

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE: Mr. Kiley of California (to rank immediately after Ms. Letlow).

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Fuller.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Fuller.

Mr. LANGWORTHY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6387, FIRE IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMING EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6398, REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6409, FOREIGN EMISSIONS AND NONATTAINMENT CLARIFICATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1156, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAX POLICIES THAT SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1174

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. Each such bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Clean Air Act to require revisions to regulations governing the review and handling of air quality monitoring data influenced by exceptional events or actions to mitigate wildfire risk.

(b) The bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation.

(c) The bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be consid-

ered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee reported on a rule, House Resolution 1174, that provides for consideration of four measures.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 6387, H.R. 6398, and H.R. 6409, each under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees, and provides for each bill one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Res. 1156, expressing support for tax policies that support working families, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

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

The rule before us provides an opportunity for Congress to rein in regulatory overreach, to restore common sense for our environmental policies, and to ensure that American communities are not punished for circumstances beyond their control.

For far too long, States, workers, and job creators have been forced to operate under a system that is overly rigid and increasingly bureaucratic and disconnected from reality. Instead of working with States, Federal regulators have imposed one-size-fits-all policies that drive up costs, delay projects, and make it harder for communities to grow and to prosper.

These measures begin to correct that course and put us on a more practical and more predictable path forward.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act. This legislation addresses a simple but important problem. States are currently being penalized for emissions

that they have absolutely no control over. That includes pollution originating from foreign countries like China, as well as natural events such as wildfires beyond our borders. Yet under current policy, those emissions can still count against a State's ability to meet Federal air quality standards.

This is not how this should work, and we have seen the impact firsthand. In my home State of New York, communities across western New York and the southern tier have repeatedly experienced severe air quality impacts from Canadian wildfires.

This has become a reoccurring issue year after year. Smoke from wildfires in Ontario and Quebec have drifted south, triggering air quality alerts across our State. Families have been told to stay indoors. Schools, camps, and outdoor events have been disrupted and canceled. What should be time spent outside during the summer has, instead, meant staying inside because of conditions beyond anyone's control locally.

□ 1030

In parts of New York, we have seen some of the worst air quality readings in the entire country on these days.

This does not affect just families. It affects local economies, as well. Small businesses, outdoor workers, farmers, and manufacturers all feel the impact when air quality restrictions tighten because of pollution they did not create in the first place.

Yet, under the current framework, those same communities can still face consequences—more regulation and more restrictions—for conditions entirely outside of their control. It makes no sense.

The FENCES Act restores the original intent of the Clean Air Act by making clear that foreign emissions, whether manmade or natural, should not be used to penalize States when determining compliance.

It allows States to account for those emissions earlier in the process instead of forcing them into costly delays, stricter requirements, or potential Federal penalties at the very end because the reality is simple, States like New York should not be punished for smoke coming from wildfires in another country like Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act. Across the country, communities are dealing with the growing threat of wildfires. At the same time, States are taking proactive steps to reduce the risk through prescribed burns, forest management, and other mitigation efforts.

However, under current law, those efforts can count against them when it comes to air quality compliance. Now think about that. States are being penalized for trying to prevent catastrophic wildfires. This isn't just backwards. It creates a system that punishes proactive solutions and rewards inaction.

Part of the problem is how the current system treats those emissions. While naturally occurring wildfires can sometimes be considered exceptional events, the very tools used to prevent those wildfires, like prescribed burns, are often treated the same as emissions from a factory. That is a clear gap in the law, and it leads to confusion, inconsistent decisions, and unnecessary delays for States trying to do the right thing.

The result is a system that discourages mitigation even though we know that proactive land management reduces the severity of wildfires and improves long-term air quality. The consequences are real. When States are discouraged from carrying out these efforts, the risk of larger, more destructive wildfires only increases, leading to worse air quality, greater damage, and higher costs for communities.

The FIRE Act fixes this by ensuring that emissions from wildfire mitigation activities are treated appropriately under the Clean Air Act. It brings consistency on how we treat emissions from wildfires and from the efforts used to prevent them, and it provides States with the clarity and predictability that we need to plan and to act.

It also reduces unnecessary regulatory burdens on manufacturers and local communities while still maintaining strong environmental protections for communities. This is about encouraging smart land management, reducing long-term risk, and recognizing that proactive solutions should not be met with Federal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act. This measure takes aim at a specific and unnecessary layer of Federal bureaucracy that continues to slow down projects across the country.

Right now, when a Federal agency completes an environmental impact statement, the Environmental Protection Agency is required to conduct a separate review and publicly comment on that work, even in cases where the EPA has already been involved in developing it.

That second review often covers the exact same ground. It adds time. It adds cost. It adds uncertainty, without meaningfully improving any outcomes.

We do not have to look far to see how duplication and delay affect real projects. In upstate New York, Micron announced a historic investment to bring advanced semiconductor manufacturing back to the United States, an investment expected to support thousands and thousands of good-paying jobs and strengthen our domestic supply chain.

This is exactly the kind of project we should be encouraging and putting a rocket booster on, but like many large-scale projects, it has to navigate a complex and very time-consuming environmental review process across multiple levels of government. That is the broader issue. It is not about identi-

fying new risks. It is about how layers of review can stack on top of one another, adding delay and uncertainty, even when high standards are already being met.

The consequences are real. When projects like this one are delayed, jobs are delayed, investment is delayed, and our ability to compete globally, especially in critical industries like semiconductors, is put at risk at a time when we are trying to onshore these critical industries and strengthen our domestic supply chain. This is exactly what is wrong with this approach.

The reality is that the agencies responsible for these projects already have the expertise and the legal responsibility to conduct thorough environmental reviews. They prepare detailed environmental impact statements. They consult with experts and are accountable for the decisions that they make. The EPA is often already involved in that process as it develops.

What this bill addresses is the additional, duplicative step that comes after the work has already been completed. Nothing in this legislation prevents coordination or input during the review itself. It simply removes a redundant requirement that adds delay without adding value.

Recent Supreme Court precedent has reinforced this approach, recognizing that the agencies responsible for a project are best positioned to evaluate its environmental impacts that the scope of review should remain focused and practical.

The RED Tape Act reflects that reality. It removes the duplicative requirement. It streamlines the process, and it ensures that projects that meet the standard can move forward without unnecessary delay because right now too often projects are not being stopped, they are just being slowed down by process.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 1156. Mr. Speaker, today is tax day, and families across the country are sitting down to file their returns and take a closer look at what they owe and what they keep. It is a significant day because it is a direct reminder of how the decisions that we make here in Washington show up in people's lives.

Last year, House Republicans passed and the President signed into law H.R. 1, the Working Families Tax Cut Act, one of the largest tax cuts for working and middle-class Americans in history. The law prevented a \$2.6 trillion tax increase on families making less than \$400,000 a year, and it continues to deliver real savings to millions of Americans.

Today, as families file their taxes, they are seeing the impact of these policies firsthand. For a family of four earning under \$73,000, it can mean no Federal income tax at all, and the relief is targeted where it matters the most: no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, tax relief for our senior citizens in their golden years. These are

changes that show up directly in what families owe, what they keep, and how they plan for the year ahead.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the beginning. In 2026 alone, this law is expected to deliver \$191 billion in additional tax relief, putting more money back in the pockets of American families, including roughly \$1,000 more in refunds. Taxpayers are projected to take home an additional \$91 billion in refunds and keep another \$30 billion in their paychecks through reduced withholdings.

The benefits don't stop there. This law locks in lower tax rates; strengthens the standard deduction; expands the child tax credit to \$2,200, and indexes it to inflation; and provides continued relief through policy like no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, and expanded support for childcare, paid leave, and savings. These policies are helping families keep more of what they earn, plan for their future, and build greater financial stability.

This resolution recognizes the impact of H.R. 1 and reaffirms our commitment to making sure working families come first. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as you know, at the end of March, last month, Speaker JOHNSON gavelled out this Chamber and sent Members of Congress home for a 2-week recess. He did so despite the fact that the Department of Homeland Security has been shut down for 60 days and counting, despite the fact that President Trump had made a reckless and unlawful declaration of war without congressional authorization, despite soaring gas prices and the ongoing cost-of-living crisis stretching from New York, the home of my distinguished colleague, to Colorado, despite the heat, the drought, and the wildfire records being shattered in the Western United States. Despite all of that, Speaker JOHNSON made the decision to gavel the House out of session and send everybody home.

□ 1040

Now, we are back. The 2-week recess has concluded. What has the Republican majority decided is the most pressing challenge and issue for this august body to debate?

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, it is a resolution commemorating a bill that Republicans passed last year. That is what we are here to debate.

Republicans control the floor. They could put a bill on the floor to address cost-of-living issues. They could put a bill on the floor to address soaring gas prices. They could put a bill on the floor to address rising healthcare costs. Instead, we are here to debate a commemorative resolution. It is absurd.

I have, over the course of the 7 years that I have had the privilege of serving in the United States House, never seen something quite like this. It doesn't

really take a resolution, Mr. Speaker, for them to extol what they believe to be the benefits of the bill that they passed last year, the tax bill, which we will talk about today.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that this resolution is wholly unnecessary. There are better ways to spend our time.

I heard the gentleman from New York's long description of the many reasons why that particular resolution that I referenced merits this body's passage. What I found interesting is that over the last 12 months that I have come down here to the House floor, I have heard Republicans use the same refrain in describing this bill: the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. It is in the law.

For a year, I have heard nothing but tweets, Truth Social posts, and floor speeches extolling the virtues of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. What is fascinating is that I didn't hear those four words this morning. I suspect I am not going to hear them the rest of today because Republicans spent some time and have come up with a new name—a new name, a rebrand.

This bill that President Trump signed into law, which gave tax cuts to the richest Americans among us, is so unpopular that Republicans decided that they had to change the name.

I hate to break it to you, but I don't think the rebrand, Mr. Speaker, is going to work. I don't think the name is what the American people were frustrated by. What they are frustrated by is a bill that kicked off 15 million Americans from their healthcare, a bill that amounted to the largest cut in SNAP in the history of our country, a bill that added \$5 trillion over the next decade to the Federal debt. That is what they are frustrated about.

They can call this bill, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act—what is the name now? Maybe the gentleman from New York will indulge me. The working families tax cut, that is what they are calling it now. I suspect, in a few months, they will change the name again because it is not going to change the unpopularity of their policies.

I know this isn't the only resolution that we are debating today, as the gentleman from New York mentioned at great length. We are going to consider three bills from the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, which seek to amend the Clean Air Act in an effort to scale back regulations that protect air quality from pollutants and polluting industries.

There is no debate that these policies could have wide-ranging implications that would allow large swathes of the United States to be exempt from various rules under the Clean Air Act.

I don't, to be candid, Mr. Speaker, really follow the argument that my friend from New York is making. As I understand it, what he is saying is that there are wide swathes of the country, including in his home State—by the way, this applies to my home State as

well—where you have pollution that exceeds the standards that have been set by regulators at the national level. That pollution is causing asthma and respiratory diseases in children.

The solution that they propose is to allow communities that are experiencing this kind of pollution to essentially exempt foreign sources of pollution from those standards so that they don't have to do anything about it.

That is their solution. The air quality is not going to get any better. There will be no prophylactic steps taken by those communities. It is just a way for those communities to no longer have to do anything about pollution. It is absurd, and the American people know it.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say—and I imagine we will have a robust debate about the three bills and the resolution that I referenced. Fundamentally, I suppose if I were to conclude with one overriding sentiment, it is that I am simply asking my Republican colleagues to get serious.

There are a lot of challenges facing the country. It is a difficult time for the families that I represent in northern Colorado and in western Colorado. Times are tough. This House, I believe, could rise to the occasion and actually work together to get some things done for the American people, for the constituents that we all serve. This is not that.

Spare us the commemorative resolutions honoring bills that you all have passed. Let's just skip those, and let's get back to doing the business that the American people expect us to do.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Once again, the Democrats are trying to distract from the facts by recycling the same class warfare talking points, even as Americans across the country are sitting down this week to file their taxes and see the reality for themselves. Families are running the numbers. They are looking at what they owe and what they keep. Filing is simpler. For working people, that matters.

Republicans passed this bill without a single Democratic vote. It was signed into law by President Trump, and 91 percent of tax filers now have a simpler tax code. Families pay no Federal income tax on the first \$31,000 that they earn. The standard deduction is locked and loaded and expanded, which means less paperwork, less time spent dealing with the IRS, and more money staying in families' budgets.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the biggest beneficiaries of this relief are workers and families making less than \$50,000 a year. That is why the rhetoric we keep hearing from Democrats doesn't line up with reality, especially for Americans sitting at their kitchen table filing their taxes right now.

This is relief for the server pulling a double, the factory worker on the line trying to work a few extra hours of overtime, the barber running a small shop, and families trying to get ahead.

Unfortunately, while Republicans fought to ensure that hardworking Americans keep more of their paychecks, because it is their money and not Uncle Sam's, Democrats under President Biden chose a different path. They flooded the post-COVID economy with trillions of dollars in new spending. They overheated the economy and drove inflation to 40-year highs. Working families were left to carry that burden that they still have a hangover on today.

□ 1050

Rather than empowering the American people, Democrats prioritized massive giveaways to political allies through Green New Deal-style programs that layer costly, ineffective regulations. Those policies were not paid for in Washington. They were paid for by families at the gas pump and the grocery store.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and House Republicans have consistently worked to unleash the full potential of the American economy so that every American who works for a living can benefit.

In stark contrast, Democrats in the last administration chose runaway spending, regulatory access, and leaving everyday Americans to pay the price through skyrocketing costs for basic necessities. Their policies hurt working families. Republican policies have helped working families, and that brings us back to the rule before us today.

This legislation before us makes sure that States are not punished for what they cannot control, supports efforts to prevent disasters before they happen, not after, cuts through red tape that delay jobs and investment, and reinforces policies that help working families keep more of what they earn.

That is what is before the House today. We are hearing concerns that this bill somehow weakens air quality protections or harms public health, but that misses what this legislation actually does. At its core, it is about fairness.

Right now, States can be penalized for emissions that they have absolutely no control over. No one in Buffalo, New York, or western New York, or the southern tier has any impact on Canadian policy on how they manage their forests or why their forests catch on fire every summer. Whether it is pollution coming from those foreign countries or background conditions beyond our control, that is not a system that makes sense.

When that happens, entire regions can fall out of compliance through no fault of their own, making it harder to build new facilities, modernize infrastructure, or bring jobs back to communities that need them the most.

That has real consequences not just for economic growth but for the well-being of the people that live there.

This bill fixes that problem. It ensures that States are judged based on what they can actually control while keeping the same underlying health-based air quality standards fully in place.

Let's be clear: Nothing in this legislation changes those standards. The protections remain. What we are addressing is how those standards are applied in the real world so that communities are not unfairly punished and locked out of economic opportunity. That matters because modernizing facilities here at home means cleaner technology, stronger environmental oversight, and fewer emissions being outsourced overseas.

While there are efforts to frame this as a rollback, it is actually about making the system workable, more predictable, and more grounded in reality. That is what this bill does and that is why it is needed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a couple of points. First, again, we have heard ad nauseam about the various ways, in the view of my colleagues, that the bill that they passed last year has benefited the American public. I disagree. My constituents disagree, but we are not debating that bill today. We are debating—for those who might be watching this, I encourage everybody to look it up—H. Res. 1156. It is a two-page resolution. It is not particularly long. This resolution does nothing, achieves nothing, and changes nothing. It is a commemorative resolution honoring a law that they passed last year. It is a waste of time.

What are we doing? Seriously. This is how the Republican majority chooses to spend its time?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do next week? Are you going to introduce a different commemorative resolution that honors maybe this resolution that passes today? Maybe that is what we should count on, I guess.

If this resolution passes today, Mr. LANGWORTHY and I will debate next week a second resolution that honors this resolution.

Give me a break. There are better ways for the House of Representatives to spend its time. These are serious issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I don't even know if I can dignify a response to the things that I have heard here this morning. Perhaps we will do another showerhead resolution or utilities or something like that. But it is very clear that there is a war in the Middle East, runaway inflation, out-of-control costs, a partial government

shutdown, and a madman in the White House. What are our colleagues across the aisle calling us here today to do? They are calling us here to gut the Clean Air Act. Mr. Speaker, this is why I rise in opposition today to all three of these bills and in the strongest defense of the Clean Air Act, which is the bipartisan legislation that has protected the health of the American people and our planet for more than a half-century.

It was passed in 1970 with bipartisan support from both Republicans and Democrats. It was born out of necessity when smog choked our cities and our communities suffered from unchecked pollution. It has delivered on a promise to the American people that no matter who you are or where you live, you have a fundamental human right to breathe clean air. There is nothing more basic than that right.

It is a promise that has delivered. It has saved millions of lives, prevented countless illnesses, and improved air quality across the country. As we know, it is under a threat not just in this Chamber but by an administration that has rolled back standards, weakened emissions, undermined the authority of the EPA, and gutted our climate commitments.

Now, at a time, especially in the West when we are facing record drought, record heat, and dangerously low snowpack, what are you all doing with your time on the floor? You are trying to further gut the fundamental program that protects our communities and our planet.

That is why I rise today to oppose these bills. This is not permitting reform. This is gutting our right to breathe clean air. The FENCES Act strips the EPA's authority, the FIRE Act manipulates how air pollution is measured, and the RED Tape Act is perhaps the most alarming of all as it would silence communities and allow Federal projects to move forward without consideration to our public health and to the planet.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this: The consequences of these bills are not abstract. They are measurable, and they will be measured in lives, in the well-being of our people, and damages to our planet.

The Clean Air Act exists to protect the fundamental right of every American, every human, to breathe clean air. That is why I oppose these bills unequivocally. For the sake of our children, our communities, and our future, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on these bills today.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want to lecture us on the environment, but let's take a look at their record.

For 4 years in the last administration, they pushed policies that were more about ideology than results. They drove up costs. They added layers of bureaucracy. They made it harder for

States and communities to actually manage real environmental challenges.

They created a system that punishes States for factors outside of their control. It discourages proactive solutions and slows down projects with duplicative and unnecessary reviews. That is not environmental leadership. It is regulatory overreach.

Now, under President Trump's leadership, we are taking a more practical approach. We are focusing on policies that actually work by supporting States, encouraging prevention, and cutting through red tape that has held back progress for years. The difference is very clear.

Democrats defend a system that is more complicated, more expensive, and less effective. Republicans are focused on making environmental policy more predictable, more efficient, and more grounded in reality.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the legislation in this rule does. It makes clear that States shouldn't be penalized for emissions they can't control, including pollution from foreign countries and wildfire smoke drifting across our borders. It supports proactive wildfire mitigation instead of punishing States for taking steps to prevent catastrophic fires. It removes duplicative Federal review processes that slow down projects without improving environmental outcomes.

It is not partisan. It is common sense. We have heard a lot from the other side that the EPA already has the tools to deal with wildfire emissions and that this bill is unnecessary. If that were true, we would not be here today.

The reality is, the current system doesn't work. It is broken, and while EPA can exclude certain emissions as exceptional events, the process is complicated, time consuming, and, in many cases, unworkable for States.

Mr. Speaker, here is the real problem. Under the current law, emissions from wildfire can only qualify as exceptional events, but emissions from prescribed burns used to prevent those wildfires do not.

□ 1100

Think about that. States are effectively penalized for taking proactive steps to reduce wildfire risk. That is just totally backward.

As a result, many States don't even attempt to use the existing process because it is too burdensome, too uncertain, and too resource intensive. In fact, for years, States and local agencies were unable to successfully use this process for prescribed burns.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about creating a loophole. It is about fixing a system that is clearly not working. The FIRE Act removes this barrier. It gives States the certainty that they need to carry out responsible wildfire mitigation without risking noncompliance with Federal air quality standards.

That matters because prescribed burns are not the problem. They are

part of the solution. They reduce the intensity of wildfires. They lower long-term emissions, and they help prevent the devastating economic and environmental damage that we see from large-scale fires like we saw in California.

States should not have to choose between meeting air quality standards and preventing wildfires. This bill makes sure that they don't have to.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, I co-chair the Bipartisan Wildfire Caucus. I have worked with my Republican colleagues on a number of wildfire resiliency and forest management bills, proposals, and securing funding. I will not be lectured by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as they work to defund the Forest Service, literally, about wildfire resiliency and prescribed burns.

There is no question that, at least with respect to the FIRE Act—I understand we are debating multiple bills with respect to the Clean Air Act, but in terms of the FIRE Act, Mr. EVANS' bill, it does nothing. I mean, existing processes within the EPA provide for precisely the type of relief that he is seeking in this bill.

The bill is, again, completely unnecessary. It is also not going anywhere. We, of course, know that to be the case. In any event, I digress.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and thank her for her leadership, I might just say, Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague from New York wax very poetically about the importance of the big or not the Big Beautiful Bill Act—whatever they are calling it now—the working families bill or something like that that they have come up with.

There are 218 Republicans in the House of Representatives, give or take. I presume, given the importance of this commemorative resolution, that there perhaps might be some colleagues who are going to join my colleague from New York to talk on this bill?

Mr. Speaker, might I ask you to pose that question to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY)? Does he anticipate any colleagues coming to the floor or just him?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAN of Florida). The inquiry of which you describe, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry, but the gentleman from New York will be able to respond during his time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I hope he does. I suspect the answer is “no.” I suspect that Mr. LANGWORTHY is here alone and that he will be the only Republican who has been tasked with arguing in favor of this really important commemorative resolution that we are all so eager to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, in any event, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to adopt the

Senate amendment to H.R. 7417, the bipartisan compromise bill that the Senate unanimously passed twice now—twice—to fund the law-abiding agencies within DHS.

Mr. Speaker, this is the deal. You know it. I know it. At the end of the day, the compromise legislation that the Senate passed twice was deprived of a vote on this floor by Republicans. Not a single Senator objected to this bill, twice.

The Republican Senate majority leadership authored the motion, but House Republican leadership refuses to take it up. As a result, it is perpetuating the shutdown of DHS by not putting that deal on the floor.

Members who want to end the shutdown ought to join us in defeating the previous question to put this bipartisan compromise on the floor today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. We are grateful to her for her leadership.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it has been more than 20 days since the United States Senate reached a unanimous agreement to all but end the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. Yet, Republican House leadership refuses to bring the measure up for a vote on the House floor. It would pass overwhelmingly here, without question. Without question.

The White House has only recently decided to start paying workers throughout TSA, FEMA, Coast Guard, and our cybersecurity agencies after refusing to do so for weeks. They claim they have the authority to do this.

Madam Speaker, if the administration believes that they have the authority to use this money, then every paycheck that a TSA worker was forced to miss was because the White House made an active choice not to pay them.

Imagine. Imagine the turmoil in people's lives due to no paycheck at the end of the week or at the end of 2 weeks. How do you pay your rent? How do you buy groceries? We know the stories of people being evicted, sleeping in their cars, and donating their plasma for money. This is reality.

The White House had the authority to pay them so that they didn't have to go through this. A number of people left their jobs because they were not getting paid. It really defies imagination that people's lives and economic

security was being held up for purely political reasons.

Madam Speaker, I will just add that this money will probably run out at some point, and our job and the job of the Appropriations Committee is to make sure that these agencies are funded through the end of the year. That can be done because there is no disagreement on both sides of the aisle on funding Coast Guard, TSA, FEMA, cybersecurity, and the Secret Service.

The issue is what we do in our cities and our towns nationwide with the terror that ICE—and there will be a lengthy debate on dealing with this. That is going to be a lengthy debate about the reforms and the overhaul, as it should be. In the meantime, everyone should continue to be paid. Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, they made an agreement.

The public wants to know why you can't get together. I will generally say that we can't get unanimous consent on whether or not the sky is blue in this institution.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, we had unanimous consent not once but twice. I think I read that the Speaker of the House had agreed that this is what they would do, but that was turned around. That was upended.

We know, and I have said a moment ago, that rank and file would support it, as well, if we were allowed to receive a vote. The only people who do not want to reopen this government and this Department are House Republican leadership, who continue to block the bill.

The madness must end, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Senate bill that passed unanimously so that we can end the shutdown. Let's get back to work for the American people, and I encourage my Republican colleagues to join us in this effort.

□ 1110

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

Madam Speaker, I heard the words “purely political gain,” and I completely respect the work that the Committee on Appropriations has done this year. Chairman COLE and Ranking Member DELAURO did a beautiful job navigating a process that has led us for fiscal year 2026 to get all but one of our appropriations bills passed with bipartisan support.

They had a bipartisan agreement on how to fund the Department of Homeland Security, but it wasn't until the Democrats on the other side of the aisle figured that they had to answer to their political base that they decided to throw the biggest political temper tantrum in the history of the

country. Here we sit with a Department still shut down, and they still won't agree to fund the entire Department. In fact, nearly every one of the Members, all but a few courageous Democrats, have voted against funding the Department of Homeland Security in its entirety time and time again right here in the House of Representatives. It is a matter of public record.

Let's be honest about who is responsible for the shutdown. Republicans have put forward serious, good-faith efforts to fund the Department of Homeland Security and keep these critical operations running. It is Democrats that chose to walk away time and again, over and over. It is Democrats who chose to play politics with funding for agencies that protect the American people every single day. They did that knowing full well what is at stake: funding for FEMA and disaster response, our Coast Guard operations, and other core Homeland Security functions.

That was all put at risk because Democrats refused to engage. They made the decision to do that. They were willfully aware that certain parts of the Department, like ICE, were already funded through the end of the year. This wasn't about policy. It was all about political theatrics, and it is all that we have had for the last 40, 50 days.

The consequences are real. Since Democrats shut down DHS, we saw violent attacks at Old Dominion University, the Temple Israel synagogue in Michigan, and in Austin, Texas, and we saw a massive cyberattack on the Stryker Corporation. This is no time to be playing politics with the safety of our homeland. Instead of stepping up, Democrats chose to step back, and now they come to the floor trying to shift the blame, hoping the American people will forget who actually walked away from funding the very agencies responsible for protecting them.

The facts are clear: Republicans are working to fund the government and keep Americans safe. Democrats chose to shut it down.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, a lot of political rhetoric again. I think the American people know the facts. They know that the Senate passed a bill twice on a unanimous basis to fund DHS. It is not complicated. The United States Senate passed the bill. Not a single Senator objected. The United States Senate passed the bill again. Not a single Senator objected. TED CRUZ, MIKE LEE, the most conservative Senators in the United States Senate, approved of this bill. They sent it here. It is sitting at the Clerk's desk. If we voted on it today, my guess is 90 percent of the House of Representatives would vote for it. The only reason we are not is because the Speaker of the House, MIKE

JOHNSON, has decided we are not going to vote on it. That is it.

The rest of it, they can try to confuse the American public and describe to them the play-by-play of the last 65 days. Again, it is not complicated. There is a bill sitting at the Clerk's desk to fund DHS that every Republican Senator, every Democratic Senator, and 90 percent of this body support. The only reason we are not voting on it is politics because Republican Speaker of the House MIKE JOHNSON has decided that he won't allow it. That is it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am prepared to close, but I will say that I am doing this very begrudgingly because I was hoping that we might be able to have some colloquies with my colleague from New York with his colleagues on H. Res. 1156. I know how important this commemorative resolution is to the Republican Conference, and I would be loath to deprive my colleague from New York with the opportunity to have a fulsome debate on it.

Is there no Republican in the House of Representatives who is willing to come down to the floor to extol the virtues of the big, beautiful bill—or the working families bill that they have renamed? None, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I think that was the original name on the bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Was that—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I wish to clarify something that the Speaker said. That is not the name of the bill. Just to be clear, I encourage anybody who is watching to go online and pull up the bill. It is, I think, about 350 pages. The one phrase that you will not find in the entirety of the bill is "Working Families Tax Cuts," Madam Speaker. It is nowhere.

I checked. I checked yesterday during the Committee on Rules. I checked again before I came to the floor just to be sure, so I don't know where you came up with that name, Madam Speaker. I am not even really sure who has come up with it in the Republican Conference. Somebody, a marketing guru in the Republican Conference I think convinced the Speaker, and I suppose said to him: "Look, this bill is deeply unpopular. President Trump is deeply unpopular, more unpopular than any President in the modern history of our country. We have got to do something different, and I have got an idea. We will just come up with a new name for the bill; a new name, resolution honoring that new name that will convince them. I am sure that will get the American public on our side." Fascinating.

Madam Speaker, week after week, my colleagues on the other side of the

aisle have opted to take up a variety of legislation. The one common thread is that it fails to meet the moment.

Americans sent us here to work on the issues that they care most about, that have the most impact on their everyday lives: the rising affordability crisis, expanding access to affordable healthcare, protecting our environment and public resources; not to gut air pollution standards and pass commemorative resolutions patting themselves on the back. That is not how Congress should be spending its precious time.

The bills before us do nothing to improve the lives of working families in our country. It is why I would encourage my colleagues to oppose the previous question, the rule, and the underlying bills.

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

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

For years, Democrats have told the American people not to believe what they can see with their own eyes. They have defended a system that penalizes States for emissions they don't control, discourages wildfire prevention, and buries job-creating projects under layers of unnecessary bureaucracy.

The legislation under this rule today takes real steps towards fixing those failures—restoring fairness to our air quality standards, supporting proactive wildfire mitigation, cutting red tape that delays jobs and investment, and reaffirming tax relief for working families through H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule before us today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1175 OFFERED BY
MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7147) making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion that the House recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of the motion.

SEC. 5. The Speaker is directed to sign the enrolled bill no later than one calendar day after adoption, and the Clerk is directed to present the bill to the President immediately upon signature by the Senate President.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ONDER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. 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 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas) at 1 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1174; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1174, 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6387, FIRE IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMING EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6398, REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6409, FOREIGN EMISSIONS AND NONATTAINMENT CLARIFICATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1156, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAX POLICIES THAT SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1174) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Clean Air Act to require revisions to regulations governing the review and handling of air quality monitoring data influenced by exceptional events

or actions to mitigate wildfire risk; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—212

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

Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—211

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

NOT VOTING—8

Baumgartner
Cole
Kaptur

Kean
Letlow
Mace

Scholten
Tiffany

□ 1329

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. McCLAIN DELANEY, and Ms. TOKUDA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.