

please, for the sake of the health and well-being of the American people, vote “no” on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize none of us wants the world polluted. The gentlewoman indicated that somehow this was going to affect arsenic and lead. I suppose, in a theoretical world, perhaps it could, but there are other regulations on tire manufacturing that may deal with that.

That is not what this Congressional Review Act is about. It is about a regulation that was put into effect because, instead of looking for things like arsenic and lead or actual hazardous air pollutants, the EPA used a proxy measurement and measured carbon dioxide. They didn’t use a test to come up with this rule based on arsenic or lead. It was a proxy using carbon.

Further, somebody said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we were stripping away critical regulations. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if it was so critical, why did the Biden administration wait until November 29 with less than 2 months left in their term? If it was so critical, why did the EPA in 2020 find that there was an ample margin of safety in the regulations that already existed?

Mr. Speaker, this is not about stripping away all regulations on tire manufacturing. It is one specific ill-advised, ill-timed, expensive regulation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I can’t stress enough that the EPA’s rule, which the Republicans are trying to repeal, would remove 171 tons of hazardous air pollution per year, including some of the worst air toxins.

This critical rule is, first and foremost, a public health rule, seeking to help both the workers and the communities surrounding these facilities.

We heard a very impassioned speech by the gentlewoman from Akron, Ohio, who talked about how much, in Akron, they depend on this industry and want it to thrive. They have suffered over the years, not only the people who work in the factory but the people of Akron and the surrounding areas, from hazardous air pollution. Essentially, that is why she is opposed to the repeal of this rule that helps people breathe.

Again, this is not only something that the EPA is required to do under the Clean Air Act, which is to look at whether or not particular industries are causing health problems for the American public, but in addition to that, the EPA was compelled to regulate these specific air toxins by a 2020 court case that required the agency to close loopholes for unregulated hazardous air pollution that they are legally required to manage under the Clean Air Act.

My colleagues on the other side suggested that somehow this is a Biden administration midnight rule and that it

was rushed at the last minute. The reality is that the EPA has been regulating the process involved in tire manufacturing since 2002. That is over 20 years ago.

Rubber processing, which is really what we are talking about here, had gotten a free pass, as I said, for over 20 years. This rule that the EPA promulgated seeks to ensure that the workers and communities like those in Akron near these facilities aren’t put in harm’s way any longer.

I think House Republicans are really minimizing these critical public health protections decades in the making by using the CRA to repeal this title and block the EPA from further action.

Instead of funding our government, lowering prices, or finding ways to help everyday Americans, House Republicans are wasting Congress’ time by rescinding a long-awaited rule that will reduce 171 tons of harmful, cancer-causing emissions a year.

While this rule was finalized in November, the 11 rubber processing facilities have 3 years to make the necessary technology upgrades. Any doomsday claims about the EPA rule simply ignore the very real experiences of people who have been forced to breathe toxic pollution while coming into work or walking out of their front door for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the EPA was under no obligation to do this regulation. They may have been under an obligation to look at unregulated hazardous air pollutants, but nowhere in the statute does it allow for proxy carbon studies.

Hydrocarbons are not listed as a hazardous air pollutant. The plain language, I repeat, does not authorize proxy or surrogate studies to say: Well, we looked at it, and there is a lot of carbon. Therefore, we are going to make specific regulations that cost hundreds of millions of dollars and may or may not cost jobs.

That is not their job. That is the purpose of the Congressional Review Act. It is to rein in unreasonable, improper, or irrational regulations done at the last minute by an outgoing administration or by an incoming team.

This is not something that needs to be on the books to protect health. They did a proxy study. They don’t have actual data that shows that this would do any good at all. It will perhaps cause significant curtailment in production at certain facilities of tires made in the United States. It is our job as Members of Congress to prevent this travesty.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the arguments that we have made have now worn out. We have used up the mileage on these arguments. Now, we get to vote “yes,” and voting “yes” is where the rubber meets the road and gives us

a more sound regulatory scheme related to tire manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas 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.

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM FOR APPLIANCE STANDARDS: CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, LABELING REQUIREMENTS, AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL EQUIPMENT”

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 177, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment”, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 42

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment” (89 Fed. Reg. 81994 (October 9, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 42.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my Congressional Review Act joint resolution of disapproval which seeks to overturn the Department of Energy's final rule on the Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Provisions, and Enforcement Provisions.

Over the past 4 years, the Biden-Harris administration has flooded our economy with burdensome regulations, stifling growth and restricting Americans' freedoms. In total, these regulations have imposed a staggering \$1.7 trillion in costs on the American people. Fortunately, House Republicans and President Trump are committed to rolling back these unnecessary and costly mandates.

The latest example of overreach came in October of 2024, when the Department of Energy finalized new certification, labeling, and enforcement requirements affecting 20 different consumer and commercial products, including dishwashers, central air conditioners, heat pumps, washing machines, battery chargers, and light bulbs. These new mandates add unnecessary red tape, disrupt supply chains, limit consumer choice, and drive up prices. It is time to get the Washington bureaucracy out of Americans' everyday lives.

My legislation seeks to rescind this final rule which places excessive costs and bureaucratic obstacles on appliance manufacturers, costs that will inevitably be passed down to consumers. In its broader push against fossil fuels, the Biden administration has imposed at least 31 appliance regulations at an estimated cost of over \$60 billion. This resolution would eliminate Biden-era energy conservation certification and labeling regulations, ensuring that American consumers, not Washington bureaucrats, decide which appliances best fit their needs.

Even the Biden-Harris Department of Energy acknowledges that this rule

will increase annual costs for individual manufacturers by \$213,000 and require an additional 2,905 hours of compliance paperwork, just paperwork, a major burden, particularly for small businesses. As a small business owner myself, I understand how crushing regulations like these harm the small businesses that drive our economy, especially in rural communities like northeast Georgia.

Last November, the American people soundly rejected the Biden-Harris administration's disastrous policies. Now, as President Trump moves swiftly to get our country back on track, Congress must act to roll back these costly misguided regulations, starting with the Department of Energy's appliance rule.

I thank Chairman GUTHRIE, Chairman GRIFFITH, and House leadership for prioritizing this commonsense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support its final passage to protect consumer choice, reduce costs, and eliminate unnecessary regulatory burdens.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 42. This resolution is a deliberate distraction from the fact that Republicans cannot govern and have no ideas for lowering costs or helping everyday Americans. Rather than debating things that actually impact our constituents, it appears as if House Republicans opened the Federal Register, searched for what fell within the Congressional Review Act window, and then randomly selected an obscure, noncontroversial rule, one that is, by the way, supported by American manufacturers.

That is why we are here today. We are not here to talk about Republican cuts to Medicare or DOGE's raid of the Federal Government or Trump's tariffs that are tanking the stock market and threatening a recession. We are not even here to consider a government funding bill when government funding runs out in less than 10 days. No, we are here to talk about appliance labels.

Let me talk about them. Let me start with the fact that the recently finalized Department of Energy rule that Republicans want to strike from the books isn't even an efficiency standard. It is a set of technical updates to certification requirements and labels for select products that fall under the appliance standards program.

Now, you might say: Congressman PALLONE, what does this mean? It means that Republicans are simply out of ideas.

The Republican majority seems to be under the impression that by removing this rule from the books, they are somehow alleviating a major burden for manufacturers and consumers. The problem is that manufacturers have been submitting certification information to the Department of Energy for decades, and none of this is new.

This Republican resolution will only create regulatory confusion for American manufacturers because they will still have to make products that meet efficiency standards, but they won't have updated guidance from the Department of Energy on how to prove that they are compliant. As a result, these companies will likely have to waste valuable time and resources on communications with lawyers and the Department of Energy as everyone tries to figure out how to move forward.

My colleagues on the other side are suggesting they are cutting red tape, but it seems to me they are creating more red tape with this resolution. Absolutely no one opposed the Department of Energy's final rule on this topic, no one.

In fact, manufacturers are on record saying that consistent and clear certification guidance is helpful and necessary to them. Today's resolution is the opposite of consistent and clear. They are asking for this, the manufacturers are, and you are saying no. You don't even know what you are talking about, frankly.

I refuse to believe that—I can't believe that they think on the other side that this is a pressing issue facing Americans. In case they have forgotten, Republicans are right now moving forward with a budget that includes devastating cuts to Medicaid, all so they can give tax breaks to their billionaire buddies.

Every day for the last 6 weeks, we have heard horror stories of mass firings across the Federal Government, funding freezes, and Elon Musk and his minions having access to every American's private, personal financial and healthcare information. This is what I hear about when I go home. The list goes on. Now, there is a looming government shutdown next week.

Rather than tackling these real issues that are impacting the lives of everyday Americans, Republicans are wasting time with this resolution.

As far as I can tell, the only beneficiaries of today's resolution are foreign manufacturers. If Republicans create chaos and uncertainty by revoking this Department of Energy rule, they will create an opportunity for cheap foreign imports, with misleading claims about performance, to flood our appliance market. That would hurt consumers and American manufacturers alike.

The Republicans have made their choice. They have sided once again with the foreign manufacturers. They have chosen to push through a resolution that doesn't reduce regulatory burdens, doesn't lower costs, and doesn't improve consumer choices. The only thing it does is create chaos and confusion, from what I can see.

For all these reasons, I oppose the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of

the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the subcommittee this morning, it was brought to my attention that our colleague SYLVESTER TURNER had passed away. He was new here, so I didn't really know him that well. Actually, the first time was either Monday or—the days run together. It would have been yesterday during votes, right before we adjourned to get ready for the special session, he was sitting right there on the aisle on the corner, and I shook his hand and talked to him for the first time.

Today, in Energy and Commerce, there were two Members, our colleagues from Texas, Mr. WEBER and Mr. GOLDMAN, who served with him in the Texas Legislature. If you listened to what they said about SYLVESTER TURNER, only knowing him for a day or so, I missed a lot. He seemed to be a wonderful man, a wonderful person, and my thoughts and prayers and the thoughts of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I know the whole House, are with his family. He is going to be missed.

I will get down to the business in front of us. I know that has moved all of us—that is why I wanted to bring it up—to lose such a great colleague.

I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 42 to repeal the Biden administration's burdensome and unnecessary certification, labeling, and enforcement provisions for 20 different products that American families and businesses rely on day in and day out.

Over the last 4 years, the Biden Department of Energy proposed and finalized new and amended standards for 30 appliance classes, regulating virtually every appliance in our houses and much of the equipment in businesses. All of these regulations led to over \$60 billion in added costs.

Implementing these certification, labeling, and enforcement provisions will further solidify the disastrous standards promulgated under the last administration.

This rule alone will increase costs annually by \$213,000 while doing nothing to improve appliance efficiency, extend product lifetimes, or lower costs.

While consumers struggle to keep up with the ever-increasing cost of appliances and dwindling product optionality, the Biden administration consistently hampered innovation by imposing unnecessary and duplicative regulation on manufacturers.

Fortunately, H.J. Res. 42 will roll back this red tape and enable Congress and the Trump administration to safeguard consumer choice and lower costs for American households.

I thank the gentleman from the Ninth District of Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), my good friend, for leading this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 42.

We will miss our good friend from Texas, as I said, who I really got to

know in the last 24 hours. I missed a lot by not knowing him longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution.

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

I just want to clarify some of the comments that we are hearing today from the other side. My colleagues across the aisle said at one point it costs the Department of Energy a little over \$200,000 to implement this rule, and they have described what sounds like onerous associated paperwork and a big administrative burden.

Now, understand, that is \$200,000 total, across all manufacturers throughout the country. I mean, we are not talking about a huge amount of money here. The thing is that the Department of Energy already has certification requirements for manufacturers, and this resolution doesn't remove those requirements. It just includes technical updates that bring those requirements up to date.

The manufacturers, as I said before, have been submitting this information to the Department of Energy for decades. There is nothing new here.

In fact, if this resolution passes, the Department of Energy and manufacturers will be left with a new administrative burden to navigate. They will have to figure out how to use old testing requirements for new standards even when technically these things don't go together.

The manufacturers, who, as I said, support the rule, will have to work with their lawyers to figure out if they are compliant with standards and will have to identify ways to prove they are compliant. The Department of Energy will have to wade through confused outreach from stakeholders. This is what happens if the resolution passes. The rule is not a problem for any of the manufacturers, the underlying rule they are trying to repeal.

Since the Department of Energy will be barred from issuing substantially similar rules, they won't be able to officially update these requirements ever again.

I know this sounds very bureaucratic. I don't know where they came up with this resolution, so I have to explain how they are creating more bureaucracy for the manufacturers who actually like the underlying rule they want to repeal.

□ 1315

In what world is removing clear and consistent guidance, creating regulatory uncertainty, and reducing costs and administrative burdens a bad thing? It doesn't make any sense. Why are we creating a scenario where manufacturers must report outdated information and risk penalties for non-compliance?

If my colleagues across the aisle are worried about administrative burdens at the Department of Energy, perhaps they should speak up for the employees that Musk and President Trump have

fired at the Department of Energy, or maybe they should speak out against all the administrative confusion of turning funding on and off again—you know, freeze one day, thaw the next day, freeze again.

I just think that this resolution is a distraction, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't accomplish what my colleagues across the aisle want to accomplish. In fact, it creates so much confusion that it accomplishes exactly what we should be trying to avoid, and that is increased costs and delays.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 42, which will roll back another burdensome Biden-Harris rule on the Department of Energy efficiency standards for appliances and equipment.

Let's be clear: People elected us to make the laws, and these agencies are making rules. I think Congress is entitled to speak on this issue.

Alongside President Trump, House Republicans are on a mission to reclaim American energy dominance, and that means continuing to eliminate President Biden's burdensome energy regulations that have limited consumer choice. Again, we represent the people, and the people are telling us that these things have to stop.

This final rule that we will overturn today imposes unnecessary and duplicative labeling, certifying, and reporting requirements for various appliances and commercial equipment. This is part of a broken system that needs major reforms. The American people are done paying for it with higher costs, created by government bureaucrats, for at-home appliances.

Under the Biden administration alone, the DOE implemented more than 30 appliance and equipment efficiency rules, at a cost of \$60 billion, many of which negatively impact consumers and manufacturers in my district.

Amazingly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were stuck in their seats last night as President Trump spoke about unleashing American energy and lowering costs. Regardless, House Republicans will deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLYDE for his leadership, and I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 42.

This is the latest Republican bill to raise costs on American families. In fact, Republicans in Congress have failed to bring any bill over the past couple of months since this new Congress started to help reduce the cost of living for our neighbors back home.

Meanwhile, the Trump administration's illegal shutdown of grants, loans,

and partnership funds to our local communities and nonprofits; the firing of public servants, like the inspector general at the Department of Energy, whose job it is to root out waste, fraud, and abuse; the firing of experts that oversee the nuclear enterprise and our nuclear weapons; and tariffs, which are, in essence, new taxes on American families and businesses, is really socking it to the pocketbooks of American families and businessowners, except for billionaires like Elon Musk, who stand to win big from the tax breaks for billionaires that Republicans are moving through the House.

Let's talk about what is going on right now with all of this chaos and confusion. The unemployment rate is up. Prices are up. If you haven't checked your 401(k), that is down. All of this has a real-world impact, and I really want to beseech my Republican colleagues to help us end the madness. Find your spines to stand up to the chaos and confusion that all of these illegal actions are having on our folks back home. I mean, right now laying people off, public servants who provide essential services, the illegal pause in funding—thank goodness the United States Supreme Court just announced this morning that they were turning back one of the illegal actions to, in essence, rob money that has been congressionally mandated to fund essential services.

It really is weighing on the entire economy. More importantly, people back home want to know what the Congress is going to do about it, and it is just silence from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Let's talk about how ridiculous this is to target labeling on energy-efficient appliances, just plain information that you need to have when you go shopping. Energy efficiency is very important to Americans. It has been, as a matter of fact, for about 50 years. When the Congress passed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, we said to the Department of Energy: Work with manufacturers and advocates and do everything you can to help with innovation to help consumers save more money.

That is really smart policy. One of the innocuous things that goes along with it is the labeling so that customers understand what they are buying. They need to know about how energy efficient an appliance is and be able to comparison shop when they buy a dishwasher or some other appliance.

Republicans, I just don't understand why you want to keep families and businesses in the dark on this. It is a real head-scratcher until you understand that polluters and big oil and gas companies have all too much influence here on Capitol Hill.

Republicans keep sending these love letters to big oil and gas companies. In fact, it was on Valentine's Day, February 14, when the Trump administration announced it would halt cost savings for consumers through energy-effi-

cient coolers and freezers, clothes washers, and air-conditioners. This labeling fiasco, I just don't understand why you think it is important for families to have less information just when they are trying to figure out what appliance to buy.

In contrast, the Democrats, over the past few years, have really been focused on lowering the cost of living and passed very significant cost savings for consumers. I am not talking about prescription drugs and the cap on insulin. I am talking about energy-efficient appliances, home energy tax credits, and rebates so that you can buy those energy-efficient appliances.

Right now, Floridians are waiting for about \$350 million, which has now been put on hold because of the illegal shutdown of a lot of funds that are supposed to flow back home to the benefit of my neighbors.

I know that Republicans and polluters don't like energy efficiency, but today's resolution does nothing to even get at energy efficiency. In fact, it just creates more confusion. They are just talking about the labels.

It creates confusion for businesses. It is confusing for manufacturers. So many of them are grappling now with the twists and turns of new taxes through tariffs on their products. This is going to cost everyone money.

Americans are rightly asking why Republicans are wasting time repealing this until this week. Until this week, I would hazard to guess that most Members of Congress didn't even know that this was a rule.

American families are also asking why Republicans are turning a blind eye to their responsibility to look out for the pocketbooks of our families and small business owners back home.

I think it is because the Republicans are scared. They are scared of Elon Musk. They are scared to talk about the real problems facing working families across the country: affordability, the escalating costs of the overheating climate, what that is doing, higher insurance costs, and higher electric bills because their summers are longer and more intense. Back in the Tampa Bay area, we are trying to rebuild from the most devastating hurricane season that we have ever experienced.

The changing climate isn't just about the weather. It is about your wallets, and folks really need help. They need Republicans, in addition to Democrats, looking out for them, not just lip-service about lowering costs.

That is why it has been so disheartening to watch Elon Musk and the new administration. They have no plan, no interest in addressing the problems. Instead, they continue to double down on chaos and confusion.

Last night, we heard from the President. He continued his crusade of endless lies. It was difficult to listen to. It was very long because the President campaigned on reducing costs and making government more efficient, and instead, all he has proposed is a

major tax giveaway to billionaires like Elon Musk, paid for by hardworking folks, children who rely on Medicaid, our neighbors with disabilities, and our older neighbors in skilled nursing, saying to Social Security recipients it is going to be harder for you to get your payment because we are going to slash the people who ensure that that happens, repealing affordable healthcare, repealing these initiatives that lower your electric bills, and other actions that make us less safe.

Congressional Republicans have a lot to say about today's resolution and their war against energy-efficient appliances. As Elon Musk and his lackeys really take a hammer—a chain saw, I guess—to what really matters in this country, it is very difficult to try to work together to say we are going to solve problems for the American people when one side has no spine and no answer and instead brings these ridiculous resolutions to the floor rather than working on really helping the American people.

The only labels we should be talking about today are the lies stickered across Trump's empty campaign promises. He continues these misleading claims and lies to the American people, and Democrats are not going to stand idly by while he loots the U.S. Government for his own benefit. There has to be an end to the chaos and corruption, and it needs to start right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, but I think it bears repeating, Republicans have cited about \$200,000 in costs for manufacturers associated with this rule that they seek to repeal, but understand that is the total cost of the rule for all affected manufacturers combined. If you break that down, the Department of Energy estimates the costs per manufacturer at about \$2,555.

That is a ridiculous amount to even discuss at this point. We actually heard from one manufacturer that they have already redone their certification reports to comply with the rule. If this resolution is enacted, they will have to redo their certifications to the old, out-of-date rules, and that will cost them more money.

□ 1330

The details of these certification rules are obscure, but they are important for establishing a level playing field and ensuring the products meet U.S. standards, whether they are imported or made here in the U.S.

Repealing the certification would increase costs for the manufacturers that play by the rules and can make it harder on the DOE to enforce standards against those that don't. The good guys

all like the rule and don't want it repealed. Only the bad foreign manufacturers might like to get rid of the rules.

I just find it, Mr. Speaker, deeply ironic that my Republican colleagues are hell-bent on attacking anything even remotely related to energy efficiency standards or bringing up things like administrative burdens on the Department of Energy during a time when they have been praising Elon Musk's destructive government efficiency efforts through DOGE.

I guess my Republican colleagues only care about efficiency improvements, if we can even call it that, when it means indiscriminately slashing our Federal workforce. If Republicans cared about government efficiency, then they wouldn't be rescinding rules that provide clear and consistent guidance for American companies. They wouldn't look the other way when the DOE workforce is slashed without evaluating the impacts.

I don't think Republicans care about reducing costs for American families or helping government work better for our families and industries. Mr. Speaker, just look at their budget that they adopted last week. The only thing they care about is cozying up to greedy billionaires.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to vote against this resolution, it absolutely makes no sense for anyone, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I find this debate fascinating and interesting. That may come as a shock, because it is really pretty boring. However, I find it interesting because my colleagues have just said: Why are we spending time worrying about this little regulation from the Department of Energy when employees are losing their jobs?

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that if this is such a small, little regulation, I mean it is merely a labeling thing that doesn't cost very much according to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, then what in the world were we doing having DOE employees?

We have got so many DOE employees that they have time to spend all day, weeks, and months creating a new regulation that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim doesn't really have much value to it, it is just a little label.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, it costs more than what DOE has estimated, because even though they spent countless hours coming up with this new regulation, I would submit that in my opinion it looks like they only counted the cost of the new labels. That is because somebody has to send it to legal, and we have to determine if the new certification has any legal consequences.

Does it say something on the new appliance or on the appliance that is already out there but is in the produc-

tion process that might cause a legal issue?

I would submit it costs our manufacturers not only the money to print the label but an employee to come up with the new label before it goes to legal to be looked at. Somebody has to pay those people.

While the cost of the labels might only be \$200,000, there is a cost to each company. That is because this is broad. It doesn't apply to one or two little items. It applies to all kinds of stuff.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is where your real cost is, and instead of being concerned about coming up with some kind of a new certificate that has to have a new label, maybe we shouldn't have been doing that at the DOE. Maybe we should have been focusing on making small nuclear reactors available for communities and working on ways to provide a stronger electric grid; but no, no, by golly, we are going to have the best labels in the world. That is what we need.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you this regulation needs to go away, but my colleagues have told me that it is insignificant. If they don't think it is significant, I think we should get rid of it, particularly when it is going to cost businesses.

It may not cost every business, maybe one manufacturer out of dozens and dozens, or maybe hundreds. I haven't done a study, Mr. Speaker. I will just tell you that it has been interesting to listen to all of this discussion.

I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, that over the last 4 years, the Biden administration finalized more than 30 new or updated energy efficiency standards that ended up totaling over \$60 billion in costs. This is just one of many cuts to our manufacturing base in the United States and our producers as well as across the world.

The Biden administration was out to regulate or restrict nearly every appliance or piece of equipment relied upon by every single American household and business.

Today, the House will vote on H.J. Res. 42 to repeal yet another Biden-Harris administration rule that only serves to increase red tape and costs to manufacturers. We know what happens when the costs to manufacturers go up; the American consumer pays the price.

In October 2024, the Department of Energy finalized new and amended certification, labeling, and enforcement provisions for about 20 different products, including dishwashers, central AC, heat pumps, and more.

I am going to get to the "and more" in a minute.

Today, an American homeowner spends about 34 percent more money on appliances than they did just 15 years ago. From 1995 to 2005, the average homeowner replaced their appliances about every 12 or 13 years. These days families get new appliances about every 8 or 9 years. Maybe it is because they are not as efficient as they used to be. I don't know.

However, I do know on one washer-dryer standard, according to the data—I believe this was DOE data—there was a 46-year payback on a device that was expected to last or be expected to be used by the homeowner 8 to 9 years. We are going to make it more efficient, but, by golly, it is going to cost you, Mr. Speaker. It is going to cost you, and it is going to take 46 years to pay back on an item you will only use for about 10.

Consumers are buying more frequently in part because some energy standards make the appliance wear down more quickly. That is what my suspicion was all along.

Consumers don't see the savings. These appliances just don't last as long because they have got to run their washing machine three times.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, one time I had a constituent contact me, and she said: Morgan, look at this picture. I take a hose from my backyard to fill up my washing machine because under the new guidelines there is not enough water in there to actually get my clothes clean on one time, so I supplement it with the backyard hose and add more water to my washing machine.

Yeah, that is really, really good policy.

I remember an old DOE energy standard from a few years ago that one of my constituents told me about related to the washing machine. I just told you that story, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is instructive.

This final rule will only expand already broken efficiency standards, increase costs, and slow the development of reliable, efficient products.

On a previous DOE standard for electric combination washer-dryers, DOE said in plain black and white in Federal regulations: payback period 46 years.

DOE itself estimates this final rule might only cost \$213,000, but that is \$213,000 we don't have to spend. As I said, I don't think it is that cheap. I think by the time you get finished with the lawyers and everybody who has to review it and all the time that is spent by your employees, Mr. Speaker, it is a lot more than that in reality.

DOE assumes manufacturers will incur these additional costs, but we know better than that. They will send that on to the consumer, and it will cost us more money.

It also has a DOE expansion in data collection. In one example regarding the data collection, Mr. Speaker, you have to collect the data for dedicated purpose swimming pool pump motors.

Historically, DOE only collected data demonstrating compliance with efficiency standards. However, in this final rule, DOE aims to expand reporting requirements to store data for potential future conservation standards.

If you are trying to run a pool, whether at your house or a commercial operation, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that is an additional cost. You are

having to collect all this data, Mr. Speaker, or if it is built into your machine, then that is going to cost more, and it is unnecessary. We are making everything more complicated.

Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to know that at one time in my life I was a Virginia certified pool operator. That is why I brought this over. I keep this on my desk. When the baby pool pump—that would qualify as one of these dedicated purpose swimming pool pump motors—when it broke down, and it would have been in 1980, I found that when we had to get it replaced, this was the gadget that had worn out.

It reminded me that we were moving from brass, in this case, to plastic, and so I have kept it on my desk all these years.

Who knew it would become important today because probably some kind of a label should have been on here if we had today's standards in place. I don't know. All I do know is that when you are trying to get something replaced, Mr. Speaker, particularly in the case of a swimming pool, when the pump breaks, it means you are going to have to shut your facility down, and you are not looking at the label on the new pump motor. You are just getting it in there as fast as you can. You are driving over to the swimming pool supply place, Mr. Speaker, or you are calling them up and saying: Get over here now.

That came out of the Hunting Hills Country Club baby swimming pool where I was the manager that summer and was a certified pool operator to have that job.

Now we are going to be collecting data on all this stuff. Mr. Speaker, you would think we were TikTok in the way we are collecting data on swimming pool motors and other devices.

This overcollection jeopardizes confidential business information. It might not have mattered to the swimming pools I worked with, but it complicates the matter. It is an inappropriate use of the certification process.

Additionally, many of the provisions in this final rule are also duplicative of existing reporting requirements by certain States, EPA, and Energy Star. This increase in red tape will do nothing to lower appliance prices, and it will do nothing to lengthen product lifetimes or to bring real energy savings to the American homeowner.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for his leadership on bringing this to our attention. I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 42, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be 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 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) at 4 p.m.

#### EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE SYLVESTER TURNER

Ms. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 191

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable SYLVESTER TURNER, a Representative from the State of Texas.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### 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:

Passage of H.J. Res. 61; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 42.

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

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS: RUBBER TIRE MANUFACTURING"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing" on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 202, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Fischbach	Langworthy
Alford	Fitzgerald	Latta
Allen	Fleischmann	Lawler
Amodei (NV)	Flood	Lee (FL)
Arrington	Fong	Letlow
Babin	Fox	Loudermilk
Bacon	Franklin, Scott	Lucas
Baird	Fry	Luna
Balderson	Fulcher	Luttrell
Barr	Garbarino	Mace
Barrett	Gill (TX)	Mackenzie
Baumgartner	Gimenez	Malliotakis
Bean (FL)	Golden (ME)	Maloy
Begich	Goldman (TX)	Mann
Bentz	Gonzalez, V.	Massie
Bergman	Gooden	Mast
Bice	Graves	McCaul
Biggs (SC)	Gray	McClain
Billirakis	Green (TN)	McClintock
Boebert	Greene (GA)	McCormick
Bost	Griffith	McDowell
Brecheen	Grothman	McGuire
Bresnahan	Guest	Messmer
Buchanan	Guthrie	Meuser
Burchett	Hageman	Miller (IL)
Burlison	Hamadeh (AZ)	Miller (OH)
Calvert	Haridopolos	Miller (WV)
Cammack	Harrigan	Miller-Meeks
Carey	Harris (MD)	Mills
Carter (GA)	Harris (NC)	Moolenaar
Carter (TX)	Harshbarger	Moore (AL)
Ciscomani	Hern (OK)	Moore (NC)
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Moore (UT)
Cloud	Hill (AR)	Moore (WV)
Clyde	Hinson	Moran
Cole	Houchin	Murphy
Collins	Hudson	Nehls
Comer	Huizenga	Newhouse
Costa	Hunt	Norman
Crane	Hurd (CO)	Nunn (IA)
Crank	Issa	Oberholte
Crawford	Jack	Ogles
Crenshaw	Jackson (TX)	Onder
Cuellar	James	Owens
Davis (NC)	Johnson (LA)	Palmer
De La Cruz	Johnson (SD)	Perez
DesJarlais	Jordan	Perry
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Pfluger
Downing	Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler
Dunn (FL)	Kean	Rogers (AL)
Edwards	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Ellzey	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Emmer	Kennedy (UT)	Roy
Estes	Kiggans (VA)	Rulli
Evans (CO)	Kiley (CA)	Rutherford
Ezell	Kim	Salazar
Fallon	Knott	Scalise
Fedorchak	Kustoff	Schmidt
Feenstra	LaHood	Schweikert
Finstad	LaLota	Scott, Austin