all about massive and huge tax breaks to billionaires paid for by stealing from working Americans. That is not hyperbole. That is just the truth. It rips away Medicaid from parents and grandparents. It slashes food assistance for children. The biggest cut in food assistance in history is contained in this bill. It drains resources from the moms and dads all to fund giveaways for those at the very, very top.

Any backroom deals made in the next few hours to twist arms and to buy votes will only make this terrible bill even worse.

This is not what democracy looks like. This is what corruption looks like. Shame on every single person who votes to advance that awful process by torching any semblance of a fair process.

A vote for this rule is a vote to allow Republican leadership to jam this bill through the House without enough time to even read it. There is zero transparency and zero respect for this institution or the Members here. Just close your eyes and vote for it. That is what Trump told Republicans to do: Close your eyes and vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a hell of a lot better than this rushed, reckless process. They deserve leaders who work for them, not for the billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WIED). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1230

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

Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation bill is the work of 11 committees that have gone through full markup, that went through the full bipartisan process.

I sat through 27 hours in the Energy and Commerce Committee. I know full well that I had a front seat to the longest markup, just as my colleague did with his service on the Agriculture Committee.

That is not what we are here debating. Despite what some of my colleagues across the aisle are saying, the CRA that we are discussing right now is addressing standards for major and area sources that will actually promote cleaner and more environmentally conscious operations among manufacturers, refiners, and energy producers.

The rule implemented by the Biden administration reflects a flawed approach, one that eliminates incentives for voluntary emission reductions and imposes excessive regulatory burdens without delivering clear environmental benefits.

Under this policy, facilities that successfully reduce their actual or potential hazardous air pollutant emissions below the major source threshold are still prohibited from reclassifying as area sources. This means that even after substantial improvements, these facilities remain subject to the strictest and costliest regulatory framework forever, indefinitely.

This not only increases operational costs but also removes a key incentive for companies to invest in cleaner technologies and practices, something we should all be encouraging.

For example, take a chemical plant that emits hazardous air pollutants like benzene or formaldehyde. Under the Biden-era rule, if they invest millions in cutting-edge emissions control systems that reduce their pollution below the regulatory threshold, they get no relief from the major source permitting burdens.

The Biden-era rule entangles them in permanent red tape, discouraging innovation and undermining progress.

Under the Trump-era rules that S.J. Res. 31 would pave the way for, companies would have a financial incentive to invest in pollution control since doing so would actually reduce their compliance costs and regulatory delays. The result is cleaner air, a cleaner environment.

The reality is that most of these companies and the people who run them live in the very communities affected by emissions. They have every reason to care about cleaner air and healthier environments.

What they need is smart, flexible policy, not arbitrary and capricious restrictions that stifle growth and reduce competitiveness. S.J. Res. 31 would restore a proven framework that recognizes and rewards emissions reduction. It allows regulatory classifications to reflect a facility’s current environmental impact, not a legacy status based on past emissions.

This flexibility fosters continuous improvement and aligns environmental goals with economic incentives. This is not about weakening protections. It is the contrary, actually. It is about applying regulation in a way that actually works, delivering clean air, encouraging innovation, and maintaining the strength of America’s industry.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense path forward to a cleaner, more sustainable future, one that supports jobs, growth, and the environment.

This should be a no-brainer for my colleagues who claim to be the champions of effective environmental policy. Let’s not be fooled by their rhetoric. The reality is that many on the other side of the aisle are beholden to a vocal and uncompromising wing of the environmental lobby, groups that would rather see American workers laid off, manufacturing plants shut down, and entire communities economically gutted than support balanced, commonsense regulatory reforms.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of things. First of all, I want to correct the record. The gentleman said that this budget reconciliation bill reflects a full, fair, and open process in all the committees of jurisdiction. I hate to tell him, but I am on the Agriculture Committee, and the chairman actually cut off debate when there were dozens of amendments still yet to be offered. That is not a full, open, and fair process. Maybe by Republican standards it is, but by most people’s standards, it isn’t.

The gentleman is on the Rules Committee. We are debating the rule, so I have a question for my Rules Committee colleague. This rule contains a fast-track process for the Republican tax scam, this so-called budget reconciliation bill. We all know that deals are being made behind closed doors, changes are still being negotiated—big changes, we are told. I would like to know if the majority will commit to ensuring a Congressional Budget Office score is available on the final bill before it moves forward.

We need to know the impact on our constituents, not only how much it will cost, but how many people will lose their healthcare and how quickly they will lose their healthcare.

Those are legitimate questions that, quite frankly, Democrats not only want to know but Republicans should want to know, as well.

Can I get the gentleman to kind of give us some assurances that we know the impact? Will he commit to ensuring a Congressional Budget Office score is available on the final bill before it moves forward?

I am happy to yield to him.

I guess we are not going to get an answer.

I mean, I guess we all know why they don’t want the nonpartisan, expert analysis to be made available before a vote on this bill. This vote is a monstrosity. This vote is going to throw at least 14 million people off their healthcare. This is going to constitute the largest cut in food assistance in history. People are going to see their nutrition benefits reduced, which will impact children, senior citizens, veterans, and those with disabilities.

It is relevant to what we are talking about here today because in this rule you provide the authority to immediately bring the budget reconciliation bill to the floor without giving people any time to debate the bill, to be able to analyze the bill, for CBO to do their work on this, or for us to even know what the impact is going to be on our constituents from something this big.

By the way, I hear Republicans say that they have this deadline. There is no deadline. There is nothing magic about having to pass this bill by tomorrow or the next day.

You could do this right. You could actually have a Rules Committee hearing in markup in the light of day. You could do it when you come back after the Memorial Day recess.

People should ask the question: Why are they rushing so quickly? Why are they doing everything they can to jam this through before people have a chance to understand the full impacts of this bill?

The reason why is that they don’t want the American people to know what they are doing. They are ashamed of what is in this bill—again, throwing people off healthcare, throwing people off food assistance. Why? It is to give a tax cut to billionaires. Give me a break.

We are here to help lift up people in this country, to be there for people who are struggling. Instead, this Republican Congress is about enriching those who are well-off and well-connected.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot of dramatic words from my friend and colleague across the aisle about the reconciliation process. Let’s take a moment to remind them of what they did when they were in the majority.

During the 117th Congress, when a Democratic-led House considered the last reconciliation bill, also known as the Build Back Better Act, the process was a little messy, to say the least. The gentleman talks about CBO scores, and it is certainly something that we are working very hard on.

Mr. MCGOVERN, in a meeting on November 4, 2021, was reading the manager's amendment to be self-executed. His response to not having a CBO score was:

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will do everything they can to slow this process down. I will also assure the gentleman, as he knows, that this cannot become law and will not move forward in the Senate without a CBO score, and that will have to happen.

Regardless if we do have a JTC score or a CBO score or what that score says, I don't think any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will vote for this bill at the end of the day.

People in glass houses really shouldn't throw stones here.

In fact, this process on their side of the aisle was so messy that two separate rules had to be passed out of the Rules Committee, each one self-executing a new manager's amendment as negotiations were ongoing and changes continued to be made. It was constantly a shifting landscape and, frankly, chaos at times.

I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts won't let facts get in the way of a good story. He pounds the table over the use of same-day authority. The reality is that the first rule for Build Back Better extended what is essentially a martial law procedural lockdown of the House floor, granting broad, same-day authority that allowed the majority to jam through changes without proper scrutiny.

Let's not forget the second rule for that bill was brought to the floor and voted on the very same day. It was reported from the Rules Committee, exactly the kind of tactic our colleagues are now clutching their pearls while opposing.

The fact is that governing is hard. The process is rarely a smooth one, but the American people elected President Trump, a Republican majority in the House of Representatives, and a Republican majority in the United States Senate, and gave us unified government with a clear expectation for Congress to deliver on this agenda.

The Rules Committee will continue to use the tools at its disposal to facilitate the passage of historic legislation, just as our colleagues did when they were in charge.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am really confused after listening to the gentleman from New York complain about same-day authority. In this bill, the Republicans put in same-day authority to be able to jam this tax scam through.

The gentleman didn't answer my question. I guess he is basically saying that, no, the Republicans will not commit to a CBO score for people to be able to know what, in fact, the bill will do and the impacts the bill will have.

I mean, this bill is so awful that I can't imagine any Democrat voting for

it, but it is so awful that I would like to think some Republicans who have a conscience wouldn't vote for it either.

I would like to think it would matter to Republicans that 14 million Americans will lose their healthcare. What if that number went up to 20 million or 30 million? Is there any number that will be so high that maybe some Republicans might pause and say, wait a minute, maybe we should not go down this road? I mean, this is crazy.

By the way, the difference in legislation that we are talking about, the Build Back Better bill, I remind the gentleman, was about helping people. This bill is about screwing people. There is a difference here.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2753, the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act, which would block the Republican budget from cutting Medicaid or SNAP benefits and kicking people off these lifesaving programs.

While we vote on two measures that would give even more power to big banks and large industrial polluters, Republicans are trying to jam their multitrillion-dollar budget scam down our throats in the dead of night by holding a hearing at 1 o'clock in the morning in the Rules Committee, hoping the American people won't notice.

Shame on my Republican colleagues.

The American people are noticing, and they are pissed off that working families are going to have to foot the bill for massive tax cuts for multimillionaires, wealthy heirs, and corporations.

Republicans claim they don't want to cut critical benefits for working people. I have heard many of you do press conferences and sign on to letters. Now, here is the chance to prove it by voting for my amendment to bring up the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to discuss our proposal.

Late Sunday night, the House Budget Committee, on which I serve as ranking member, passed out, with only Republican votes, a draconian tax bill that cuts almost 14 million Americans off their healthcare and ensures a few million more lose their food assistance.

You might ask yourself why. The reason is, in order to help pay for tax cuts for billionaires.

Interestingly, we were originally supposed to pass this on Friday, but on

Friday, around lunchtime, enough hard-line conservative members on the Budget Committee withheld their votes and voted "no," not because they objected to 14 million Americans losing their healthcare, not because they objected to millions more losing their food assistance, but because they looked at those numbers and said: Well, that is a good start.

□ 1245

We want those numbers to go up. We want even more people to lose their healthcare and more people to lose their food assistance.

The vote went down Friday. We come back Sunday night, and suddenly the vote is called again. I raised the question as a parliamentary inquiry. I simply asked: What has changed? What deals have been made? The American people deserve to know. We, as Members, on both sides of the aisle, deserve to know before casting our votes.

I was assured that nothing had changed. There were no agreements made.

Then the very next Republican speaker, who is one of those hard-line conservatives, gave the game away and said he was flipping his vote because of the agreements that were made. Backroom deals deny the American people the transparency that they deserve.

One of the things we keep hearing on the other side of the aisle is that we need to get this done, otherwise taxes will go up on the American people. Apparently, the President said that today while he was here in this building. It is completely false.

Just this past week, Democrats introduced an amendment that would ensure the extension of the tax cuts for every American making under a billion dollars. Every Democrat voted yes. Every Republican voted no. This really is about the tax cuts for billionaires.

Now, the President has also said: he would "love and cherish Medicaid."

My Republican friends, all of those included who have said that they would protect Medicaid, they have an opportunity to prove it. Right now at the well of the House Chamber is a discharge petition that would force a vote on my legislation, the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act. It would stop permanently these outrageous cuts from happening. It would preserve healthcare.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it would ensure these cuts do not happen. Right now we have 211 signatures, all from Democrats. We just need a few Republican Members to sign that discharge petition, and we will be able to love and cherish Medicaid as well as SNAP. That is all it would take, just a few Republican Members to save healthcare for millions and millions of Americans and save food assistance for millions more.

I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, the difference in priorities between this side of the aisle and the other side. It is the Members on this side of the aisle that are fighting to save healthcare for the American people, and it is our friends on the other side of the aisle who are fighting for the billionaire class.

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

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle, they love to cherry-pick the facts when it comes to the timing of committee proceedings, especially in reference to the Rules Committee's upcoming meeting. They bemoan the late start and the timing of tonight's meeting. Yet, they actively ensured one committee markup after another for the legislation before us tonight, they ran hours and hours, if not days on end.

Why did those markups run as long as they did? They ran that long because Democrats engaged in the legislative process, which is their right.

The same principle applies to the Rules Committee. On this committee we have a long tradition of meeting late into the evening to complete our work. This isn't new, and it is not unique to our current majority. It is simply how the legislative process operates when the House has its full agenda.

We need only look at the Committee's operations under Democratic control to see a long history of meetings in the dark of night. Under Democratic control of the Rules Committee, we have seen things like House Resolution 587, which the report was filed at 3:46 a.m. House Resolution 481, the report was filed at 2:09 a.m. House Resolution 597, the report was filed at 3:43 a.m. House Resolution 903, the report was filed at 2:25 a.m. For House Resolution 445 in the 116th Congress, the Committee adjourned at 12:20 a.m.

Late-night sessions are not partisan anomalies and unique to the Democrats. These are precedents that Democrats themselves have maintained for years.

Let's be clear, this is the way the Rules Committee has operated when necessary, regardless of which party holds the gavel. It is about getting the work done. In fact, tonight we may not be reporting in the dark of night at all but rather as the new day has begun. I expect Mr. MCGOVERN to take full advantage of our unlimited debate rules in the Rules Committee to make sure that that happens, and I see my second sunrise in a couple of weeks here.

I invite my colleagues to set aside the theatrics and focus on the work at hand, and I encourage my colleagues on the other side to prove me wrong.

Once again, my colleagues across the aisle are doing what they do best. They spread misinformation, and they try to sow fear into the hearts of the most vulnerable in this country about Republicans' work through the budget reconciliation process.

Let's set the record straight. President Trump and House Republicans are working to strengthen and secure and sustain Medicaid.

Democrats, through their reckless spending and unwillingness to enact commonsense guardrails themselves, have worked to undermine this critical program. We are laser-focused on protecting the absolute most vulnerable among us, Americans with disabilities, pregnant women, children, and our beloved seniors, by putting in place commonsense guardrails to ensure that those truly in need always get the care that they deserve. That means making sure that precious Medicaid resources go to the living, breathing Americans who actually need the care, not bureaucratic bloat, fraud, or people that have come into this country illegally and have been put on this system.

We are also ensuring Medicaid's long-term sustainability by rolling past costly Biden-era regulations that are driving up the program's price tag by hundreds of billions of dollars.

Let's be clear, Medicaid should always serve American citizens first and foremost, and that is why reinforcing citizenship verification, another commonsense step that the American people believe in, not only protects the program but saves the taxpayers tens of billions of dollars.

Yes, we are, reintroducing Clinton-era work requirements. One of the most popular things Bill Clinton achieved in his Presidency, and he worked with Congress to get it done, was bringing commonsense work requirements to social welfare programs.

It would only apply to able-bodied adults without dependents. It is something that we should all be able to agree on. If you can work, you should work. It is a step that was once broadly bipartisan, but today, our Democratic colleagues would rather let Medicaid spiral into insolvency with no solution in sight than support a basic principle that if you are able to work, you should.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard noise from across the aisle, words like "cruel" and "harsh," and all the hyperbole you could expect to be thrown around to score political points from their base. Let me be clear. Those labels belong not to those fighting for reform but to those who would refuse commonsense changes today and instead allow this critical safety net program to become fiscally unsustainable, leaving behind the very people that depend on it every single day.

If we want Medicaid to be there in its entirety for the next generation, for those that truly need us, who we need to be working for every day, we must act now. House Republicans are committed to doing just that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, can the gentleman name for me one meeting that the Rules Committee had, when Democrats were in control,

where the hearing portion began at 1 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I didn't serve then, so I am not sure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thought he was intimating that that was the case. I don't know of a single meeting where we began taking testimony—we may have reported out Rules late at night, but not taking testimony.

Mr. Speaker, and, secondly, let me just say, with all due respect, I don't view it as theatrics to stand up for people's healthcare and food assistance. I feel that that is my job.

If Republicans think that somehow people are not going to be adversely impacted, read the CBO score on the current draft of the bill. Again, it is going to get worse.

On the current draft of the bill we are told because of the changes in this bill and because of the inaction by Republicans, CBO estimates right now 14 million Americans will lose their healthcare. That is not me. That is the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. Republicans rely on that. Democrats rely on that. By saying somehow that people aren't going to be adversely impacted by the cuts in nutrition, I don't think you understand the nutrition title if that is what you believe.

Under this bill, if a mother of a 7-year-old loses her job, for whatever reason, she has 3 months to find a new job. Otherwise, she loses her food assistance.

You have lowered the age of when work requirements are mandatory, and it is a cruel thing to do because this is about children. I don't know, but if you are a single parent and you have got a 7-year-old—by the way, some schools end the day at 2 or 2:30. How do you pay for childcare? How do you try to make ends meet? What about the summer vacation when school is not in session?

My Republican friends are so in the pockets of billionaires and the well-off and the well-connected, I don't think they know what real life is like for so many people in this country, how difficult it is.

When we talk about programs like SNAP, I have a news flash for you. The majority of people on SNAP who are able to work, work. They earn so little they still qualify for the benefit.

By the way, the benefit is on average of about \$2 per person per meal. You can't buy a cup of coffee in the United States Capitol Complex for \$2.

Then what my friends don't talk about is how this is shifting some of the cost burdens on to States. All of a sudden States are going to be required to come up with hundreds of millions and, in some cases, billions of dollars in order to prevent people from losing their food assistance.

Who does that? Who does that, all while giving tax breaks to billionaires?

It just makes no sense to me. All we are asking for—and I think some Republicans may agree with me on this—is before you bring the bill to the floor—and I appreciate the gentleman saying that there will be a CBO score by the time it gets through the Senate—don't House Members deserve to know what the hell they are voting on before they vote on it?

We ought to insist that we all go into this with our eyes wide open, so that we know, in fact, what the impact is going to be on our constituents. I don't think that is a radical thing to demand or to ask for. Yet, my Republican friends seem to think that that is unrealistic.

This bill is going to need major changes for me to even take another look at it and show the priorities don't represent my values. We don't share the same values. It is clear when I look at this bill.

The bottom line is the process right now and what is relevant to this rule that we are debating right now. My friends on the other side put in same-day rule authority to expedite this so people won't even have adequate time to find out how it impacts their constituents.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we had to go and do a little research, but in the 110th Congress on August 1, 2007, when considering House Resolution 3162, the Democrats did indeed convene a Rules Committee meeting at 1 a.m., and they gaviled out at 3:07 a.m.

They have done exactly the same thing that we have all heard about, the ranting and raving and the waving of arms here today. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. However, rules for thee and not for me is typically the way this works.

We will do the work of the Rules Committee. We will continue to pass this legislation and deliver real relief for working families in this country. We have listened to a lot of rhetoric about millionaires and billionaires. It sounds like BERNIE SANDERS is in the Chamber, but really this is about the working people of this country.

If we do nothing and the tax cuts expire in this country, it will be a \$4.5 trillion tax increase on the American people. It will cut the child tax credit in half. It will cut the standard deduction in half that puts real money into the pockets of working families. In my district, it is about \$1,700 a month that the current Tax Cuts and Jobs Act delivers. We deliver even more in this reconciliation package.

That might not sound like a lot to some of the people on the other side of the aisle. For my constituents, that is a couple of mortgage payments. That means real relief for working families in western New York.

□ 1300

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's set the record straight. I have to go back and look 20 years ago? Yet, I can say this: Democrats never ever did anything like Republicans are doing here today, never. I don't even remember, and maybe the gentleman could enlighten us what the bill was.

Yet, on a major budget reconciliation bill, the majority is jamming this through? It is going to add to the deficit. It is going to throw people off of food assistance. It is going to throw people off of healthcare assistance.

That is not me saying that. That is the Congressional Budget Office saying it. Nothing like this has ever been done. Nothing like this has ever been done, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing it with a straight face as if it is no big deal. It is as if who cares if people lose their food assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about that if we don't do something, taxes will be increased. The reason why taxes are going to be increased is because when my friends passed this tax bill when Trump was last in office, the majority made all the tax cuts for middle-class families temporary. They all expired. Mr. Speaker, do you know what Republicans didn't make temporary? The tax breaks for corporations; those are permanent. Those are permanent, and that says it all there. That is the difference between the two parties, it is that I think we have different priorities. We have a different set of values.

Mr. Speaker, I am really deeply concerned about those who will go without food, and I am deeply concerned about those who will go without healthcare. Those are my priorities. I am sorry it makes the gentleman and the Republicans uncomfortable, but that is where I am coming from.

I don't give a damn about whether Elon Musk gets another tax break or not. Maybe my friends do because he poured so much money into the last campaign. Again, that is why we need campaign finance reform. We need to get this place to focus in on what regular people are concerned about and not what billionaires and corporations are concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, before Republicans try to cut Medicaid and SNAP benefits in the dead of night, I should also point out that the majority is giving gifts to big polluters in broad daylight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter signed by nearly 100 public health and environmental organizations laying out the extreme risks of increased incidence of cancer and birth defects if S.J. Res. 31 is enacted.

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

There was no objection.

MAY 20, 2025.

ALL MEMBERS,
United States House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose S.J. Res. 31, a joint resolution providing for disapproval under the Congressional Review Act ("CRA") of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") titled "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act." We base our opposition on two grounds: (i) the rule it would overturn is a crucial tool to protect the American public from some of the most toxic air pollutants; and (ii) using the CRA to legislate in this space would create profound regulatory uncertainty and would throw the Federal government's ability to protect the public from highly toxic airborne pollution dangerously into doubt.

I. THE ENACTMENT OF S.J. RES. 31 WOULD
JEOPARDIZE PUBLIC HEALTH

The The Clean Air Act requires EPA to regulate emissions of some of the most toxic air pollution—including lead, mercury, arsenic, benzene, and metals, which are dangerous in fractions of ounces and are known to cause cancer, birth defects, and other serious maladies—as "hazardous air pollutants" ("HAPs"). Facilities that have the potential to emit 10 tons per year of any one HAP, or 25 tons per year of any combination of HAPs, are treated as "major sources" of toxic air pollution. "Major sources," such as chemical plants, are subject to maximum achievable control technology ("MACT") standards, which are based on the attainment of emissions levels already achieved by the best-controlled sources in the industry.

For decades, EPA policy (known colloquially as "once in, always in") required that "major sources" that had complied with MACT standards and lowered their HAP levels must continue doing so—even if, after compliance, their total HAP emissions were reduced to levels below the "major source" threshold. That sensible approach was displaced in 2020 by an ill-considered rule (the "2020 Rule") that would have upended this practice. Fortunately, that misguided effort was curtailed in part in 2024 by the rule presently in S.J. Res. 31's crosshairs (the "2024 Rule"), which ensured that facilities emitting seven of the 187 most dangerous pollutants ("super-toxics") covered by the Clean Air Act remain subject to strict pollution controls.

The 2020 Rule allowed nearly 50 percent of "major source" facilities (approximately 4,000 in total) across the nation to increase their emissions of some of the most dangerous air pollution regulated by the Clean Air Act overnight, and with no guaranteed monitoring or reporting. The 2024 Rule prevents some of the most harmful increases enabled by the 2020 Rule, even as it retains that rule. Should S.J. Res. 31 be enacted, and the 2024 Rule struck down—without a clear answer as to what the state of regulatory affairs would be in S.J. Res. 31's aftermath—the threats to public health could be devastating. In short, the door could open for the air we breathe to be contaminated at an unprecedented rate by some of the most toxic air pollution that Congress has identified. These super-toxics cause, among other things, cancer, developmental disorders, and neurological problems even at extremely low levels of exposure.

This should be reason enough to vote "no" on S.J. Res. 31, but there is further cause to oppose this misbegotten bill.

II. THE CRA IS AN INAPPROPRIATE TOOL FOR
REPEALING THE 2024 RULE.

We do not contend that the 2024 Rule is the perfect tool for the regulation of “major sources” of HAPs. We would advocate for a rule that provides even *stronger* protections for public health; we recognize that certain industry actors, more interested in ameliorating costs, would argue the opposite. Regardless of one’s stance, however, *there should be universal agreement that using the CRA to set the 2024 Rule aside is a mistake—and, potentially, a dangerous one.*

First, it is uncertain what the ultimate regulatory state of play will become if the 2024 Rule is set aside using the blunt-force instrument that is the CRA. If the answer is that the 2020 Rule would occupy the field, that rule still is the subject of unresolved litigation currently held in abeyance. Might we revert to the longstanding “once in, always in” policy if the 2020 Rule ultimately is struck down? If not, a regulatory vacuum would ensue that would, at a minimum, take time to fill—time that the public’s welfare cannot afford, as emissions of the most highly toxic air pollutants would be allowed to increase across the country. Either way, it is clear that this use of the CRA is a terrible gamble when it comes to protecting the air we breathe.

Second, use of the CRA to strike down the 2024 Rule may prevent further similar regulation, including regulatory efforts that may be undertaken by the present administration. The CRA provides that rules disapproved under its auspices cannot be replaced by “a new rule that is substantially the same” as the one struck down. The scope of this prohibition is essentially untested and could pave the way for a less—or more—protective future rulemaking when it comes to the reclassification of “major sources.” *The problem is, no one can be sure.* Moreover, such a bar on new regulation may not be contestable in court, given the CRA’s prescription on the judicial review of determinations made pursuant to the statute. Thus, we could be left with a regulatory landscape that leaves the public wholly unprotected—or perhaps even one that the present administration views as unpalatable—and find ourselves stuck in place. This is an unthinkable risk to assume when it comes to the regulation of the Clean Air Act’s most toxic air pollution and the health of the American people.

In short, whether you support the rule that it targets or not, you must oppose S.J. Res. 31. It is a perilous legislative half-measure in an area that requires serious deliberation and responsible lawmaking, and it cannot be permitted to proceed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Air Alliance Houston; Alliance for Mission-Based Recycling; Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments; American Lung Association; American Public Health Association; American Thoracic Society; Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America; Bend the Curve; Between the Waters; Breathe Project; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Coalfield Justice; Center for Environmental Health; Center for Oil & Gas Organizing; Cherokee Concerned Citizens.

Cherokee Concerned Citizens Pascagoula, MS; Children’s Environmental Health Network; Church Women United; Citizens for Arsenal Accountability; Clean 4 Change, Kentucky; Clean Air Action Network of Glen Falls; Clean Air Coalition of Greater Ravena-Coeymans; Clean Air Council; Clean Water Action; Climate Action Campaign; Climate Conservation Brazoria County; Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety; Defend Our

Health; Del Amp Action Committee; Earth Ethics.

Earthjustice Action; Eco Madres; ecoAmerica/Climate for Health Environmental Protection Network; Eco-Cycle; Ecology Center (Michigan); Environmental Advocates; Environmental Justice Health Alliance for Chemical Policy Reform; Environmental Law and Policy Center; Environmental Watch NJ; Environmental Watch NY; Eureka Recycling; FraTracker Alliance; FreshWater Accountability Project; Friends of the Earth; Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA).

Good Neighbor Steering Committee of Benicia; Greenpeace USA; Health Care Without Harm; Hip Hop Caucus; International Society for Environmental Epidemiology North America Chapter; Iowa Environmental Council; Just Zero; League of Conservation Voters; Los Jardines Institute; Louisiana Just Recovery Network; Micah 6:8 Mission; Mid-Ohio Valley Climate Action; Milwaukee Riverkeeper; Moms Clean Air Force; Natural Resources Defense Council.

Neighbors for Clean Air; North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE); Oncology Advocates United for Climate and Health; Partnership for Policy Integrity; People Over Petro Coalition; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania; Plastic Free Future; Plastic Pollution Coalition; Recycle Hawaii; Resource Renewal Institute; Rio Grande International Study Center; RiSE for Environmental Justice; RISE St James; Safer States.

San Antonio Bay Estuarine Waterkeeper; Santa Cruz Climate Action Network; Seneca Lake Guardian; Sierra Club; SOBE Concerned Citizens Youngstown, Ohio; Social Eco Education (SEE); Society of Native Nations; Southern Environmental Law Center; Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision; Terra Advocati; The Last Plastic Straw; The Story of Stuff Project; Turtle Island Restoration Network; Union of Concerned Scientists; Unite North Metro Denver; Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment; Vessel Project; WEACTION for Environmental Justice; West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs; 350.org; 5 Gyres Institute.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that Republicans have betrayed the middle class of this country time after time after time. We are seeing that today with the CRA measures that uplift big banks and big polluters at the expense of our health, safety, and economic security.

Does anybody think that big banks need more help, that we want big banks to get even bigger, and we want big banks to swallow up community banks? I don’t know. On what planet is that a good idea? It is a good idea only in the Republican-controlled Congress here.

We will see during the rest of this week Republicans’ priorities all twisted as my Republican colleagues jam through Trump’s one big, awful tax scam.

The Speaker has ordered Republicans on the Committee on Rules to meet at 1 o’clock in the morning. That is the middle of the night. Again, here is what puzzles me: We were supposed to meet at noon yesterday, and we are instead meeting at 1 o’clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, we know there are going to be changes. Republicans could have taken testimony and hearings

from all the committees and waited to report out the rule until whenever final deals were made with their Members. Yet, Republicans are deliberately choosing to meet at 1 o’clock in the morning on something this consequential.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman thinks it is a good idea. The gentleman says that I will use my time and try to take every moment I can to make my points. I can say to the gentleman: You bet your life I will be. I am going to be fighting like hell for the people of this country. I am not going to sit back, and I can say this for the other Democratic Members and others who will come to this mike: We are not going to sit back and watch our constituents get screwed over. We are just not going to do that.

Republicans can do it at 1 o’clock in the morning or 2 o’clock in the morning. We are going to be there, and we are going to stay there. We are going to offer our amendments, and we are going to make our points. I would urge my colleagues to be prepared to be there for a very, very long time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman can give us some assurance that, unlike in the Agriculture Committee where the chairman cut off debate and cut off amendments even though there were many amendments that were pending, we won’t see the same thing happen in the Committee on Rules.

Clearly, our debate on this bill is something Republicans don’t want the American people to see. I invite every single American—it doesn’t matter if they are Republican, Democrat, Independent, or someone who doesn’t follow politics—to tune in to the Committee on Rules. It will be up on our website. I will be live-streaming on YouTube. It will be on C-SPAN. Hell, maybe even cable will carry us live.

I urge Americans to watch it and judge for themselves what this bill means for them and their families and their communities. They will see how Republicans are gutting regular order to jam this thing through. They will probably see them walk in with a huge amendment at the last minute. It will be one that could dramatically change the bill, including accelerating the timeline for kicking millions of people off of their health insurance. As soon as next year, people could start losing coverage. That is what we are being told might be coming down the way.

If the rule that we are talking about right now passes, my Republican colleagues will be able to rush that newly changed bill to the floor just hours later, giving Members and the American public zero time to read it or to review it.

Make no mistake: A vote for today’s rule is a vote to give the Republican leadership a blank check to fast-track Trump’s one big, ugly bill through this House.

Mr. Speaker, here is what really gets me: Members of the House Freedom

Caucus have said over and over again that bringing a 1,000-page bill to the floor without time to read it is corrupt and immoral. They were the loudest voices demanding the 72-hour rule, so let's see if they mean it. Let's see if they actually mean what they say or if they fold under pressure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to vote "no" on the PQ, "hell no" on this rule, "no" on the underlying legislation, and to send a strong message that we reject this Republican obsession with screwing over the middle class to give tax breaks to billionaires.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here once again to protect Americans from the heavy hand of Biden-era regulations. The slew of midnight rules forced on the American people by the last administration pose a direct harm to our Nation's economy, and it has threatened jobs.

The pieces of legislation before us today under this rule are not filler. They are quite the opposite. The resolutions passed by the Senate and here before the House are lawmaking exercises. Democrats' dismissal of these CRAs speak volumes as to their lack of care and compassion for the serious ramifications that the regulatory agenda has had on the economy, on consumer choice, and on the environment.

My Democratic colleagues certainly wouldn't want to focus our time today on these CRAs because they are part and parcel to dismantling the regulatory agenda that they wed themselves to for 4 long years under President Biden.

What was the result of their commitment in the Biden-era regulatory agenda: \$450 billion in new regulatory costs on the economy. That may just be numbers on paper for a D.C. bureaucrat, but the amounts of jobs lost, manufacturing shuttered, and communities decimated for folks outside the beltway is what it is really all about.

The CRAs before us will allow Congress and the Trump administration to continue its important work of reversing harmful regulations and unleashing the promise of the American economy. I strongly support the rule before us today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 426 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2753) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for a point of order against reconciliation measures that cut benefits for Medicaid or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous

question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Clause 1 (c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2753.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 426;

Adoption of House Resolution 426, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1223, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY RELATING TO THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS UNDER THE BANK MERGER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 31, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "REVIEW OF FINAL RULE RECLASSIFICATION OF MAJOR SOURCES AS AREA SOURCES UNDER SECTION 112 OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT"; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 426) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act"; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 207, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]
YEAS—215

Aderholt	Bice	Ciscomani
Alford	Biggs (AZ)	Cline
Allen	Biggs (SC)	Cloud
Amodei (NV)	Bilirakis	Clyde
Arrington	Boebert	Cole
Babin	Bost	Collins
Bacon	Brecheen	Comer
Baird	Bresnahan	Crane
Balderson	Buchanan	Crank
Barr	Burchett	Crawford
Barrett	Burlison	Crenshaw
Baumgartner	Calvert	Davidson
Bean (FL)	Cammack	De La Cruz
Begich	Carey	DesJarlais
Bentz	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Donalds