

CONGRATULATING ANDY COLLINS
ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend, Andy Collins, a lieutenant game warden retiring after 33 impressive years of service to the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency.

Andy grew up in Knoxville and graduated from my alma mater, Bearden High School. He attended the University of Tennessee and earned a degree in fisheries and wildlife sciences. He began his career in Hawkins County before moving south to Loudon County. His responsibilities eventually expanded to include 11 counties in east Tennessee, covering all of Tennessee's Second District.

Throughout his 33-year career, Andy has exemplified the mission of preserving, protecting, and enhancing the State's fish and wildlife. Andy knows more about wildlife than anyone I know. As a matter of fact, he has forgotten more than I will ever know. When I run into a problem on my farm, he is the first person I call. Whether it is with deer or turkey or anything else, he is always quick to pick up my call.

Andy will spend his retirement days doing what he loves best: spending time outdoors with his beautiful wife, Mary Jo; his son, Wyatt; and his daughter, Emily.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Andy on his achievement. I thank him so much for his service to our great country and to the beautiful State of Tennessee. It is a much better place because of folks like him and the great folks at TWRA.

HOMEOWNER ENERGY FREEDOM
ACT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1075, I call up the bill (H.R. 4758) to repeal provisions of Public Law 117-169 relating to taxpayer subsidies for home electrification, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 1075, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4758

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 "Homeowner Energy Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. HOMEOWNER ENERGY FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following are repealed:

(1) Section 50122 of Public Law 117-169 (42 U.S.C. 18795a) (relating to a high-efficiency electric home rebate program).

(2) Section 50123 of Public Law 117-169 (42 U.S.C. 18795b) (relating to State-based home energy efficiency contractor training grants).

(3) Section 50131 of Public Law 117-169 (136 Stat. 2041) (relating to assistance for latest and zero building energy code adoption).

(b) RESCISSIONS.—The unobligated balances of any amounts made available under each of sections 50122 and 50131 of Public Law 117-169 (42 U.S.C. 18795a; 136 Stat. 2041) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) are rescinded.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 50121(c)(7) of Public Law 117-169 (42 U.S.C. 18795(c)(7)) is amended by striking “, including a rebate provided under a high-efficiency electric home rebate program (as defined in section 50122(d)),”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill 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 Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. 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. 4758.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4758, the Homeowner Energy Freedom Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Texas' 12th Congressional District.

The Homeowner Energy Freedom Act repeals disastrous policies from the Inflation Reduction Act that were used to subsidize expensive mandates and implement backdoor fossil fuel bans.

Today, in the United States, the dream of home ownership is out of reach for far too many Americans. In fact, 75 percent of households today cannot afford a medium-priced home.

□ 0920

Mr. Speaker, provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act to force States to implement green energy building codes only serve to make matters worse.

It is estimated that building codes associated with the HOMES rebate program raises the cost of a single-family home by \$31,000. These building codes effectively prevent the use of natural gas and require expensive equipment to accommodate EV chargers and other intermittent energy sources.

It is important to remember that upwards of 60 percent of homes utilize natural gas appliances and that the number rises to more than 75 percent in colder climate States. These aren't just talking points. They are real-world impacts.

Take Kansas City, for example. After adopting the latest IECC building codes, the city saw a 22 percent decrease in construction permits, while the surrounding communities saw a 117 percent increase.

The data is clear. The cost of a new home goes up when Democrats get their green mandates in place. If the Biden administration's so-called energy efficiency regulatory agenda was cost effective for the American people, why did they also have to have a billion dollar slush fund to pay for it?

Instead of a one-size-fits-all mandate from Washington, House Republicans are focused on limiting the authority of the Federal Government, making it easier to build affordable homes and taking advantage of abundant natural gas reserves beneath our Nation.

Importantly, H.R. 4758 builds on the important work of the Working Families Tax Cut law by officially putting an end to these egregious authorities so future abuses cannot occur.

By passing this legislation, House Republicans are continuing to address the affordability for hardworking American households and responsibly protecting finite taxpayer resources.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans simply cannot help themselves. It is bad enough that they refuse to do anything to address the affordability crisis that American families are facing today. Republicans are doubling down on bills that will drive up energy costs for families when they are simply being stretched too thin.

Yesterday, we were here on the House floor debating a bill that guts appliance efficiency standards which save families money on their power bills. Today, we are back to debate the gutting of another popular program that lowers upfront appliance prices.

Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh bill about appliances that we have debated on the House floor this past year. When I am back home in New Jersey talking to my constituents, no one ever brings up showerhead flow or how much water their dishwasher uses.

These folks want to know how we can put a stop to Trump's disastrous tariffs which are a tax on the American people and which raise the price of absolutely everything we buy.

They want to know what Congress is doing to lower their skyrocketing healthcare premiums. They want to know why Congress is asleep at the wheel, while they struggle to make ends meet, watch their power bills go up every month, and have to start making impossible choices between paying for medicine or keeping their lights on.

Sorry, folks, apparently Republicans in Washington don't have time for any of that. They are focused on passing another appliance bill instead—talk about out of touch. This bill repeals and rescinds funding for three important Department of Energy programs.

First, it rescinds funding from the Home Electrification and Appliance Rebate program. This is a \$4.5 billion

program created by Democrats as part of the Inflation Reduction Act to lower the upfront costs of appliance upgrades for low- and moderate-income families. The families get a rebate. It helps families better afford appliances for their homes. With this bill, House Republicans are eliminating the funding for the rebate. Again, they are driving up costs on American families.

The second thing this bill does is to rescind funding from a program designed to help with building energy code adoption. That might sound a little obscure, but it is also important from a cost point of view.

Third, they repeal a program that provides assistance for contractor training. Even these two programs that might seem less important than the rebate are still programs that reduce costs for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress it enough. This bill only worsens the affordability crisis for American families. Trump promised to cut Americans' power bills in half during his first year. That didn't happen. In fact, electricity prices are up 15 percent and increasing twice as fast as inflation just since Trump took office.

More than 80 million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills. Even though these price increases are a direct result of Republican policies, today House Republicans are choosing to double down. Rather than working on constructive solutions that help Americans, they are choosing to cut funding that helps homeowners and businesses save money.

There is a reason why electrification rebates are popular. Again, these are rebates that help people. Some States have already rolled out their rebate programs and are seeing significant interest.

Despite how Republicans try to frame them, rebates are not mandates. Rebates are optional, and they provide discounts to families who have crunched the numbers and made the decision that electrification would help them save money. Republicans want to take away that choice at a time of skyrocketing energy costs and energy demand.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. The programs that this bill targets are designed to lower costs, create jobs, and help Americans across the country. I only wish that Republicans cared more about that than wasting floor time with ridiculous antiefficiency and anticonsumer bills.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOLDMAN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, the Homeowner Energy Freedom Act.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is facing a housing affordability crisis. When I was growing up, the median age of a first-

time home buyer was 29 years old. Today, it is 40 years old. Since then, the median home price has increased by more than 400 percent. As a result, nearly 75 percent of U.S. households cannot afford the typical price tag of a new home.

Homes are simply too expensive for many Americans, and burdensome Federal Government regulations are a major driver of these rising costs. The Biden administration mandated mountains of red tape, dictating what Americans have to put in their homes.

Specifically, they imposed costly climate change codes, restricting which appliances families can use to cook their food and heat their homes. The Homeowner Energy Freedom Act would change that. This bill is simple, but its implications are significant.

First, it helps reduce the cost of building new homes. Regulations account for nearly 25 percent of the price of constructing a single-family home. Instead of improving housing affordability, the Federal Government is burying the dream of homeownership under 6 feet of red tape.

Some of my Democratic colleagues argue that green energy regulations save homeowners on utility bills. If electric appliances are so cost effective, why did Democrats need to allocate billions in taxpayer money to mandate their installation?

In reality, these green energy regulations fail to lower utility costs, and they increase overall costs of new homes. Homebuilders have estimated that these energy regulations have increased the price tag of a new home by up to \$31,000.

Second, this bill restores Americans' freedom to make their own choices in their own homes. Americans don't need the Democrats and Washington, D.C., bureaucrats dictating which appliances they can or cannot have in their own home.

Federal overreach threatens the American Dream of homeownership. For generations, Americans have worked hard, raised families, and built their lives in their homes. Homeownership remains foundational to financial security and long-term prosperity.

Americans are calling on Congress to improve housing affordability. We must act to ensure hardworking Americans can raise a family in a home of their own. We must repeal these costly green energy mandates. We must reduce the cost of new homes. We must return consumer choice to homeowners. We must restore the American Dream of homeownership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Homeowner Energy Freedom Act.

□ 0930

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

Mr. Speaker, I will debunk some comments that were made by my colleague from Texas.

Both of the speakers on the other side of the aisle repeatedly cited the

National Association of Home Builders' estimate that building a home to meet the 2021 International Energy Conservation Code standard would add as much as \$31,000 in costs to a new home.

This is flawed. It is intentionally misleading. Republicans are trying to demonize energy codes that actually save Americans money and deliver increased comfort, health, and climate benefits, all to prop up their fossil fuel buddies.

This figure of \$31,000 originally came from Kansas City. When you actually analyze the cost breakdown, it includes costs that are not required by the 2021 energy code.

For example, the costs include over \$18,000 for double-wall construction, but the code doesn't require double-wall construction.

It includes \$3,000 for a ventilation energy package. The code does not require this package. It only requires one of several energy options, like energy-saving water heaters.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on debunking these claims, but hopefully you get the point that this fictitious figure is just meant to mislead the public about energy building costs.

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 thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4758. It is a bill that is going to sock it to the pocketbooks of our hardworking neighbors back home. Republicans appear to be doing everything they can to stick their heads in the sand when it comes to the affordability squeeze.

Higher costs, that is the last thing that our neighbors back home need right now. Yet, there is this relentless march by Republicans to bring bills to the floor that rip away savings from people who could really use it right now.

What does this bill do? It guts a very popular, commonsense initiative that hardworking Americans rely on. In 2022, Congress passed some rebates to help people afford home appliances through two home energy rebate initiatives that helped to lower their electric bills.

The first is the Home Efficiency Rebates Program, or HOMES. That is the rebate to households that conduct whole-house energy-saving retrofits. That means that our neighbors can increase insulation in their homes or improve their HVAC systems.

The second is the Home Electrification and Appliances Rebate Program, or HEAR. That provides rebates to upgrade electric panels, conduct weatherization, or purchase an appliance like an electric water heater or air-conditioner, because oftentimes we know that people need a little bit of help with that upfront cost. If they can get a little help to afford an upgraded appliance, that is going to save them money in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, it is just a real head-scratcher as to why Republicans are bringing this bill in the midst of an affordability crisis, but I think if you listened to the State of the Union Address last night, that is a little bit illuminating because the President said that everything is great in America. He solved it. There is no affordability squeeze. Look, our economy is roaring. Everybody is doing great.

That is not what I hear from my neighbors back home in Florida. Everything costs more. In fact, 80 million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills.

Electric rates across the country are up by 13 percent on average and are higher in a lot of places. Then, these illegal, arbitrary tariffs have added to this affordability squeeze. Many analyses have it that the average household is paying \$1,700 more per year because of the Trump tariffs, and Republicans in Congress have been supportive the entire way along.

Even after the United States Supreme Court ruled last week that the tariffs—these high import taxes, the highest in 100 years on households, making their groceries, their appliances, and everything else cost more—are illegal and that the President doesn't have the authority to do that, the President doubles down and says that he does.

In fact, the President is going to inflict more pain, and Republicans last night in this Chamber cheered—cheered—more taxes on hardworking Americans.

This relates directly to the bill that we are debating today because we are talking about affordable appliances. Do you know what tariffs have done to the cost of appliances? Tariffs have driven a steady rise in appliance pricing, hitting American consumers with higher costs for essentials like refrigerators, washers, dryers, and dishwashers.

Since most appliances rely on imported steel, aluminum, and foreign-made components, such as motors and control boards, tariffs on both finished goods and parts have pushed up production and import costs. Retailers and manufacturers are working on very slim margins. They have passed along all of these increases directly to shoppers, leading to some of the fastest price jumps in years.

Now that the President thumbs his nose at what the Supreme Court has told him and is now inflicting new pain and new taxes on Americans, new tariffs, that is going to keep the prices of appliances elevated at a time when people are really under the gun and feeling the squeeze. They are going to make it harder to replace or upgrade big-ticket items.

The result is the persistent squeeze on American budgets with no meaningful relief in sight. People will tell you this. They will say that they might have listened to that speech last night, but they are out of touch. Everything is not all well.

The affordability crisis is not solved, and now Republicans bring a bill to the floor that makes it harder and makes everything more expensive for people back home.

Mr. Speaker, 54 States and territories are already getting these rebate initiatives out, getting the money into the pockets of consumers. Governors and State energy offices have dedicated their own funding and staff time, and they are working with the Department of Energy. This is something that Americans of all political stripes will support, and they need it.

Texas received \$689 million to help Texans afford new appliances and weatherize their homes. Ohio received \$249 million. Republicans are going to rip that away. Kentucky received \$134 million.

In Georgia and North Carolina, where rebates are already in place, participating families are saving over \$1,000 a year. That doesn't make up for the tariffs, the pain inflicted and the higher costs that people are paying, but it will sure help. Every dollar will help working families right now.

In Florida, I know my neighbors are very eager to take advantage of the \$346 million in cost savings that will come under these initiatives. We received it just last week.

Mr. Speaker, do you know why it is particularly important to parts of the country that have experienced disasters and hurricanes? I will tell you a story. I was meeting with a small business owner and homeowners last week who are still recovering from Hurricanes Helene and Milton.

One of my neighbors, Rebecca, is a retiree on a fixed income and living in a 960-square-foot home in St. Petersburg. When Hurricane Helene hit, she lost her car, her furniture, her washer and dryer, and her air-conditioner. What happened in the subsequent months? Electric bills went up, up, up. Last year, she paid \$170 in May, \$258 in June, and \$314 in July. As people try to rebuild, they could really use these rebates as they are replacing their appliances.

Why do Republicans want to make life so much harder and more expensive? I guess it is because they believed what the President said last night, that everything is great, everything is fine, nothing to see here.

Mr. Speaker, that is out of touch. It is really out of touch.

For all of these reasons, 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 implementation of this act would not increase costs for homeowners and renters.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our neighbors are suffering an affordability crisis. They want policymakers in Washington, D.C., to help solve problems and bring down the cost of living.

Every time the President and congressional Republicans deny that this is happening and say that everything is great and everything is well, they are doing a real disservice to hardworking American families.

Tariffs, higher electric bills, the cost of housing, and the cost of groceries, you can't turn a blind eye to it, and you shouldn't. What you should do is adopt my motion to recommit and defeat this bill. Vote "no." Our neighbors deserve better.

□ 0940

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I adopt the comments of my distinguished colleague from Florida.

I also wish to speak on behalf of the unanimous consent that we will request.

The President last night spoke to the Nation. One of the things he said was that TSA, the Coast Guard, and FEMA are not operating. That is accurate. They are not operating because we have a disagreement in this House between Republicans and Democrats on whether those agencies ought to be funded. We do have a deep and severe disagreement with the administration with respect to how ICE and CBP are operating, contrary to the Constitution, contrary to the laws of our country, and contrary to the norms of police departments all over this country, which have resulted in the deaths of a number of American citizens egregiously and, in my view, illegally.

That unanimous consent request will simply say that we will fund all of those agencies that are within the Department of Homeland Security that are not controversial, not because we absolutely agree with every expenditure, but we have come together on a consensus. The American people, Mr. Speaker, ought to know that Democrats are prepared to vote for the funding of TSA, of FEMA, of the Secret Service, of the Coast Guard, and every other agency that is acting within the bounds of the Constitution and acting legally within the bounds of the Constitution.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this hand-wringing about TSA perhaps shutting down or employees of TSA working without pay, they should not be doing that. We ought to open up TSA. We ought to open up the

Coast Guard. They are critical employees, so they are working but without pay. We ought to pay them. We ought to have FEMA open, as the President said last night, so that it can serve the American people, particularly at a time when we just had a gargantuan storm in the northeast.

I rise in strong support of a unanimous consent that the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations (Ms. DELAURO) will be asking for. This is a unanimous consent that makes sense. It makes common sense and on which we have agreement.

What we disagree with is the unconstitutional, illegal, unlawful, and death-causing activities of an out-of-control agency at the instance of the President of the United States.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's make sense. Let's say yes to what we agree on.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the leader on our side of the aisle on the Committee on Appropriations, for initiating this effort. I took this time because I am not sure we are going to have time on the other bill. I urge Members on the Republican side of the aisle, do not object to this unanimous consent because it does what Republicans say we ought to be doing: Funding those agencies, those operations, those very critical activities for the American people on which we agree.

What the American people are so frustrated about is we seem to not even be able to move on that on which we agree. Let's show them that yes, we can agree. And let's also recognize and admit that we have a difference of opinion on a very critical issue, an issue at the heart of our Constitution of how we treat individuals in this country: that we don't go around arresting people with masks on and putting them in unmarked cars and disappearing them, that we don't have heavily armed troops coming out of cars into the streets of our cities to confront a woman who is driving her car alongside and heckling the police. We may not agree with that, but it is certainly within the bounds of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason that we ought to have TSA shut down, FEMA shut down, the Coast Guard shut down, and the Secret Service shut down. They are really not shut down because we are making them work, but we are saying, by the way, we can't pay you.

If Republicans get up and say Democrats are shutting down those agencies, they are not telling the truth because Democrats are prepared right now to pass legislation which will be offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) to fund everything but that on which we disagree. Isn't that reasonable? Isn't that what we ought to be doing as legislators, as Americans, as people who have sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution and laws of this country?

I urge my colleagues, particularly my Republican colleagues, do not object because your objection will be to continue to hamper the agencies on which we agree that are serving the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for standing and speaking today about something that should be a bipartisan effort, a unanimous consent effort to make sure that those public servants who fight every single day, come to work, and play by the rules are funded. In this body, there is agreement that we need to fund TSA. We need to fund the Coast Guard. We need to fund FEMA, the Secret Service, and cybersecurity. Those are integral parts of our government. They serve a great purpose to the American people.

There is not a shred of difference between Democrats and Republicans on those issues. Why then can we not by unanimous consent say let us fund these agencies through the rest of the year?

Where we have serious disagreements with ICE or CBP, we can, on a parallel track, be able to address those issues.

I could not be more proud to have worked on a bipartisan basis, to pass 11 appropriations bills, 11 of our appropriations bills, reclaiming the power of the purse for the Congress, as it should be. That is what we are doing here with making sure that we can fund these agencies through the rest of the year.

There are serious difficulties with ICE. The American public gets it. They understand it. This is a marauding band of masked and armed agents all over our streets, terrorizing our communities and being responsible for the killing of Renee Good and Alex Pretti. It is unconscionable.

The Democrats have made reasonable demands for reform, reforms that have been in the public view now for a very long time. How about we don't detain and deport American citizens? How about we unmask? How about we use body cameras? How about we obtain a warrant before you knock on somebody's door? How about we train officers, serious training, not 47 days of training?

These are absolutely bedrock reforms that can be done, and we can overhaul an agency, make it run as it is supposed to be run. Do we need to have border enforcement? Yes, but this is out of control.

That is the debate that we should be having and the negotiation that we should be having, not on the agencies that play such a role. Look, we just had serious snowstorms all over the country. My State of Connecticut declared an emergency. Aren't we going to indicate that we are going to deal with FEMA and help people out?

Very simply speaking, it is a simple premise. Let's take the Department of

Homeland Security bill where we have major agreement on the bulk of the bill, let us pass the bill in that context and fund those agencies, take care of those folks, and fight for demands on reforming ICE and CBC.

□ 0950

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

Last night, the President finally admitted that the American public is concerned about the price increases. If you care about affordability, why would you repeal a rebate program that helps Americans with their electricity bills, which is exactly what this bill unfortunately does? It repeals the rebate.

That rebate is at the point of sale. When you go out and buy an appliance or a heat pump or something, you actually get a discount on the sale price. That is the rebate, at the point of sale.

This bill targets this very popular electrification rebate program, a program that is already active in 12 States plus the District of Columbia. Those States include North Carolina, Georgia, Michigan, and Indiana. All but two States in the country have applied for the program funding.

What they are essentially doing is eliminating this rebate program, which is clearly popular, in the very middle of it, while Americans are taking advantage of it.

I think it is disingenuous to portray this as some kind of red State or blue State program. It is popular across the board amongst Republicans and Democrats.

With this bill, House Republicans are voting to rip funding away from 12 States that have active programs and against the interests of 46 total States who have applied for the program and are about to put it in the process.

At full deployment, the rebate program is expected to deliver \$275 million in annual energy savings with participating families projected to save about \$1,000 a year, and the installation of these appliances is projected to support 23,000 jobs.

Why are you eliminating a program like this that puts money back into Americans' pockets when they are concerned about affordability?

To date, electrification rebates have served 16,000 homes and resulted in \$7.6 million in annual savings. This is across only the 13 active programs that I mentioned.

These programs are all designed in unique ways to meet States' needs in local context, and obviously Americans are interested.

If Republicans are successful in repealing this rebate program, they are not just scrapping some hypothetical program. They are removing real dollars from real States, real people, including the States that they represent.

Again, we have this affordability crisis. Why eliminate a rebate that puts money back in Americans' pockets?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, returning to the legislation before us, we are here to debate H.R. 4758, the Homeowner Energy Freedom Act. Again, I thank the gentleman from Texas' 12th Congressional District for sponsoring this legislation.

This legislation is about reversing the damage caused by President Biden's Inflation Reduction Act's aggressive regulatory agenda and taxpayer-funded spending spree.

Whatever happened to the free market? What has happened to consumer choice?

Housing affordability is a critical issue facing the American people. Look at the numbers.

The costs associated with IRA programs this bill seeks to repeal significantly add to the price of new homes and lead to higher energy bills for the American people.

According to the Federal Reserve, median home prices have skyrocketed over the past decade, with the largest increase from 2020 to 2022, which saw a 40 percent increase in median homes.

When you talk about the home rebates that we are talking about here today and who is getting them, it provides taxpayer subsidies for households earning over 150 percent of the median household income for the area.

The data from 2024 shows that the median income in the District of Columbia was \$104,800, meaning that households in Washington making up to \$156,000 can receive taxpayer subsidies to upgrade their appliances. In the same numbers in 2024, median income for Massachusetts was \$113,900, meaning that households making up to \$170,850, which is nearly double the nationwide median household income, qualify.

H.R. 4758 brings the dream of homeownership back to millions of Americans.

By the way, let's talk about electricity costs again. We talk about this a lot, reliable power, affordable power. Look at the increases. Where is it? It starts in Maryland and goes to Maine. It is California. If I lived in those States, as I said before, I would call my legislators in those States and say: What are you doing out there? What is the Governor doing?

Look where those States are and look where the affordability crisis is in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and 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.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. 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. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4758 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Ms. CASTOR of Florida is as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4758 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. 3. 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 implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act will not result in increased costs for homeowners and renters.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 208, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—198

Adams	Davids (KS)	Huffman
Aguilar	Davis (IL)	Ivey
Amo	Davis (NC)	Jackson (IL)
Ansari	Dean (PA)	Jacobs
Auchincloss	DeGette	Jayapal
Balint	DeLauro	Jeffries
Barragan	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Beatty	Deluzio	Kamlager-Dove
Bell	DeSaulnier	Kaptur
Bera	Dexter	Kelly (IL)
Beyer	Dingell	Kennedy (NY)
Bishop	Doggett	Khanna
Bonamici	Elfreth	Krishnamoorthi
Boyle (PA)	Escobar	Landsman
Brown	Espaillet	Larsen (WA)
Brownley	Fields	Larsen (CT)
Budzinski	Figures	Lee (NV)
Bynum	Fletcher	Lee (PA)
Carbajal	Poster	Leger Fernandez
Carson	Foushee	Levin
Carter (LA)	Friedman	Liccardo
Casar	Frost	Lieu
Case	Garamendi	Lofgren
Casten	Garcia (CA)	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Garcia (IL)	Magaziner
Castro (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Mannion
Cerfilus-	Gillen	Matsui
McCormick	Golden (ME)	McBath
Chu	Goldman (NY)	McBride
Cisneros	Gomez	McClain Delaney
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez, V.	McClellan
Clarke (NY)	Goodlander	McCollum
Cleaver	Gottheimer	McDonald Rivet
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	McGarvey
Cohen	Grijalva	McGovern
Conaway	Harder (CA)	McIver
Correa	Hayes	Meeks
Costa	Himes	Menendez
Courtney	Horsford	Meng
Craig	Houlahan	Mfume
Crow	Hoyer	Min
Cuellar	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (WI)

Morelle	Raskin	Suozi
Morrison	Riley (NY)	Takano
Moskowitz	Rivas	Thanedar
Moulton	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Mrvan	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Mullin	Ryan	Tlaib
Neal	Salinas	Tokuda
Neguse	Sánchez	Tonko
Norcross	Scanlon	Torres (CA)
Olaszewski	Schneider	Torres (NY)
Omar	Scholten	Trahan
Pallone	Schrier	Tran
Panetta	Scott (VA)	Underwood
Pappas	Scott, David	Vargas
Pelosi	Sewell	Vasquez
Perez	Sherman	Veasey
Peters	Simon	Vindman
Pettersen	Smith (WA)	Walkinshaw
Pingree	Sorensen	Wasserman
Pocan	Soto	Schultz
Pou	Stansbury	Waters
Pressley	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Quigley	Stevens	Whitesides
Ramirez	Strickland	Williams (GA)
Randall	Subramanyam	

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Gimenez	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Goldman (TX)	Mills
Allen	Gooden	Moolenaar
Amodei (NV)	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Graves	Moore (NC)
Babin	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Grothman	Moore (WV)
Baird	Guest	Moran
Balderson	Guthrie	Murphy
Barr	Hageman	Nehls
Barrett	Hamadeh (AZ)	Newhouse
Baumgartner	Haridopolos	Norman
Bean (FL)	Harrigan	Nunn (IA)
Begich	Harris (MD)	Oberholte
Bentz	Harris (NC)	Onder
Bergman	Harshbarger	Owens
Bice	Hern (OK)	Palmer
Biggs (AZ)	Higgins (LA)	Patronis
Biggs (SC)	Hill (AR)	Perry
Bilirakis	Hinson	Prluger
Boebert	Houchin	Reschenthaler
Bost	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Brecheen	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Bresnahan	Hurd (CO)	Rose
Buchanan	Issa	Rouzer
Burchett	Jack	Roy
Burlison	Jackson (TX)	Rulli
Calvert	James	Rutherford
Cammack	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Carey	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Schmidt
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cline	Kean	Self
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Clyde	Kelly (PA)	Shreve
Cole	Kennedy (UT)	Simpson
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Crank	Knott	Smucker
Crawford	Kustoff	Staubert
Davidson	LaHood	Steil
De La Cruz	LaLota	Steube
Diaz-Balart	Langworthy	Strong
Donalds	Latta	Taylor
Downing	Lawler	Tenney
Edwards	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Ellzey	Letlow	Tiffany
Emmer	Loudermilk	Timmons
Estes	Lucas	Turner (OH)
Evans (CO)	Luna	Valadao
Ezell	Luttrell	Van Drew
Fallon	Mace	Van Dyne
Fedorchak	Mackenzie	Van Epps
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Van Orden
Fine	Maloy	Wagner
Finstad	Mann	Walberg
Fischbach	Massie	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McClain	Westerman
Fleischmann	McClintock	Wied
Flood	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Fong	McDowell	Wilson (SC)
Fox	McGuire	Wittman
Franklin, Scott	Messmer	Womack
Fry	Meuser	Yakym
Fulcher	Miller (IL)	Zinke
Garbarino	Miller (OH)	
Gill (TX)	Miller (WV)	

NOT VOTING—26

Crenshaw	Johnson (TX)	Spartz
Crockett	Keating	Stefanik
DesJarlais	Latimer	Stutzman
Dunn (FL)	Mast	Swalwell
Evans (PA)	Menefee	Sykes
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Titus
Gonzales, Tony	Ocasio-Cortez	Velázquez
Gray	Ogles	Wilson (FL)
Hunt	Schakowsky	

□ 1028

Messrs. FRY, LAWLER, Mrs. WAGNER, Messrs. MEUSER, MURPHY, BARR, PALMER, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois and Ms. KELLY of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAUMGARTNER). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 199, answered “present” 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—210

Aderholt	Ellzey	James
Alford	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Allen	Estes	Johnson (SD)
Amodei (NV)	Evans (CO)	Jordan
Arrington	Ezell	Joyce (OH)
Babin	Fallon	Joyce (PA)
Bacon	Fedorchak	Kean
Baird	Feenstra	Kelly (MS)
Balderson	Fine	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Finstad	Kennedy (UT)
Barrett	Fischbach	Kiggans (VA)
Baumgartner	Fitzgerald	Kiley (CA)
Bean (FL)	Fleischmann	Kim
Begich	Flood	Knott
Bentz	Fong	Kustoff
Bergman	Fox	LaHood
Bice	Franklin, Scott	LaLota
Biggs (AZ)	Fry	Langworthy
Biggs (SC)	Fulcher	Latta
Bilirakis	Garbarino	Lawler
Boebert	Gill (TX)	Lee (FL)
Bost	Gimenez	Letlow
Brecheen	Goldman (TX)	Loudermilk
Bresnahan	Gooden	Lucas
Buchanan	Gosar	Luna
Burchett	Graves	Luttrell
Burlison	Griffith	Mace
Calvert	Grothman	Mackenzie
Cammack	Guest	Malliotakis
Carey	Guthrie	Maloy
Carter (GA)	Hageman	Mann
Carter (TX)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Massie
Ciscomani	Haridopolos	Mast
Cline	Harrigan	McCaul
Cloud	Harris (MD)	McClain
Clyde	Harris (NC)	McClintock
Cole	Harshbarger	McCormick
Collins	Hern (OK)	McDowell
Comer	Higgins (LA)	McGuire
Crane	Hill (AR)	Messmer
Crank	Hinson	Meuser
Crawford	Houchin	Miller (IL)
Davidson	Hudson	Miller (OH)
De La Cruz	Huizenga	Miller (WV)
Diaz-Balart	Hurd (CO)	Miller-Meeks
Donalds	Issa	Mills
Downing	Jack	Moolenaar
Edwards	Jackson (TX)	Moore (AL)

Moore (NC)	Rulli	Tenney
Moore (UT)	Rutherford	Thompson (PA)
Moore (WV)	Salazar	Tiffany
Moran	Scalise	Timmmons
Murphy	Schmidt	Turner (OH)
Nehls	Schweikert	Valadao
Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Van Drew
Norman	Self	Van Dуйne
Nunn (IA)	Sessions	Van Epps
Oberholte	Shreve	Van Orden
Onder	Simpson	Wagner
Owens	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Palmer	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Patronis	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Perry	Smucker	Westerman
Pfuger	Spartz	Wied
Reschenthaler	Stauber	Williams (TX)
Rogers (AL)	Steil	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Steube	Wittman
Rose	Strong	Womack
Rouzer	Stutzman	Yakym
Roy	Taylor	Zinke

NAYS—199

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

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Davis (NC)

NOT VOTING—22

Crenshaw	Dunn (FL)	Gonzales, Tony
Crockett	Evans (PA)	Hunt
DesJarlais	Frankel, Lois	Johnson (TX)

Keating	Ogles	Titus
Latimer	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Menefee	Stefanik	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Swalwell	
Ocasio-Cortez	Sykes	

□ 1040

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor and missed Roll Call Nos. 77 and 78. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 77 on the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 4758, and NAY on Roll Call No. 78 on Passage of H.R. 4758.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, due to the blizzard in New York City, I was unable to travel to Washington and I missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 77 and NAY on Roll Call No. 78.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 7481, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Appropriations and Budget be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7481, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2026, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRANK). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, am I to take from the definition that you gave as to why you could not accept the gentlewoman’s unanimous-consent request that the majority has not agreed to funding the balance of the DHS bill other than CBP and ICE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker’s guidelines to clear a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and we are not objecting.

HONORING THE LIVES OF RHONDA AND AIDEN DORGAN

(Mr. AMO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)