

made by this Act, will not increase, including for vulnerable populations such as seniors, children, and minority and low-income communities, any of the following:

- (1) Asthma attacks.
- (2) Hospitalization and emergency room visits for those with respiratory disease or cardiovascular disease.
- (3) The risk of preterm birth, babies born with low birth weight, or impaired fetal growth.
- (4) The risk of heart attacks, stroke, or premature death.
- (5) Reproductive, developmental, or other serious harms to human health.
- (6) The costs of healthcare treatment for respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, or any other serious disease or condition.

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.

Mr. MIN. 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.

**REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT**

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1174, I call up the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6398

*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 "Reducing and Eliminating Duplicative Environmental Regulations Act" or the "RED Tape Act".

**SEC. 2. POLICY REVIEW.**

Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
  - (A) by striking "and comment in writing" and inserting ", and comment in writing,";
  - (B) by striking "Administrator," and inserting "Administrator";
  - (C) by striking "(1)"; and
  - (D) by striking ", (2) newly authorized Federal projects for construction and any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which section 102(2)(C) of Public Law 91-190 applies, and (3) proposed regulations published by any department or agency of the Federal Government"; and
- (2) in subsection (b), by striking ", action, or regulation".

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 Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6398.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act, which would address burdensome regulations in the Clean Air Act and provide the permitting reform needed to support American innovation.

The legislation, which was introduced by my friend Congressman JOHN JOYCE of Pennsylvania eliminates the duplicative requirement in the Clean Air Act that requires the EPA to assess and provide feedback on environmental impact statements other agencies prepare under NEPA.

The primary agency preparing an environmental impact statement already possesses the expertise and resources necessary to evaluate the impacts of a project on our environment, and the EPA is often already involved in the NEPA review process as a cooperating agency. Requiring them to provide a secondary review under section 309 is unnecessary, duplicative, and inefficient, leading to more delays and higher costs for American job creators.

This legislation is an important step to streamline permitting, and it removes burdensome inefficiencies in the current NEPA process. This bill is an essential component in the committee's permitting reform efforts.

The Clean Air Act is long overdue for an update to eliminate outdated provisions that are holding back American manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the RED Tape Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6398, the so-called RED Tape Act. This bill deletes a section of the Clean Air Act that requires the EPA to review major Federal projects under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. As a result, major Federal projects and regulations will be exempt from any scrutiny of their impacts on air quality and public health from EPA experts.

The bill would also make the permitting process less transparent by removing the requirements that EPA comments be made available to the public

and, therefore, communities would be kept in the dark.

Ignoring the consequences of major actions won't make them go away, but that is exactly what the RED Tape Act would do. For the communities who live near these major projects, turning a blind eye to problems won't protect their families from potentially toxic exposures.

Worse yet, the RED Tape Act is billed as permitting reform when in reality it is a bill to let polluters run amok out of sight from the public and without proper safety and common-sense guardrails.

Republican hypocrisy knows no bounds. They court the make America healthy again community, but then they move a bill forward that will take away the public's ability to simply know the potential toxic risks of large Federal projects. They then tout the importance of permitting reform but bring false permitting solutions to the floor instead of real proposals to make cleaner and cheaper energy sources more readily available to combat rising costs for Americans.

This hypocrisy is just one of the many problems we have to confront as the House is set to vote on these blatant attempts to gut the Clean Air Act, one of the most successful environmental and public health laws ever enacted by Congress. House Republicans are working overtime to further the Trump administration's efforts to silence the scientific, medical, and public health experts at EPA from being able to alert other agencies about how their projects might cause harm to the health of our constituents and our neighbors. That is the type of critical assessment that EPA's expertise alone could offer and would be missing as a result of this bill.

Contrary to the rhetoric of my Republican colleagues, they haven't offered any proof that these reviews were slowing or stopping projects. In fact, the EPA reviews thousands of environmental impact statements each year, with most other agencies taking their recommendations.

Unfortunately, by removing the EPA from the overall process, we are losing out on the expertise of the scientists tasked with protecting public health and the environment. However, to the Republican majority, if you can turn a blind eye to the consequences, they will disappear. Well, they don't disappear just because you turn a blind eye, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1510

That is not how toxic pollution works for countless communities in your district and mine. They deserve to know how large Federal projects might impact their water, air, and soil, and they deserve to have the best and brightest EPA scientists analyze these projects and make comments for the public to scrutinize and to hold the government accountable. Any attempts to remove this simple level of government accountability is an attempt to

silence basic civic participation and transparency, nothing more.

I don't have a problem with making government more efficient, but this bill is simply removing the voice of an important agency whose viewpoint Republicans happen to dislike. This ongoing attack on the EPA, on science and transparency cannot stand, so I urge my colleagues to stand with me in opposition to this misguided bill.

One of the most important things that we have in Congress and that I try to achieve, and I think Democrats all try to achieve, is the right to know. If people know what is going on, then they can voice their opinion. They can go out and speak. They can protest. They can do what they have to do to protect their communities.

However, by eliminating the right to know, we are making it impossible for people to actually express their opinion, which is a fundamental right, in my opinion, under our Constitution.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Dr. JOYCE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding. I rise today in support of my legislation, the RED Tape Act.

The RED Tape Act removes an unnecessary and duplicative environmental review that the EPA currently conducts under the Clean Air Act.

As it stands, the relevant department or agency prepares an environmental impact statement as part of the permitting of a new Federal project, a process in which the EPA is often already involved. After completion of that review, EPA is then asked to go back and provide additional comments on those same findings; hence, the redundant and duplicative nature of the process.

This secondary review of an already-completed environmental impact statement only serves to slow down the critical projects, especially projects in the energy industry.

This bill is about getting projects permitted and getting projects completed, projects that will help us compete with our adversaries in industries like AI and advanced manufacturing.

This bill is not, as has been alleged, an attempt to undermine environmental review. The environmental impact statement must still be completed by the primary agency. This is a process that agencies already have the necessary expertise and capacity to carry out efficiently. In many cases, EPA will still have the opportunity to comment during the initial process as a co-operating agency.

As the name implies, the RED Tape Act simply removes bureaucratic, redundant red tape. Projects will still need to comply with all applicable environmental laws. This is in no way

giving a pass to polluters. It is ensuring that economic growth is not stifled by overly burdensome Federal regulations.

Understand what this legislation will do. This is a commonsense bill that leaves basic environmental protections in place while eliminating artificial barriers. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage on the floor later this week.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding. It is worth reiterating just how effective the Clean Air Act has been at protecting our public health.

In the past 50-plus years, the Clean Air Act has proven time and time again that environmental protections and economic growth can, indeed, go hand in hand.

Between 1970 and 2022, major air pollutants dropped by 78 percent, while the U.S. gross domestic product nearly quadrupled. However, despite this progress, there is still much more work to do to ensure that all Americans can breathe healthy air.

More than 156 million Americans are living in places with unhealthy levels of ozone or particle pollution, and that air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States each and every year. I find it disheartening that the majority continues to advance bills that would make the Clean Air Act less effective at protecting people from dangerous pollution.

The RED Tape Act is the latest Republican effort to claim that the rules are too burdensome on industry. This bill amends section 309 of the Clean Air Act to eliminate the requirement for EPA to review and provide written comments on major Federal construction projects and actions in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

This could allow major Federal projects and actions to be approved without proper consideration of their impacts on air quality and public health.

The bill also removes the ability for the public to be informed of potential public health concerns stemming from these projects.

I really do not think Americans are opposed to the Federal Government considering the potential health, economic, and environmental impacts of major decisions before they are made. Yet, this bill would limit that consideration while making it harder for the public to understand the consequences of major projects.

I know some Members will claim this review is duplicative of NEPA, but many of these same Members are also pushing parallel efforts to gut NEPA, claiming that NEPA isn't necessary because our underlying environmental laws will sufficiently protect public health and the environment.

You can have it both ways. You cannot end both parts of a supposedly duplicative process unless the goal of this effort is to severely limit environmental reviews of projects entirely. That is not about cutting red tape. That is about ending decades-old public health protections so that industry doesn't need to worry about how pollution mitigation might cut into their profits.

The bottom line is that the EPA is our Nation's foremost expert at assessing projects' impacts on air quality and is responsible for protecting the air that we breathe and the water that we drink. I cannot support efforts to undermine EPA's expertise and eliminate the agency's efforts to carry out reasonable environmental reviews, and so I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act. Under current law, as we have heard here today, the EPA is required to review and comment on the environmental impacts of Federal projects from other Federal agencies.

Perhaps this would make sense if the EPA wasn't already involved in the initial environmental review and development of the environmental impact statement for Federal projects. What we have here is another, as we said, duplicative and inefficient government process that for decades has delayed development, slowed economic growth, and only hurt American families and businesses in making it more unaffordable for the American people.

Furthermore, in the 30 years since Congress enacted section 309 of the Clean Air Act, agencies have developed their own expertise in preparing environmental impact statements. That is why the Supreme Court ruled that EPA's separate review and comment on broader environmental impacts of proposed Federal actions are no longer appropriate.

I come from the construction industry. I understand how unpredictable timelines and Federal red tape can increase costs and negatively impact job creators. Let me be clear: The RED Tape Act in no way undercuts the environmental review of Federal projects. In no way does it remove EPA's expertise from the process.

It simply streamlines the Federal review process by eliminating duplicative requirements. It seems that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are just fundamentally opposed to efficiency and a sense of urgency.

This legislation is a commonsense solution that benefits job creators and the communities we represent. It makes life more affordable for the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 6398.

□ 1520

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MENEFE).

Mr. MENEFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called RED Tape Act.

This bill clearly harms our communities. Right now, when the Federal Government approves a major construction project, like a highway or a Federal facility, the EPA has the legal authority to review it and to flag public health concerns. It can say that this project will harm air quality in this community. It can put that on the record, and regulators can act on it.

This bill eliminates that EPA review entirely. The one agency whose job it is to protect human health and air quality gets cut out of the process—no EPA air quality check, no independent public health voice at the table, major Federal projects approved with zero input from the people whose mission it is to protect the air we breathe.

That is not cutting red tape. That is cutting public health protection.

This bill hits different for my district back in Houston. I remember walking through a neighborhood in my district that for years had been fighting a cancer cluster as a result of environmental contamination. The woman who lived there told me: "In that house, two grandparents passed away. In that house, it was a child. In that house, it was a mother." She said it matter-of-factly, the way people do when grief becomes routine.

I later walked that same neighborhood with the EPA Administrator under President Biden. I showed him what I had seen. EPA under that leadership showed up. They did the work, and they provided a line of protection for the community that they never had before.

The Trump administration and my Republican colleagues are now rolling all of that back. They have already fired thousands of EPA employees, roughly one in four people in the agency. They shut down the Office of Environmental Justice. They took down the EPA's environmental justice mapping tool that communities and local governments were beginning to rely on. One in three EPA staffers who were there on Inauguration Day will be gone by the time this is all over. That is not reform. That is demolition.

Today, the air quality in Houston is unhealthy for sensitive groups. The experts routinely tell us to reduce our time spent outside. It just happened this morning. Houston already ranks among the worst cities in the entire country for toxic air pollutants: ethylene oxide, benzene, and fine particulate matter from petrochemical plants and heavy traffic.

Black and Brown communities in Houston are more than twice as likely as White residents to live in neighborhoods that fail on multiple pollution metrics.

Those are the communities that this bill will hurt. Those are the commu-

nities that need EPA review of major Federal projects, not less of that, but more.

People across this country are dying and having horrible health outcomes because of hyperconcentration of pollution in their communities. This body's response is to present a bill that removes the one Federal agency charged with protecting public health and the environment from the room entirely.

Before I came to Congress, I stood up to the Trump administration in court when they tried to roll back environmental protections, and I plan to do the exact same thing in the Halls of Congress, as well. We owe it to our communities to make sure they have access to clean air, clean land, and clean water, regardless of where in this country they live.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act.

In my home State of Idaho, we have more than 34 million acres of federally controlled land. I just want to put that in perspective for a minute. My good friend on the other side of the aisle is from the great State of New Jersey. You can put more than six New Jerseys just within the Federal land mass in the State of Idaho. That is how big it is.

Why is that pertinent here? It is pertinent because, with that much land mass, you have a seemingly endless flow of processes going on from departments or agencies for approvals for one thing or another: energy impact statements, the NEPA process. Everything ongoing all the time takes years each time.

We had a recent situation with a wind farm project in my home State. Regardless of what you think about wind farms, this was just an actual occurrence. There was a long process of approval where an EIS, an environmental impact statement, was required, and the EPA was a part of that statement every step of the way, running in parallel as part of that EIS. As soon as that was completed by mandate, the EPA had to go back and publicly comment on the process it just went through itself.

That is just one example, Mr. Speaker, of the duplicative situation that we have. This is really problematic when you have a lot of these projects going on. In my home State, that is a prime example.

All the RED Tape Act does is eliminates that duplicative mandate. There is still the process. We are still going through all the areas of concern. It just eliminates the duplication of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would just add, as I close, that this is potentially even more important now than ever before, to make this easier to deal with, because our energy needs as a country

are taking a hockey stick in the demand curve. It is only going one way.

So much of the energy needs have to go through these processes. A lot of it is coming right out of my home State. We see this as a real problem. Again, I rise in support of H.R. 6398, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RIVAS).

Ms. RIVAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding to me and for his continued leadership on the Energy and Commerce Committee, especially on environmental justice.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Republicans' RED Tape Act because it guts the Clean Air Act and strips the EPA's ability to inform the public of potential health concerns that they will face because of Federal projects.

The Clean Air Act makes sure that the EPA considers the health and environmental impacts of communities before a project begins. It has helped communities like mine in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles breathe cleaner air.

My district has some of the highest asthma rates in the country because of generations of poor land-use decisions. These decisions have placed freeways, landfills, and warehouses next to homes, schools, and parks.

I know that my community is not alone. Over 100 million Americans live in counties with unhealthy levels of pollution. In particular, children, the elderly, low-income communities, and communities of color are disproportionately at risk for serious health conditions.

Air pollution is already associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in our country every year. Trump and Republicans will make this problem worse by ignoring the needs of environmental justice communities across the country. Trump and Republicans are prioritizing the profits of their billionaire and corporate interest friends over the health of our communities.

The RED Tape Act allows polluters to contaminate the air that we breathe without regard for the lives or livelihoods of communities that would be impacted the most.

There is a reason that all Democrats on the Energy and Commerce Committee voted against the RED Tape Act, and that is because it is a harmful bill for everyone, except for Donald Trump and Republicans' billionaire friends.

This bill will increase levels of air pollution and send more people to the hospital at a time when Republicans have already gutted working families' healthcare. This bill does not make life safer or more affordable for working families in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the RED Tape Act and to stand up for environmental justice communities.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. GRIJALVA).

□ 1530

Mrs. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the RED Tape Act is a blatant sacrifice of human health for corporate profits. It will allow major Federal projects to move forward without any consideration for impact on air quality or public health. This is a clear attempt to hide the truth about the health impacts of pollution.

I will make this crystal clear: Our constituents do not want to increase the risks of their children developing asthma or cancer so that billionaires can fast-track polluting projects. This notion is obscene. As a parent, I can tell you, we will not stand for putting polluters over our children's right to breathe in clean air. Not now, not ever.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment. My amendment would ensure that section 309 reviews still occur for major Federal projects or actions that may increase public exposure to mercury, lead compounds, asbestos, or any other hazardous air pollutants.

Air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States each year. These are not just numbers. They are people taken from families far too soon. There must be no sidestepping protections for human health.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit, and I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the RED Tape Act would exempt major Federal projects and regulations from any scrutiny of their impacts on air quality and public health from EPA experts.

The bill would also make the permitting process less transparent by removing the requirement that EPA comments be made available to the public.

Now, clean, safe air is a fundamental human right, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. The Clean Air Act exists to protect that right. Air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States every year, and particulate matter is among the most dangerous forms of air pollution. Air pollution presents serious health risks to our communities every day.

Over 100 million Americans live in counties with unhealthy levels of air

pollution with children, the elderly, low-income communities, and communities of color being disproportionately at risk.

You won't hear my colleagues focus on the transparency part of the RED Tape Act, but I will talk about that a little bit today as we conclude.

Under the Clean Air Act, EPA's analysis and comments on major Federal projects and potential impacts must be made public. This transparency is a key feature to hold the government accountable and is the reason why most agencies take EPA's suggestions.

If a major Federal project could expose the public to asbestos, lead, or PFAS under this bill, EPA would not be required to look at that project and provide scientific and public health-focused feedback and suggestions for making it safer.

Equally as important, EPA's comments and suggestions on those risks and exposure would not be made available to the public. That only serves to shield Republican corporate polluters from any scrutiny and would do nothing to ensure Americans' health is protected.

What I said before when we were talking about the FENCES Act, I will say it now on the RED Tape Act. The right to know is one of the most important things that we need to protect around here because then the public can look and see what the dangers are of pollution coming from a particular project and then they can act accordingly.

A healthy America includes healthy air, water, and soil. The EPA is integral to achieving that goal.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to protect transparency and the public health and vote "no" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I will point out is in 2025, the Supreme Court decision in Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County, Colorado, ruled that upstream-downstream impacts of Federal action fall outside the scope of the environmental impact statement under NEPA. In light of this decision, the EPA's separate review and comment on broader environmental impacts of proposed Federal action are no longer appropriate.

It is really insulting to the American people to have my colleagues make outrageous statements in regard to what our intent is with this. We have the means to make sure that our air is clean. We are working on that. We do not want, in any form or fashion, to compromise the quality of life that we have here in this country.

It really is stunning to hear fellow Americans want to deny economic justice to whole communities throughout the country. I pointed out several times what each one of their States was receiving in funding from the Rural Health Transformation Fund, a

historic effort to improve healthcare in rural areas where so many disadvantaged people live, that every one of my Democratic colleagues voted against.

We want to give people economic opportunity, not deny them. We want to dramatically improve the healthcare of people who have been denied the opportunity to have a good-paying job with good benefits. As one who grew up with few opportunities, I understand how important it is to have a job that allows people to live in better housing, to have access to better food, better healthcare, and to have something left over to save to meet future needs and eventually retirement.

My colleagues who oppose this bill literally oppose the economic opportunities that could lift millions of disadvantaged Americans into a much brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we recognize that we have a host of Federal regulations that need to be reviewed, to be modernized, not to compromise anyone's healthcare, not to compromise environmental quality, but to improve these to make them work better for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this excellent legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, 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

Mrs. GRIJALVA. 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:

Mrs. Grijalva of Arizona moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6398 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. GRIJALVA is as follows:

Mrs. Grijalva moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6398, as Reported to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

#### SEC. 2. POLICY REVIEW.

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) The Administrator shall review, and comment in writing, on the environmental impact of—

“(A) any matter relating to duties and responsibilities granted pursuant to this Act or other provisions of the authority of the Administrator contained in any legislation proposed by any Federal department or agency; and

“(B) any matter relating to duties and responsibilities granted pursuant to this Act or other provisions of the authority of the Administrator contained in—

“(i) any newly authorized Federal project for construction or any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which section 102(2)(C) of National

Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies that the Administrator determines may result in an increase in the release of, or public exposure to, mercury, a lead compound, asbestos, or any other hazardous air pollutant; or

“(ii) any proposed regulation published by any department or agency of the Federal Government that the Administrator determines may result in such an increase.

“(2) Any such written comment shall be made public at the conclusion of any such review.”

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.

Mrs. GRIJALVA. 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.

□ 1540

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAX POLICIES THAT SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 1147, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1156

Whereas, on July 4, 2025, the President signed Public Law 119-21, commonly known as the “Working Families Tax Cuts”;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts prevented a \$2,600,000,000 tax hike on taxpayers making less than \$400,000 per year;

Whereas, for the 2025 tax year, the Working Families Tax Cuts helped deliver an estimated \$222,000,000,000 in tax refunds, putting money directly back into Americans’ wallets;

Whereas, for the 2026 tax year, the Working Families Tax Cuts are anticipated to deliver an average tax cut of \$3,750, helping make America affordable again;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts ensure that families of four making under \$73,000 will generally face zero Federal income tax liability;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts will result in a 15 percent tax cut for Americans whose income is in the bottom 40 percent, with the largest percentage reduction going to the bottom 20 percent;

Whereas the share of total income taxes paid by Americans whose income is in the top 1 percent will increase to nearly 40 percent as a result of the Working Families Tax Cuts, while the share paid by Americans in the remaining 99 percent will decrease to 60 percent;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts enacted “no tax on tips”, which will provide

millions of tipped workers with \$32,000,000,000 of tax relief;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts enacted “no tax on overtime”, which will provide hard-working Americans with a \$90,000,000,000 tax cut on their overtime pay;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts provide a new deduction for interest on auto loans for new American-made vehicles, lowering costs and helping more Americans get behind the wheel;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts honor a lifetime of hard work by American seniors by providing them with a deduction of up to \$6,000 per year;

Whereas, to date, nearly 45 percent of tax returns filed this tax season have claimed at least one of these four new tax cuts;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts help jump-start the American dream for millions of youth by making a down payment of over \$15,000,000,000 in tax-advantaged investment accounts for American children;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts permanently increase the standard deduction, delivering \$205,000,000,000 in new tax relief to the 90 percent of earners who claim it;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts permanently expand the child tax credit, increasing the maximum credit amount to \$2,200 per child and ensuring that the credit will not lose value due to inflation;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts expands the accessibility of the \$17,280 adoption tax credit so that all families who adopt, regardless of income, can benefit;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts expands educational freedom and choice for working families by ensuring 529 accounts can now cover costs associated with trade schools or K-12 educational expenses; and

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts expands access to health savings accounts for more than 10 million Americans to help control health care costs and promotes preventive care by allowing patients to pair these accounts with innovative direct primary care and easier access to telehealth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its support for tax policies that support working families and let them keep more of their hard-earned money; and

(2) recognizes the significant tax relief provided by the Working Families Tax Cuts for hardworking Americans.

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

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1156 and the working families

tax cuts, which have led to this year’s historic tax refund season.

Today, April 15, is tax day. The IRS typically receives around 24 percent of tax returns in April. What millions of Americans are finding out today is that their tax refund is significantly larger than it has been in the past, thanks to the working families tax cuts.

Refunds this tax season have increased by 11 percent, with the average refund over \$3,400. Much of that relief is thanks to the policies championed by President Trump. Over 6 million Americans have claimed no tax on tips, 25 million Americans have claimed no tax on overtime, and 30 million taxpayers claimed the Social Security deduction. Over 1 million Americans claimed the no tax on auto loan interest.

Who are the folks claiming these deductions? It is working-class Americans. It is not millionaires. It is not billionaires. Overall, nearly half of all tax filers this season claimed at least one of those key provisions.

Under this tax relief, tipped workers get, on average, a \$1,300 tax cut. Hourly workers get, on average, a \$1,400 tax cut from no tax on overtime. A \$12,000 deduction for a married couple on Social Security means a more secure retirement.

When Republicans enacted the working families tax cuts, we made America’s workers, families, farmers, and small businesses our top priority.

An inconvenient fact that the Democrats don’t talk about is that the share of income taxes paid by the top 1 percent actually went up from 37 percent to 40 percent. The very rich are paying a higher share of taxes today than they were before passage of this bill. Why? It is because the other 99 percent of Americans saw the share of their taxes go down, from 63 percent to 60 percent.

Don’t take my word for it. Listen to the stories of everyday Americans, like Raymond Huff from Colorado, who testified before the Ways and Means Committee that the working families tax cuts will help him grow his small business and hire more workers; Nancy Overman from Nevada, who testified that she will be able to afford basic necessities without draining her retirement savings, thanks to the no tax on Social Security; Sharon Simmons, a DoorDash driver—who showed up at the White House yesterday, in fact—originally from my home State of Missouri, who testified to how no tax on tips will help her better afford her husband’s medical treatments and travel to Missouri to see her family more often; or the waitress in my district who told me that she got a \$10,000 tax refund, thanks to the no tax on tips, the expanded child tax credit, and other provisions. She told me, Mr. Speaker, that because of that provision, she will be able to pay for her rent for an entire year and a lot of food for her family.

That makes a huge impact on everyday Americans. Families have more