

Frost	Mannion	Ruiz
Garamendi	Matsui	Ryan
Garcia (CA)	McBath	Salinas
Garcia (IL)	McBride	Sánchez
Garcia (TX)	McClain Delaney	Scanlon
Gillen	McClellan	Schneider
Goldman (NY)	McCollum	Scholten
Gomez	McDonald Rivet	Schrier
Gonzalez, V.	McGarvey	Scott (VA)
Goodlander	McGovern	Scott, David
Gottheimer	McIver	Sewell
Gray	Menendez	Sherman
Green, Al (TX)	Mfume	Simon
Grijalva	Min	Smith (WA)
Harder (CA)	Moore (WI)	Sorensen
Hayes	Morelle	Soto
Himes	Morrison	Stansbury
Horsford	Moskowitz	Stanton
Houlahan	Mrvan	Stevens
Hoyer	Mullin	Strickland
Hoyle (OR)	Neal	Subramanyam
Huffman	Neguse	Swalwell
Ivey	Norcross	Sykes
Jacobs	Olshewski	Takano
Jayapal	Omar	Thanedar
Jeffries	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Thompson (MS)
Kamllager-Dove	Pappas	Tlaib
Kaptur	Pelosi	Tokuda
Kelly (IL)	Perez	Tonko
Kennedy (NY)	Peters	Torres (NY)
Khanna	Pettersen	Tran
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Underwood
Landsman	Vargas	Pocan
Larsen (WA)	Pou	Vasquez
Larson (CT)	Pressley	Vindman
Lee (NV)	Quigley	Walkinshaw
Lee (PA)	Ramirez	Wasserman
Leger Fernandez	Randall	Schultz
Levin	Raskin	Waters
Liccardo	Riley (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lieu	Rivas	Whitesides
Lofgren	Ross	Williams (GA)

(1420)

**DON'T MESS WITH MY HOME APPLIANCES ACT**

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1075, I call up the bill (H.R. 4626) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). Pursuant to House Resolution 1075, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-20 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4626

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act".*

**SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS.**

(a) AMENDMENT OF STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 325(m)(1) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, for any product, publish a notice of proposed rulemaking including new proposed standards for such product based on the criteria established under subsection (o) and the procedures established under subsection (p)."

(2) AMENDMENT OF STANDARD.—Section 325(m)(3) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) AMENDMENT OF STANDARD.—Not later than 2 years after a notice is issued under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish a final rule amending the standard for the product."

(3) APPLICATION TO PRODUCTS.—Section 325(m)(4) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) APPLICATION TO PRODUCTS.—An amendment prescribed under this subsection shall apply to a product that is manufactured after the date that is 5 years after publication of the final rule establishing an applicable standard."

(b) PETITION FOR AMENDED STANDARD.—Section 325(n) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(n)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "AN AMENDED STANDARD" and inserting "AMENDMENT OR REVOCATION OF STANDARD";

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or revoked" after "should be amended";

(3) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall grant a petition to determine if standards for a covered product should be amended or revoked if the Secretary finds that such petition contains evidence, assuming no other evidence were considered, that such standards—

"(A) result in additional costs to consumers;

"(B) do not result in significant conservation of energy or water;

"(C) are not technologically feasible; and  
 "(D) result in such covered product not being commercially available in the United States to all consumers.;"

(4) in paragraph (4)—  
 (A) by striking "NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS." and inserting "NEW, AMENDED, OR REVOKED STANDARDS.;"

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively (and by conforming the margins accordingly);

(C) by striking "Not later than 3 years" and inserting the following:

"(A) Not later than 3 years"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) Not later than 180 days after the date of granting a petition to revoke standards, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

"(i) a final rule revoking the standards; or

"(ii) a determination that it is not necessary to revoke the standards.

"(C) The grant of a petition by the Secretary under this subsection creates no presumption with respect to the Secretary's determination of any of the criteria in a rulemaking under this section.

"(D) Standards that have been revoked pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be considered to be in effect for purposes of section 327.;" and

(5) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking "3 years (for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers, room air conditioners, dishwashers, clothes washers, clothes dryers, fluorescent lamp ballasts, general service fluorescent lamps, incandescent reflector lamps, and kitchen ranges and ovens) or 5 years (for central air conditioners and heat pumps, water heaters, pool heaters, direct heating equipment and furnaces)" and inserting "5 years";

(c) CRITERIA.—Section 325(o) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)) is amended by amending paragraphs (2) and (3) to read as follows:

"(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) DESIGN.—Any new or amended energy conservation standard prescribed by the Secretary under this section for any type (or class) of covered product shall be designed to achieve the maximum improvement in, as applicable, energy efficiency or water efficiency, which the Secretary determines is technologically feasible and economically justified.

"(B) TEST PROCEDURES.—If the Secretary determines that a test procedure should be prescribed or amended in accordance with section 323 for a type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for such type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary has prescribed or amended (and published in the Federal Register) a test procedure for such type (or class) of covered product at least 180 days before publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking with respect to the new or amended energy conservation standard.

"(C) SIGNIFICANT CONSERVATION.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product if the Secretary determines that the establishment and imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of, as applicable, energy or water.

"(D) TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE AND ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary determines that the establishment and imposition of such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified.

"(E) DISCLOSURE.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary, not later than the date on which the standard is prescribed, publicly discloses each meeting held by the Secretary, during the 5-year period preceding such date, with any entity that—

**NOT VOTING—37**

Arrington	Hunt	Ogles
Auchincloss	Jackson (IL)	Reschenthaler
Bell	Johnson (TX)	Schakowsky
Brecheen	Keating	Stefanik
Burlison	Latimer	Suozi
Cleaver	Lynch	Titus
Conaway	Magaziner	Torres (CA)
Crockett	Meeks	Trahan
Dunn (FL)	Menefee	Veasey
Emmer	Meng	Velazquez
Evans (PA)	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Golden (ME)	Nadler	
Gonzales, Tony	Ocasio-Cortez	

1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend the first vote series today due to a delayed flight into Washington, D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 71, YEA on Roll Call No. 72, NAY on Roll Call No. 73, and NAY on Roll Call No. 74.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes today due to being sick. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 71, YEA on Roll Call No. 72, YEA on Roll Call No. 73, and YEA on Roll Call No. 74.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor and missed Roll Call Nos. 71 through 74. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 71, H.R. 6329, YEA on Roll Call No. 72, S. 2503, NAY on Roll Call No. 73, the previous question on H. Res. 1075, and NAY on Roll Call No. 74, adoption of H. Res. 1075.

“(i) has ties to the People’s Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party;

“(ii) has produced studies regarding, or advocated for, regulations or policy to limit, restrict, or ban the use of any type of energy; and

“(iii) has applied for or received Federal funds.

“(3) FACTORS FOR DETERMINATION.—

“(A) ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—

“(i) DETERMINATION.—Prior to prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for any type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary shall conduct a quantitative economic impact analysis of imposition of the energy conservation standard that determines the predicted—

“(I) effects of imposition of the energy conservation standard on costs and monetary benefits to consumers of the products subject to such energy conservation standard, including—

“(aa) costs to low-income households; and

“(bb) variations in costs to consumers based on differences in regions, including rural populations, cost of living comparisons, and climatic differences;

“(II) effects of imposition of the energy conservation standard on employment; and

“(III) lifecycle costs for the covered product, including costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

“(ii) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Secretary shall provide public notice in the Federal Register and at least 60 days for public comment on the quantitative economic impact analysis conducted under clause (i).

“(B) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL COSTS TO THE CONSUMER.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary, based on an economic analysis under subparagraph (A), determines that—

“(i) imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product; and

“(ii) the monetary value of the energy savings and, as applicable, water savings, that the consumer will receive as a result of such energy conservation standard during the first 3 years after purchasing and installing a covered product complying with such energy conservation standard, as calculated under the applicable test procedure, will be greater than any increased costs to the consumer of the covered product due to imposition of such energy conservation standard, including increased costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

“(C) REQUIRED ENERGY OR WATER SAVINGS.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that compliance with such energy conservation standard will result in—

“(i) a reduction of at least 0.3 quads of site energy over 30 years; or

“(ii) at least a 10 percent reduction in energy or water use of the covered product.

“(D) CRITERIA RELATED TO PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in any lessening of the utility or the performance of the applicable covered product, taking into consideration the effects of such energy conservation standard on—

“(i) the compatibility of the covered product with existing systems;

“(ii) the life span of the covered product;

“(iii) the operating conditions of the covered product;

“(iv) the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product, as applicable;

“(v) the maintenance requirements of the covered product; and

“(vi) the replacement and disposal requirements for the covered product.

“(E) TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in the unavailability in the United States of a type (or class) of products based on what type of fuel the product consumes.

“(F) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified, the Secretary—

“(I) shall prioritize the interests of consumers;

“(II) may not consider estimates of the social costs or social benefits associated with incremental greenhouse gas emissions; and

“(III) shall consider—

“(aa) the economic impact, including any regulatory burden, of the standard on the manufacturers and on the consumers of the products subject to such standard;

“(bb) the savings in operating costs, including consumer fuel costs, throughout the estimated average life of the covered product in the type (or class) compared to any increase in the price of, or in the initial charges for, or maintenance expenses of, the covered products which are likely to result from the imposition of the standard;

“(cc) the total projected amount of energy, or, as applicable, water, savings likely to result directly from the imposition of the standard;

“(dd) the need for national energy and water conservation;

“(ee) the impact of any lessening of market competition, as determined in writing by the Attorney General under clause (ii), that is likely to result from the imposition of the standard;

“(ff) whether the imposition of the energy conservation standard is likely to result price discrimination; and

“(gg) other factors the Secretary considers relevant.

“(ii) ATTORNEY GENERAL DETERMINATION.—For purposes of clause (i)(III)(ee), the Attorney General shall make a determination of the impact, if any, of any lessening of market competition likely to result from such standard and shall transmit such determination, not later than 60 days after the publication of a proposed rule prescribing or amending an energy conservation standard, in writing to the Secretary, together with an analysis of the nature and extent of such impact. Any such determination and analysis shall be published by the Secretary in the Federal Register.

“(G) REGULATORY REVIEW.—

“(i) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of any final rule prescribing a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for any type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary shall evaluate the rule to determine whether such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified and whether the regulatory impact analysis for such rule remains accurate.

“(ii) EFFECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, if the Secretary determines, based on an evaluation under clause (i), that an energy conservation standard is not technologically feasible or economically justified—

“(I) the Secretary shall publish such determination and such energy conservation standard shall have no force or effect (except that such energy conservation standard shall be considered to be in effect for purposes of section 327); and

“(II) the Secretary may publish a final rule amending the energy conservation standard for the type (or class) of covered product to be technologically feasible and economically justified

in accordance with this subsection, which amendment shall apply to such a product that is manufactured after the date that is 3 years after publication of such final rule.”

(d) APPLICABILITY OF REGIONAL STANDARDS.—Section 325(o)(6)(E)(ii) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)(6)(E)(ii)) is amended by striking “shall apply to any such product installed on or after the effective date of the standard in States in which the Secretary has designated the standard to apply” and inserting “shall apply, in States in which the Secretary has designated the standard to apply, to any such product that is manufactured or imported into the United States on or after the effective date of the standard”.

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—

(A) CONSUMER PRODUCT.—Section 321(1)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(1)(A)) is amended by striking “, with respect to showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water” and inserting “water, as applicable”.

(B) ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARD.—Section 321(6)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(6)(A)) is amended by striking “, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water use,” and inserting “or water use, as applicable.”

(C) ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING COST.—Section 321(7) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(7)) is amended by striking “in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals” and inserting “, as applicable”.

(2) TEST PROCEDURES.—

(A) DESIGN OF TEST PROCEDURES.—Section 323(b)(3) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) is amended by striking “energy efficiency, energy use, water use (in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets and urinals)” and inserting “, as applicable, energy efficiency, energy use, water use”.

(B) CALCULATION OF COSTS.—Section 323(b)(4) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(4)) is amended by—

(i) by striking “or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals,” and inserting “or, as applicable,”; and

(ii) by striking “or in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals,” and inserting “or, as applicable.”

(C) RESTRICTION ON CERTAIN REPRESENTATIONS.—Section 323(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6293(c)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “ or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals,” and inserting “or, as applicable,”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “ or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals,” and inserting “or, as applicable.”

(3) CRITERIA FOR PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS.—Section 325(o)(1) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by striking “, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals,” and inserting “, or, as applicable.”

(4) REGIONAL STANDARDS.—Section 325(o)(6)(D)(i)(II) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)(6)(D)(i)(II)) is amended by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “this subsection”.

(5) PROCEDURE FOR PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS.—Section 325(p)(2)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(p)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “taking into account those factors which the Secretary must consider under subsection (o)(2)” and inserting “as determined in accordance with subsection (o)”.

(6) INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 326(d)(1) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by striking “or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals,” and inserting “or, as applicable.”

(7) ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR HIGH-INTENSITY DISCHARGE LAMPS, DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS, AND SMALL ELECTRIC MOTORS.—Section 346 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6317) is amended by striking subsection (c).

### SEC. 3. DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS.

Section 346 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6317) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) NO NEW OR REVISED STANDARDS FOR DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary may not prescribe any new or amended energy conservation standard under part B or this part for distribution transformers, including those distribution transformers for which the Secretary prescribed testing requirements under subsection (a)(1) and low-voltage dry-type distribution transformers.

“(2) EFFECT ON EXISTING STANDARDS.—Paragraph (1) does not affect any energy conservation standards prescribed under part B or this part before the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

### SEC. 4. DISHWASHERS; CLOTHES WASHERS.

Section 325(g) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)(B), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) OTHER AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDS.—The Secretary may prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard for clothes washers in accordance with this section, including—

“(I) a design requirement; and  
“(II) a performance standard which prescribes one of the following:

“(aa) A minimum level of energy efficiency.  
“(bb) A maximum quantity of energy use.  
“(cc) A minimum level of water efficiency.  
“(dd) A maximum quantity of water use.  
“(ee) A minimum level of energy efficiency and a minimum level of water efficiency.

“(ff) A maximum quantity of energy use and a maximum quantity of water use.”; and

(2) in paragraph (10)(B), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) OTHER AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDS.—The Secretary may prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard for dishwashers in accordance with this section, including—

“(I) a design requirement; and  
“(II) a performance standard which prescribes one of the following:  
“(aa) A minimum level of energy efficiency.  
“(bb) A maximum quantity of energy use.  
“(cc) A minimum level of water efficiency.  
“(dd) A maximum quantity of water use.  
“(ee) A minimum level of energy efficiency and a minimum level of water efficiency.

“(ff) A maximum quantity of energy use and a maximum quantity of water use.”.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4626.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4626, the Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act, sponsored by my colleague from Georgia's 12th District. This legislation modernizes energy efficiency authorities to lower costs for households and protects consumer choice.

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act, or EPCA, was established in 1975 amidst the oil crisis of the 1970s. EPCA gave statutory authority to the Department of Energy to regulate and set minimum efficiency standards for a list of covered products, including stoves, water heaters, and dishwashers, as well as certain commercial equipment.

At the time, Americans were dealing with the aftermath of the oil embargoes that led to mile-long gas lines and fuel rationing. The initial establishment of energy efficiency regulations was a matter of energy security.

By reducing consumption through the use of innovative technologies, we can insulate families from the harm caused by adversarial nations restricting access to critical energy resources. Madam Speaker, 50 years later, EPCA has remained largely unchanged, but under Democratic administrations, the focus of conservation efforts shifted from energy security to green policies that advance the far-left agenda.

During the same period, the United States has become the premier energy-producing nation, while home appliances have simultaneously become vastly more efficient.

During the 4 long years of the Biden-Harris administration, however, the Department of Energy used EPCA authorities to regulate a host of everyday products like dishwashers, freezers, and dryers. But these regulations were neither based on what consumers need or focused on affordability. They were rooted in ambitious climate goals.

While EPCA requires regulation to be economically justified and cost effective, the Biden-Harris administration bent the rules so that households and businesses may not see any efficient savings for decades.

In fact, the Biden-Harris Department of Energy regulations on dryers could take up to 46 years to see efficiency benefits, even though household appliances are replaced every 8 to 9 years on average.

Americans are already paying 34 percent more for their energy bills than they were in 2010. Households simply cannot afford more expensive mandates coming out of Washington.

At a time when Americans are struggling to pay their bills because of inflation caused by the Biden-Harris administration's spending spree, the Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act takes important steps to provide necessary relief to hardworking families. Decisions about home appliance

should be left to American families, not bureaucrats in Washington.

The Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act institutes common-sense accountability at DOE to protect consumers from overregulation. Importantly, this bill will foster continued innovation in energy efficiency technologies. Refocusing EPCA's authorities on cost-effective efficiency standards will lower costs while continuing to improve household appliance performance.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4626, the Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act to protect consumer choice, to modernize EPCA authorities, and to lower costs for American families.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we all know that American families are struggling to make ends meet. President Trump promised to cut energy bills in half in his first year, but that has not happened. In fact, electricity prices are up by 13 percent across the Nation and 80 million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills.

These increases did not just happen. They were a direct result of the Trump administration's disastrous policies, policies that have been rubber-stamped by House Republicans.

It is bad enough that Trump and congressional Republicans have ignored the affordability crisis and have instead done everything they can to help out their rich and big corporate interest buddies, but House Republicans are bringing up a bill today that will actually increase your monthly energy bill and make the appliances in your home more expensive to operate. It is hard to imagine being more out of touch with the needs of everyday Americans.

First, I have to mention that H.R. 4626 would make the appliances in your home more expensive to operate, sending your already high electricity bill even higher. Like all other appliance-related debates, this bill is just another way to kill floor time for Republicans who seem to only be able to garner enough Republican votes for bills to help their corporate polluter friends.

This bill guts the appliance energy conservation standards program at the Department of Energy. This program is credited with helping American households save \$6,000 on their energy bills over the last decade. The standards are projected to help reduce peak demand by 32 gigawatts by 2040. In a world where data centers are popping up all over the country, driving up costs and demand, we can't ignore the benefits from appliance efficiency.

Instead of recognizing energy efficiency as a helpful tool against rising costs and increasing electricity demand, House Republicans have made it the enemy. This bill gives the Trump

administration the power to eliminate efficiency standards, and it even prevents States from setting their own standards when the Federal Government fails to act. It creates arbitrary thresholds for new efficiency standards and eliminates the system of periodic reviews to examine if more savings are possible for certain products.

Together, these changes to the program will ensure that new energy efficiency standards get caught in a confusing and arbitrary process that delays finalization of new efficiency standards and allows for the roll back of existing standards. Basically, this bill guts the program and makes it unworkable.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy already has a robust process for finalizing energy efficiency standards. New standards must be technologically feasible and economically justified. The current process already has the buy-in and participation from a wide range of stakeholders, including consumer advocates, manufacturers, and energy efficiency advocates.

In fact, many of the efficiency standards that were finalized over the last few years are the result of a consensus agreement between these parties.

Rather than recognizing that the current process is successful at bringing everyone to the table, House Republicans have chosen to villainize it. Rather than celebrating the savings that Americans see as a result of efficiency standards, House Republicans mislead the public by misrepresenting how these standards work and how consumers save money.

With this bill, House Republicans are making the affordability crisis worse. They are gutting a successful and established program that saves Americans money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4626. I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, we are here at a time when later today we are going to hear the State of the Union Address. Based upon everything we know with the state of the Union, things are very expensive. Our neighbors back home are suffering a real affordability squeeze.

Especially when we are talking about energy, we know that 80 million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills right now. Look at our home State of Florida, Mr. Speaker, where FPL and TECO were just granted the largest rate hikes in history. That is \$6 billion that Floridians are going to

have to pay, higher costs at a time when they are really struggling with groceries and housing and hurricane repair at the same time.

Across America, electric utility rate hikes are at about 13 percent, much higher in some places. We know that manufacturing jobs decreased last year in 2025. Much of that is because of these arbitrary tariffs, the highest import taxes in about 100 years that Americans are paying for. Even the Supreme Court said we can't do that. They are arbitrary. They are illegal. People really deserve to get some money back from the illegal tariffs.

Then when we add on top the impact of the big, ugly bill. It is anticipated that due to the big, ugly bill passed by Republicans last summer, hardworking Americans are going to pay about 61 percent more on their electric bills over the next decade. Of course, there are healthcare costs, too, because of that big, ugly bill.

My guest for the State of the Union Address tonight is a small business owner from Tampa, Linda Misner. She and her husband own a healthcare business, a wellness business, in Tampa. With the benefit of the Affordable Care Act tax credits, they were paying about \$300 per month. Just like a lot of Florida families, they are hardworking Americans, small business owners.

As they are too young for Medicare, healthcare costs are just killing them. Without the tax credit, their health insurance premium will go from about \$320 per month to \$3,000 per month. That is outrageous.

Republicans ripping away that healthcare tax credit means that Linda and her husband now have had to go to an insurance plan that does not provide the same coverage. It doesn't provide prescription care. They are really at their wits' end, like a lot of Americans.

Things are too expensive. Everything the Republicans and the President have done has made life harder. It has made going to the grocery store like a military exercise. We are trying to figure out what we can buy.

To add insult to injury, we should be working together on legislation that will help our neighbors back home. What bills do the Republicans bring to the floor of the House today, the day of the State of the Union Address? They bring a bill that is going to make things more expensive. They are going to make electricity bills more expensive.

Energy efficiency standards are very popular. They are some of the most important tools that we have in helping to keep the pressure on lower electric bills. They have been a success.

Energy efficiency standards used to be bipartisan for refrigerators and air conditioners and dishwashers, but that has gone by the wayside. I don't know why. Mr. PALLONE kind of shined a light on that. High-powered corporations with all too much influence here in Washington, D.C., are calling the shots.

Utility companies and oil and gas companies want us to use more energy. They want us to consume more. They don't want us to be energy efficient. People really deserve better these days.

What does H.R. 4626 do? It guts those efficiency standards that have saved the average American household about \$6,000 over the last 10 years. In fact, Consumer Reports, a very well-respected and trusted organization, the Consumer Federation of America, writes:

"Appliance efficiency standards ensure that any of the huge array of product choices available to consumers incorporate energy-saving designs and technology that help limit energy consumption and utility bills."

"Energy efficiency doesn't just directly save money but also puts downward pressure on utility rates. Energy efficiency gains have helped create a downward trend in household energy consumption over the past 20 years, reducing the amount of investments utilities have had to make, preventing costs that they would have otherwise passed on to consumers. While energy efficiency alone can't solve all energy affordability challenges, it plays an important role in helping to counterbalance rising electricity prices."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from Consumer Reports and Consumer Federation of America.

FEBRUARY 23, 2026.

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

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
*Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. BRETT GUTHRIE,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and*  
*Commerce,*

*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON, LEADER JEFFRIES, CHAIRMAN GUTHRIE, AND RANKING MEMBER PALLONE: The undersigned groups write in strong opposition to H.R. 4626, which would grant new powers to the executive branch to weaken or remove appliance and equipment efficiency standards and set roadblocks to future improvements. If enacted, this bill would raise costs for households across America.

Appliance standards ensure consumers and businesses have access to cost-saving technologies that help reduce their utility bills. Without existing standards, the typical US household would have spent an additional \$6,000 on utility bills over the past decade, according to a recent report.

With these savings, it's not surprising that these standards have broad public support. Surveys conducted in 2025 by Consumer Reports showed that an overwhelming majority (87 percent) of consumers across the political spectrum (82 percent of Republicans and 94 percent of Democrats) believe, that new home appliances for sale in the U.S. should be required to achieve at least a minimum level of efficiency." Respondents say that their top motivation for wanting a more efficient large home appliance is lower energy bills.

Appliance efficiency standards ensure that any of the huge array of product choices available to consumers incorporate energy-

saving designs and technology that help limit energy consumption and utility bills. Even with potentially higher upfront costs, energy efficient appliances still provide much more than adequate bill savings for consumers across the country. Existing efficiency standards deliver a 3x to 5x return on investment for buyers. Minimum efficiency standards are especially valuable for the 44 million American households who rent, and typically have no direct control over the appliances within their homes.

Energy efficiency doesn't just directly save money but also puts downward pressure on utility rates. Energy efficiency gains have helped create a downward trend in household energy consumption over the past 20 years, reducing the amount of investments utilities have had to make, preventing costs that they would have otherwise passed on to consumers. While energy efficiency alone can't solve all energy affordability challenges, it plays an important role in helping to counterbalancing rising electricity prices.

By potentially enabling the executive branch to roll back efficiency standards, H.R. 4626 would increase costs for consumers. H.R. 4626 would add needless steps to an already lengthy rulemaking process and set arbitrary minimum savings thresholds and payback periods that would put future improvements to many standards out of reach.

For the above reasons, the undersigned consumer organizations respectfully oppose H.R. 4626. Thank you for this opportunity to address these policy measures. The undersigned groups welcome the opportunity to discuss how Congress can improve affordability for consumers, but this bill takes us in the wrong direction.

Sincerely,

CHRIS HARTO,

*Manager, Sustainability Policy, Consumer Reports, Washington, DC.*

KARIM MARSHALL,

*Director, Climate and Energy, Consumer Federation of America, Washington, DC.*

BERNETA HAYNES,

*Senior Attorney, National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of our low-income clients, Boston, MA.*

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the bill also says it would gut the ability of manufacturers, consumer groups, and others to arrive at consensus.

Most of what happens when the Department of Energy goes to update energy efficiency standards is that everyone gets together and they work out a consensus. It is a consensus that helps consumers save money but ensures that there is not a burden on business. Over time, technology has improved time and time again.

Some of us are old enough to reflect on the very limited choices we had decades ago on our household appliances. Now we go shopping. We have wide consumer choice.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle like to say this is a mandate. They are telling us what to buy. People are smart. They know better than that.

When consumers go shopping, it is up to them to decide: Do I want the energy efficient model? Do I want the midsize model? What benefits us? What really applies and helps my family? They have the choice to make.

Over time, through this important energy efficiency initiative at the Department of Energy, people have really

saved a lot of money. It has allowed our manufacturers to do well.

To gut these energy efficiency standards would be a gift to China. People are already suffering, paying more because of tariffs on some household appliances and supplies. If we really want to help consumers save money, why don't we do something to get the tariff revenue back to hardworking Americans?

A lot of the big businesses now are saying to the Trump administration that they want that tariff money back. What would really be fair is to get that tariff money back to the hardworking Americans who paid those import taxes, those illegal tariffs and arbitrary tariffs, imposed by a President who would like to wield them for retribution, creating—let's get back to the state of the Union—creating chaos and instability at a time when American families really need policymakers looking out for them and their wallets.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, energy conservation programs have been a very critical and valuable tool to our neighbors back home to help them save trillions of dollars over the past decades. It saves hardworking Americans thousands of dollars per year. It helps businesses save money.

Why in the world, especially on the day of the State of the Union Address, in the middle of an affordability squeeze, would the Republicans bring another bill to the floor that is going to increase the cost of living for our neighbors back home? It is not right. I think Mr. PALLONE is absolutely correct. People are out of touch in Washington, D.C.

They listen too often to the loud voices of the powerful special interests and not to the hardworking Americans who are really suffering with higher costs.

Mr. Speaker, people deserve a whole lot better. I hope they will vote this bill down and get back to work serving the people whom we represent.

□ 1440

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), my good friend, the sponsor of this piece of legislation, and an important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GUTHRIE for yielding the time and for his support of my bill, the Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I will set the stage on exactly why this bill is necessary. In 1975, Congress established the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, or EPCA, to increase American energy production, encourage efficient energy use, and bolster national security.

Under EPCA, the Department of Energy sets efficiency standards for 60 product categories. These standards must be cost-effective, significantly save energy, and be technologically feasible.

However, under the Biden administration, the EPCA language was persistently misinterpreted to impose more stringent standards on the use of conventional home appliances and force the costly rush-to-green agenda on the American people in their outright war on the fossil fuel industry.

All of this was done with the stroke of a pen and threatened the affordability and availability of reliable appliances that Americans rely on every day. I can tell you firsthand. I was in my district last week. My constituents in the 12th District of Georgia do not need the Federal Government to tell them which household appliances will best meet the needs of their families, period.

One example is that I have a small business in my district, and they have warehouses and whatnot that they rent. The owner of that small business explained that he has a 5-year-old HVAC unit, heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning. He had a problem with it, and the contractor came out and said that they had a little problem. The unit is 5 years old, and he can't get the part to fix it.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the end of the story. He has to replace the entire unit, and it is going to cost three times as much as it cost 5 years ago. Are you telling me that this is going to save money? You have to be kidding.

The second example is the gas stove. They want to do away with our gas stoves. They said that you can't cook with gas anymore, and there was such an uproar that we didn't hear about that anymore.

In the third example, I have a little place up here that is about 1,400 square feet, and the unit went out. Of course, it couldn't keep it warm anyway because it is an electric heat pump, mandated by this city, and I have a gas line right in front of my house. I told the contractor that I want to put in gas heat, like I have back home in Georgia. He said that you can't do it.

A heat pump will not work below 32 degrees. Plus, you have a total electrical system when the heat pump shuts down.

Why are we running short of electricity? Because they aimed everything at electricity. There was a war on our gas industry, or fossil fuel industry, and that is the very industry that reduced our carbon footprint by 1,400 tons. The nearest nation to us is 200 tons.

Mr. Speaker, they are trying to put the very people who put us in this position out of business.

The Home Appliance Protection and Affordability Act is a necessary measure to prevent future administrations, like the past one, from issuing burdensome standards on household appliances that would drive up costs and reduce availability. It is that simple.

The naysayers, or those who will vote in opposition to this bill today, will stand here and tell you that this bill isn't necessary. They will question

why this is what we are voting on this week. To that, I say that they can thank the previous administration.

The egregious appliance standards like those issued under President Biden's Department of Energy have caused homeowners to spend 34 percent more on appliances than they did 15 years ago, while also having to replace them at a faster rate, like the story I told about my constituent. Even more, these standards were neither economically justifiable nor significantly more efficient.

I would challenge anyone in this Chamber to find someone who wants the Federal Government to tilt the scales on what appliances they can and cannot buy while also increasing costs and reducing reliability.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of fear-mongering on energy efficiency and climate standards will justify the 4-year war waged on domestic energy, the use of natural gas, and consumer choice under the Biden-Harris Presidency. From gas stoves, refrigerators, and freezers to washers, dryers, dishwashers, and air-conditioners, no household appliance was off-limits in their pursuit of the green new scam.

We cannot allow that to happen again, and I have been proud to work closely with House Republicans this last year to right the ship and undo the many regulatory burdens that have caused the cost of living to skyrocket.

That is why we are here today: to protect consumer choice, lower costs, and ensure that American families have the freedom to decide what suits the needs of their families.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to Energy and Commerce Committee Chairmen GUTHRIE and LATA for their support of this bill, House Republican leadership for bringing it to the floor, and all of my colleagues who have offered their support. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 4626.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to clear up a few things.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, first of all, that energy conservation standards are not bans. We have to keep repeating this over and over because Republicans are adamant about misleading the public.

Energy conservation standards improve the efficiency of new appliances. They do not mandate the removal of existing appliances, and they do not mandate the removal of an appliance based on its fuel source. It is also important to note that, by law, the Department of Energy is prohibited from setting standards that would eliminate a product based on fuel type, such as gas appliances.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALLONE for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, here are three simple facts. Number one, the cost of living in America today is the number one con-

cern on the minds of Americans. Number two, increasing energy prices are a major factor causing an increase in American families' cost of living. Number three, energy-efficient appliances and appliance standards save Americans more than \$500 in energy bills per year. They are also good for our environment.

More efficient appliances will not only save money, but they conserve water, conserve energy, and reduce overall emissions that are killing our planet. This bill, without an amendment, would gut the program that sets these standards and pave the way for the administration to repeal existing standards.

It is bad for our wallets. It is bad for our planet. It is just bad policy. I cannot vote for the proposed bill as written, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to the committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would require the Secretary of Energy to certify that revoking existing energy standards will not negatively impact consumers. It simply requires that the Secretary of Energy certify that getting rid of standards such as these would not increase costs or increase greenhouse gas emissions. This ensures that we are protecting American families from further harm to their wallets and to the air they breathe.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to this bill.

Tonight, President Trump will be in this very Chamber to deliver his State of the Union Address to a joint session of Congress. We will continue to hear a series of mistruths, empty promises, and gaslighting, I would say, to the American public, so just let me provide a dose of reality here on the issue at hand.

□ 1450

Electricity prices are up 12 percent across the Nation, a far cry from President Trump's promise of cutting electricity costs in half in his first year. Residential natural gas prices are up 20 percent since the President's inauguration. When families struggle to pay

their utility bills, they often fall into debt.

Since December 2023, household utility debt has risen over 30 percent, climbing to a whopping \$23 billion. Families are having to choose between keeping the lights on or paying for food or medicine. That is because President Trump and congressional Republicans have been more focused on lining the pockets of their corporate polluter friends instead of providing relief to the American people.

The affordability crisis is real. It is quite literally hitting homes as well, as the cost of buying a home feels out of reach for far too many and rent is increasingly unaffordable. Families are struggling to afford childcare and groceries. As the American public knows all too well, President Trump and Republicans have caused their healthcare costs to rise too.

Let's also not forget about the President's disastrous tariffs, which cost the average American household nearly \$1,200 in 2025. Apparently, the affordability crisis isn't real. The President says it is not happening, or sometimes he says he fixed it. However, the American people know when they are not being told the truth.

As much as I wish it did, it doesn't stop there. With the help of his Republican colleagues, President Trump has eliminated more than 172,000 clean-energy jobs, shuttering factories and projects across the country, and canceled enough renewable energy. As we know, renewable energy is cheap. It is clean. It helps American families.

People would think that Republicans would be prioritizing legislation to address affordability, but that is not the case. Look at what is happening here today. Right now, this bill that we have before us is a retread from last Congress. It is the same bill that we voted on in the last Congress. It says it is about affordability, but it is only in name. In actuality, this bill will raise household utility bills.

In case my Republican colleagues haven't been listening, the American people can't afford any more price hikes. The American people have been crystal clear. They are in need of help. I hear from my constituents all the time about the rising cost of living, and it is time that Republicans stand up to President Trump and actually do something about it. I don't see it happening, but I hope we will see it.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are working on affordability. This whole bill is about affordability. If we look, because of the current Biden-Harris appliance policies, there is a 28 percent increase for refrigerators, a 25 percent increase for air-conditioners, and a 28 percent increase for dishwashers.

The argument is they are going to pay more up front, but they are going

to make it back in efficiency over time. A refrigerator takes 6 years and sometimes, depending on which model you buy, 46 years to recoup the increase in the value. These are Department of Energy numbers. It is up to 10 years on refrigerators.

The question is: Do people want to pay a fourth more for a refrigerator in the hopes that over the next 10 years they will get that money back? It is just not realistic, and that is why we are fighting for affordability.

When we look at the energy prices being up, we can look at a map of the United States and see in which States they are up. They are higher. They are higher in States that have policies like this. They come particularly from blue States in our country. Local governments have put the affordability crisis in their cities. State governments have put the affordability crisis in their States.

I remember being in California just last year and putting gas in a rental car. I looked over and I think I was paying well over \$5 there when I was paying about \$2.50 in Kentucky. I remember looking over at the guy next to me, and I said: Do you guys have any idea what the rest of the country pays for gasoline?

It is just astounding. The policies have increased affordability, and they come here and say we are causing the affordability crisis. With the energy crisis, we are trying to keep power online, to keep it from going offline so we can have affordability.

This is all about affordability. It is not about just having an affordable product to buy. It is about buying a product of your choice.

I don't think we ever argued that anything in the Biden-Harris administration meant that people were going to go in and take their appliances out. When appliances only last 7 to 10 years and then they are replaced, people are going to pay a fourth more. That is what we are trying to fight. People are going to pay a fourth more and recoup it in probably a longer time than that appliance has a useful life. It is just not a good investment. It just doesn't make sense.

We think that EPCA should be reformed so that they do make decisions based on what is affordable and what gives the best choice to the consumers in America.

I proudly support this bill. I thank Mr. ALLEN for sponsoring it. I encourage its passage.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1075, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Suozzi of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4626 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. SUOZZI moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4626 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 5. CERTIFICATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Energy publishes a certification that the effects of revoking existing energy conservation standards on costs, monetary benefits, and greenhouse gas emissions will not negatively impact consumers.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SUOZZI. 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 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute 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:

The motion to recommit H.R. 4626; and

Passage of H.R. 4626, if ordered.

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

DON'T MESS WITH MY HOME APPLIANCES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4626) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 208, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—197

Adams	Garamendi	Moulton
Aguilar	Garcia (CA)	Mrvan
Amo	Garcia (IL)	Mullin
Ansari	Garcia (TX)	Neal
Auchincloss	Gillen	Neguse
Balint	Golden (ME)	Norcross
Barragan	Goldman (NY)	Olszewski
Beatty	Gomez	Omar
Bera	Gonzalez, V.	Pallone
Beyer	Goodlander	Panetta
Bishop	Gottheimer	Pappas
Bonamici	Gray	Pelosi
Boyle (PA)	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Brown	Grijalva	Peters
Brownley	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Budzinski	Hayes	Pingree
Bynum	Himes	Pocan
Carbajal	Horsford	Pou
Carson	Houlihan	Pressley
Carter (LA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Casar	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Case	Huffman	Randall
Casten	Ivey	Raskin
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Riley (NY)
Castro (TX)	Jacobs	Rivas
Cherfilus-	Jayapal	Ross
McCormick	Jeffries	Ruiz
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Cisneros	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Sanchez
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Clyburn	Kennedy (NY)	Schneider
Cohen	Khanna	Scholten
Conaway	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Correa	Landsman	Scott (VA)
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Craig	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Crow	Lee (PA)	Simon
Cuellar	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Davids (KS)	Levin	Sorensen
Davis (IL)	Liccardo	Soto
Davis (NC)	Lieu	Stansbury
Dean (PA)	Lynch	Stanton
DeGette	Mannion	Stevens
DeLauro	Matsui	Strickland
DelBene	McBath	Subramanyam
Deluzio	McBride	Suozi
DeSaulnier	McClain Delaney	Swalwell
Dexter	McClellan	Sykes
Dingell	McCollum	Takano
Doggett	McDonald Rivet	Thanedar
Elfreth	McGarvey	Thompson (CA)
Escobar	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Espallat	McIver	Tlaib
Fields	Meeks	Tokuda
Figures	Menendez	Tonko
Fletcher	Mfume	Torres (CA)
Foster	Min	Torres (NY)
Foushee	Moore (WI)	Trahan
Frankel, Lois	Morelle	Tran
Friedman	Morrison	Underwood
Frost	Moskowitz	Vargas