

he was informed and ready to lead his team bright and early the next morning.

The people of Virginia's 11th District are lucky to call Chuck a neighbor. I thank him for his service and wish him a well-earned retirement.

□ 1210

RECOGNIZING MIKE LEGG ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. MCDOWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an incredible public servant from my district.

After more than three decades of service to the city of Kannapolis, Mr. Mike Legg is beginning his well-earned retirement.

Mike began working for Kannapolis in 1995, earning the community's respect and trust. In 2004, he was appointed city manager, a post which he has stewarded for more than two decades, growing the city, bringing life to the community, and carrying the torch on the downtown revitalization and continued development of the North Carolina Research Campus.

Madam Speaker, Mike's hard work has helped make Kannapolis home for the city's more than 50,000 residents. I thank him for his many contributions to our community. I know he won't be far from the action, but I wish him a long and joyous retirement.

HUNGER IN AMERICA IS ON THE RISE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, hunger in America is on the rise. Food prices are through the roof. Half of Americans are struggling to afford groceries in this terrible Trump economy.

Trump and this Republican Congress have prioritized tax breaks for billionaires, illegal wars, and tariffs that have all come at the expense of cheaper goods for the American people.

Now, they are advancing a farm bill next week that locks in their \$187 billion cut to SNAP enacted as part of their big, ugly bill in July for the next 5 years. That terrible policy enacted to give tax breaks to billionaires has already stolen basic food benefits from over 2.5 million veterans, seniors, and families with teenagers. Some of the worst provisions haven't even gone into effect yet.

SNAP provides people with about 2 bucks per meal to afford nutritious groceries. That is it. Republicans are decimating this program, making it even more difficult for families to afford food.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues who care about making food

more affordable for working people to join me in voting "hell no" on this disastrous Republican farm bill and not be complicit in increasing hunger in America. For God's sake, let's come together to end hunger now.

GUTTING U.S. FOREST SERVICE RESOURCES

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

Mr. VASQUEZ. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to this administration's plan to completely gut the U.S. Forest Service, move its headquarters to Utah, and shutter 57 research stations.

Our Ag Secretary said that her decision is guided by common sense, but, truly, it is a slap in the face to Teddy Roosevelt and those who carefully crafted the Forest Service as we know it.

I am a hunter, an angler, and someone who spends a lot of time in my national forests. I know my supervisors, my district rangers, and even the volunteer crews. As the cofounder of the bipartisan Public Lands Caucus, I don't see a shred of common sense in this decision.

What I do see is another backdoor move by this administration to push forward an anti-public lands agenda that discards career staff, under-resources our land agencies, and prioritizes corporations rather than focusing on combating wildfires, wildlife habitat, rural communities, and the growing outdoor recreation economy. We need more, not less, U.S. Forest Service resources and staff out West in places like New Mexico.

Madam Speaker, stripping resources from an agency that is already stretched thin and struggling to mitigate the impact of wildfires is the opposite of common sense. It is stupidity.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. MANUEL "MANNY" P. BERRIOZABAL

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Manuel "Manny" Berriozabal.

Manny was born in San Antonio, where he met his wife, Maria, and served our community for five decades.

After growing up in Independence, Missouri, he would go on to teach mathematics at UCLA, Loyola Marymount, the University of New Orleans, and Tulane.

Manny joined the UTSA faculty in 1976, and he was a force for change. He worked tirelessly to prepare and inspire generations of students to pursue math and science careers. He founded the Pre-Freshman Engineering Program, PREP, helping give over 50,000

alumni access to rewarding opportunities in STEM. That program is now in 33 sites across seven States.

Outside of the classroom, he fought for equity and opportunities for underserved communities, making our city a better place to learn and live.

He was also a longtime friend.

Madam Speaker, he believed in the power of education and community. His legacy lives on through countless students in San Antonio and across the country. May he rest in peace.

CONCERNS FOR SHRIMPERS

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, out on the water in eastern North Carolina, workers are putting in long hours and long days, doing honest work to feed their neighbors and keep our coastal economy alive.

Their way of life is under threat. Rising costs are squeezing businesses and families. Unfair competition from imported shrimp is making it harder to get a fair price for a hard day's work.

Concerns about mislabeling on imported seafood only make matters worse. Families think they are buying local seafood, but they are not. It only undermines consumer trust.

Spending time with commercial fishermen and shrimpers in eastern North Carolina made one thing clear: Reducing barriers for our seafood industry and bringing costs down will, indeed, make eastern North Carolina stronger.

□ 1220

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4690, RELIABLE FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1182, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AS STEWARDS OF THE ENVIRONMENT, MAJOR SUPPLIERS OF UNITED STATES ENERGY RESOURCES, CRITICAL PROVIDERS OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND MANUFACTURING CAPACITY, AND DRIVERS OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC STABILITY, AND RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 119TH CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF THOSE VITAL COMMUNITIES; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1897, ESA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2025; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5587, HARNESSING ENERGY AT THERMAL SOURCES ACT OF 2026

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1189

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4690) to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to repeal certain Federal building energy efficiency performance standards, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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. 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. 1182) expressing support for rural communities across the United States as stewards of the environment, major suppliers of United States energy resources, critical providers of food production and manufacturing capacity, and drivers of national economic stability, and recognizing the work of the House of Representatives in the 119th Congress in support of those vital communities. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1897) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to optimize conservation through resource prioritization, incentivize wildlife conservation on private lands, provide for greater incentives to recover listed species, create greater transparency and accountability in recovering listed species, streamline the permitting process, eliminate barriers to conservation, and restore congressional intent. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-23 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5587) to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment

in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule providing for consideration of four pieces of legislation.

The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 1182, expressing support for rural communities across the United States, under a closed rule, with 1 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.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 4690, the Reliable Federal Infrastructure Act, under a closed rule, with 1 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 provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 5587, the HEATS Act, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1897, the ESA Amendments Act, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Now, Madam Speaker, as the House of Representatives works to deliver on

critical issues for the American people, we urge our colleagues to pass this suite of bills that I just described.

As I already talked about, we have a resolution to support our Nation's rural communities. We have legislation to unlock geothermal energy. We have legislation to repeal burdensome energy mandates on Federal buildings, and we have a fix to the Endangered Species Act.

Now, I anticipate some of the arguments my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will make, and I would just note something that is critically important, this is going to raise issues about why we are bringing up a resolution, for example, with regard to support for our rural communities.

The fact is, if you look at what has been happening over the last 16 months, you will see that the Republican House of Representatives has led on numerous issues, issue after issue, month after month.

We started this Congress by passing legislation, the Laken Riley Act, to ensure that we can have adequate and full enforcement by ICE and by our Border Patrol men and women who are securing our country, by improving that law to ensure that people can be adequately removed.

Importantly, it included the sue act which will allow States, such as my home State of Texas, to be able to defend our homes by suing the Federal Government when it fails to secure the border, as occurred under the previous President and the previous Secretary of Homeland Security.

Fast-forward to the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, a piece of legislation that made permanent tax rates so that we can have growth and economic opportunity for the American people, lower taxes for millions of Americans to ensure that we can actually grow this economy and compete worldwide.

We had legislation in that bill that removed some of the onerous subsidies that were undermining reliable energy in Texas and around the country with the green new scam subsidies that were making energy more expensive for the American people.

We had reforms to our programs, whether it was Medicaid or whether we are talking about food stamps. By the way, those reforms are probably going to make it easier for us to move a farm bill in the coming weeks.

We had significant resources that were put aside for our defense, to modernize our military after it languished under the previous administration, and we had language that is enabling us to fund ICE and Border Patrol right now, which brings me to my final point.

What we have been able to pass has been hitting a wall, a wall in the Senate, of Democrats who refuse to do the job the American people sent us here to do. We had over 40 days of shutdown in the fall, 40 days where we had to deal with the lack of pay and resources for the people who defend our country, including TSA at airports. We are currently in over 60 days of shutdown of

our Homeland Security operations, which we are using funds that we had the foresight to put forward to be able to use to backfill in order to keep operations going to fund Border Patrol and ICE, to fund TSA, to fund the Coast Guard, and to fund FEMA when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refused to do it. This is what we are dealing with every single day in the United States Congress.

Consequently, yes, we are going to be able to tell the American people and have a resolution for the people in rural communities, that we are passing legislation that benefits them, that enables them to have more affordable energy, that enables them to be able to have lower taxes, and to be able to provide better homes for their families.

What we aren't going to do is allow Democrats to be able to get past or allow them to get away with shutting down our ability to do our job in this country, and that is precisely what they have been doing.

We are going to move legislation this week that is going to provide greater energy resources by harnessing energy and thermal sources. We are eliminating permitting restrictions and making it easier to do that.

We are going to put forward the Reliable Federal Infrastructure Act, where we have got barriers to our ability to have reliable energy to provide energy for our Federal buildings, and the ESA Amendments Act, which makes dramatically needed and necessary improvements to the Endangered Species Act, which has been standing in the way of our ability to provide energy and to provide greater freedom for the American people.

Madam Speaker, the Republican leadership and the Republican Conference in this House of Representatives have been fighting to deliver for the American people, and we have been obstructed by two things: our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and Democrats in the Senate who are using an artificial 60-vote threshold to deny the American people the ability for us to have the changes that they sent us here to Washington to do.

We are going to continue to go down this road. This week is another step in going down this road, and that is why I am going to be urging my colleagues to support this rule and to support the legislation that we put forward under the rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me first just say congratulations to my colleague from Texas (Mr. ROY) for congratulating himself. It is a special thing here in the House of Representatives. Apparently, if you work hard enough, you can introduce a resolution congratulating yourself and your colleagues for the resolutions or the bills that you have passed. It is a participation trophy, a MIKE JOHNSON

participation trophy, that my colleague from Texas is a proud recipient of along with the other members of the House Republican Conference.

Madam Speaker, it has been 15 months now, 15 months since this Republican majority and the President were elected into office. For nearly a year and a half, Republicans have presided over what is now widely considered to be one of the least productive Congresses in the modern history of our country.

□ 1230

Since President Trump took office, only 86 pieces of legislation have been signed into law. Of course, of those 86, many bills have harmed tragically, profoundly the American public.

Fifteen million Americans have lost access to health insurance since President Trump took office. Millions of Americans are going hungry because of lost SNAP benefits that my colleagues are so proud to have enacted. The country is now involved in yet another deeply unpopular war in the Middle East.

President Trump campaigned on lowering gas prices and no new wars, he said. Of course, that couldn't have been further from the truth.

Last week I stood in this exact same spot and I posed a very simple question, Madam Speaker: Would Republicans continue to waste our time on self-congratulatory, commemorative, meaningless resolutions, saluting themselves, applauding themselves?

Apparently, that was a rhetorical question. We have our answer. The answer is H. Res. 1182. I encourage everyone watching to go online and read the resolution that we are here to debate this week, "recognizing the work of the House of Representatives in the 119th Congress."

This is what Republicans choose to spend their time on: resolutions congratulating themselves, giving themselves a pat on the back, participation trophies. It is an utter absurd waste of time, and it is illogical.

It is nonsensical that Republicans would choose to spend their time for the second week in a row on a resolution that does nothing, changes nothing, accomplishes nothing, but congratulating themselves for what they would describe as a job well done.

They have the audacity to suggest that they are supporting rural communities. I represent a district that is one-third rural. Let me tell you, families are struggling in northern and western Colorado as a result of the policies that the Republican Conference have implemented, as a result of President Trump's reckless and extreme agenda.

It is no wonder that President Trump is deeply unpopular, the most unpopular President in the modern history of our country.

I simply say to you, Madam Speaker, that I suspect we will have some debate about the underlying bills that my col-

leagues have introduced and are asking this august Chamber to consider, bills that weaken a variety of different environmental standards, bills that weaken protections for endangered species. They are not the kind of matters that are coming up at my townhalls in Colorado. Perhaps my colleague from Texas has a different experience in his district.

What I am confident of is that no citizen in our country, no Republican—I am not talking about the politicians here in Washington, D.C. I am talking about their voters—would think that it would be a prudent use of our time to pass self-congratulatory resolutions.

Honestly, I hope if there are folks watching, Republicans watching this—I understand we will have principled disagreements about a wide variety of policy matters and proposals that this House ought to consider, but just understand something: They are squandering their majority.

They are not here debating immigration or gas prices or healthcare costs or any number of priorities. They are not here debating legislation that, frankly, I am likely to oppose, but nonetheless would be legislation and priorities that Republican voters might care about. They are not here debating that. We are here wasting time handing out another participation trophy to the 218 Members of the House Republican Conference.

Madam Speaker, I ask my friend, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, it may just be easier next time to put this into a press release. Put it into a letter. We will help you and that way we can get back to the business of the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I note my colleague invoked that we could be down here debating, for example, immigration. Well, this Republican House has stood up to defend our borders and defend this President and defend this administration's active enforcement of our laws at the border of the United States in the face of willful resistance by Democrats who refuse to fund it.

That is the actual truth. We know this because we are now in day 63 or something to that effect or higher than 60 days of a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security after enduring over 40 days shutdown in the fall.

Republicans are having to move money around in order to pay our men and women in Border Patrol and ICE so that they can do their job and be able to fund TSA, FEMA, and the Coast Guard.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we keep offering amendments and bills to fund it. No. They have rejected our bills to fund the entirety of the Department of Homeland Security because they are trying to keep it hostage for political purposes.

This Republican Congress, as I said, passed the Laken Riley Act. This Republican Congress, as I said, passed funds in the big, beautiful bill last summer to ensure that we can secure the border of the United States. This Republican Congress has been backing up the President and Department of Homeland Security in doing the job that Joe Biden and Alejandro Mayorkas would not do.

Now, we see the ramifications of this in continuation as we see Americans losing their lives while people are in our country who should not be. There was a woman in Florida, a mother, who walked out of the convenience store because her car was being destroyed by a Haitian who had come here and was operating under a temporary program. This individual bludgeoned this American to death, this mother, with a hammer in front of the convenience store, and I am met with utter silence from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am met with utter silence while we tried to ensure that we fund the men and women responsible for securing us against these individuals.

Now we are having to figure out how to backdoor find a way to fund these important, core constitutional responsibilities in defending the United States of America because our Democratic colleagues refuse to do it. They refuse and are willing to create chaos for the American people and endanger the American people for crass political purposes.

The American people observe this. They know this. They see what we are doing and, yes, we are going to move important legislation this week, critical legislation this week to do what our Democratic colleagues also do not want to do: free up the American entrepreneur to produce energy for the American people. We are getting barriers and regulations out of the way. We are getting barriers and regulations, obstacles that stand in the way of people who actually know how to produce energy.

As a Texan, I know what that looks like. I have had to fight and deal with the abuse of the Endangered Species Act to prevent the ability of us to be able to have frac sand and to be able to go out and produce the energy and the oil and gas that we need, that right now is providing the independence that gives us the freedom to not be reliant on people around the world.

That is what we are doing this week. That is what we have been doing for the last 16 months. There is one obstacle for the American people's prosperity, and that is the Democratic Party.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

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

Madam Speaker, first, I will say with respect to the shutdown of DHS, I find

it exceedingly rich that my colleague would say what he said when, last night, he voted against an amendment in the Rules Committee that would have enabled this body to consider the bill that passed the United States Senate twice on a unanimous basis to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

TED CRUZ didn't object. MIKE LEE didn't object. No Member of the United States Senate objected to that bill. If it were put on the floor for a vote, it would pass with an overwhelming two-thirds majority today.

He knows it. You know it, Madam Speaker. So, spare me these complaints that somehow Democrats are responsible. It is contradicted by the clear facts and procedural history.

Madam Speaker, I will also say, with all respect to my colleague, that the gentleman covered a lot of topics: immigration, Joe Biden, gas prices, and Joe Biden again. What is fascinating is that the resolution that the gentleman has offered, or, rather, that he is being asked to debate today, has nothing to do with any of it.

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives, through policies . . . has demonstrated support for the prosperity and economic growth of the United States." They are saluting themselves. What are we doing here?

Again, I understand that the gentleman from Texas does not decide what bills we debate on the floor, so I am talking to Speaker JOHNSON. If he wanted to, he could put a bill on the floor today to pay TSA agents. He could put a bill on the floor regarding healthcare costs. We could spend all week debating hundreds of bills that have been introduced by Democratic Members and Republican Members. He has decided to force the House to vote on this press release instead for the second time.

What is this obsession with the House recognizing House Republicans? We get it. They are proud of themselves. Everyone understands that. Can we move on?

That, to me, is the absurdity of what we are debating here on the floor today. I am hopeful that this will be the last week, but I am not optimistic.

Last week, I thought it was a joke. I said that maybe next week, we will debate a resolution congratulating House Republicans for passing the congratulatory resolution that they passed last week. Apparently, that was not a joke.

If the Speaker is listening, I didn't mean that literally. I think we should stop with the self-congratulatory resolutions so that Mr. ROY and I can actually debate the underlying policies and the challenges that are facing the country.

Yet, this is not that.

Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TRAN), I just will explain that if we defeat the previous question, I intend to offer an amendment to the rule to adopt the Senate amendment to H.R. 7147, which was and is the bipartisan Senate com-

promise bill that I just referenced a few moments ago that the Senate unanimously passed twice now.

I understand Mr. ROY is vehemently against that bill. I get it. I understand that he believes that the bill that MIKE LEE and TED CRUZ didn't object to doesn't satisfy his ideological goals. I understand that.

Yet, I suspect that the vast majority of the Republican Conference would pass that bill today if we had an opportunity to. The good news is that we hope to create that opportunity by ultimately defeating the previous question and enabling the House to be able to consider that bill.

Spare us more debates on commemorative resolutions, and let's fund the government.

Madam 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TRAN).

Mr. TRAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security has been shut down for 66 days, the longest shutdown in history. Yet, this shutdown is solely the choice of the House majority, my Republican colleagues.

Madam Speaker, 1 month ago, the Senate passed a bill that funded TSA agents responsible for security at our airports, the cybersecurity officers who protect us from online threats, the servicemembers in our Coast Guard, and FEMA disaster assistance as we get closer to hurricane and wildfire seasons.

This bill will also give us time to continue negotiating much-needed reforms to ICE and border protection. Americans from New York to Minneapolis to L.A. have watched as their neighbors have been wrongly arrested, beaten, and even killed in broad daylight.

ICE agents need to be held accountable and focus on deporting violent criminals, not creating terror in our schools, hospitals, or our places of worship.

While the Senate continues to make progress, my Republican colleagues have been sitting on their hands, ignoring the fears and suffering of our constituents.

How does that even serve the American people? Being stubborn in the face of terror does not serve the American people.

It is past time for this body to take action to fund our public safety infrastructure and get back to work for the people. Let's pass this DHS funding bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to

defeat the previous question so that we can bring it to the floor.

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

Madam Speaker, I note that there are three pieces of legislation that are coming to the floor that will make meaningful differences for the American people.

The Harnessing Energy At Thermal Sources Act is adding to a laundry list of things that we have done over the last 15 or 16 months to try to free up energy production in the United States. It amends the Geothermal Steam Act to streamline the permitting processes. A constant theme is the barriers to the American people being able to go out through their entrepreneurial spirit and produce energy that is affordable. In many instances, it makes dramatic improvements in terms of its cleanliness.

Currently, geothermal operators on non-Federal land that produces any quantity of Federal resources, like federally owned mineral estates, must comply with permitting, even if the Federal share of the mineral estate is trivial.

This would alleviate that burden and others by clarifying that the geothermal exploration or production on non-Federal lands is not subject to NEPA, the ESA, or the National Historic Preservation Act permitting processes. It doesn't change anything specific to our ability to produce them and the royalty structures, and it keeps in place important safeguards while allowing geothermal to be built out.

Madam Speaker, these are important, important changes for the people out there trying to produce them. We act like this is trivial. We act like this isn't a big deal for the ability of the American people to have affordable energy and for our business leaders to be able to go out and produce alternative energy sources.

The Reliable Federal Infrastructure Act repeals a 2007 mandate that Federal buildings reduce their use of fossil fuels by 2030 by, I think, 90 percent. These mandates came at a time when we thought that the United States would run out of oil.

Obviously, we had the shale revolution. We have the ability to be able to produce significant cleaner energy in the production of natural gas. We need reliable energy to be able to keep our buildings operating.

An overreliance on subsidized, unreliable wind and solar, including in my home State of Texas, has created difficulties with having reliability on the grid and, in many instances, has not produced any of the so-called improvements in terms of green energy that were promised.

We want to reduce those barriers, reduce the burdens, and be able to ensure that we are able to proceed.

Madam Speaker, the final point is the ESA Amendments Act of 2025. The ESA Amendments Act of 2025 makes

the first major reform to the broken Endangered Species Act.

Again, as I mentioned before, working with businesses in Texas, we have had numerous issues where that has been a major barrier to our ability to be able to get energy in production.

In the 50 years since the ESA was signed, only 3 percent of the listed species have ever recovered. It doesn't mean that we shouldn't be working and finding ways to make sure that we can protect certain species, but we often are listing certain species that aren't going to have a chance of recovery and that are actually used as a weapon and a tool of the left to stop the ability of us to be able to produce affordable energy for the American people.

□ 1250

The American people sit at home wondering why they can't afford goods and services, can't afford cars, can't afford energy, can't afford to be able to pay for their families. It is almost always tied back to the regulatory state and the burdens placed upon them by this body and by bureaucrats in this town.

What we have been trying to do for the last 16 months is unwind even just a fraction of those burdens. Yet we are met with constant resistance by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I know that we talk about gas prices and how they are at a point right now where we all want them to go down as we are dealing with the conflict with Iran, but they were \$6 a gallon nationally under the previous administration. Now they are somewhere around \$4 a gallon, and we want them to go down. We certainly can do that.

The best way to do that is to have massive production of oil and gas in the United States. We have tankers that are coming to the United States to get oil and gas. We have the ability to produce oil and gas if we get the regulatory climate such that they can do it, and that is what we are trying to do with this legislation.

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 to respond to. Apparently, my colleague from Texas wants the American people to believe that the reason they are paying astronomically high prices for gas is because the protections for bald eagles and humpback whales are too strong; that we need to weaken protections for endangered species, and lo and behold, we do that, gas prices will drop. It has nothing to do with the war in Iran. It couldn't possibly be connected to the unconstitutional war that the President has decided to wage. It must be the protections for bald eagles. I am sure that is the case.

Give me a break. The American people know better.

They have the audacity to lecture the House, lecture their colleagues on

the other side of the aisle about affordability when, right now, everything is getting more expensive.

For families back home in Colorado, the families that I am privileged to represent, times are tough. Costs for everything are going up. Health insurance, car insurance, appliances, gasoline, you name it, the price is going up.

I am sure it will come as great solace to those families that House Republicans have decided this week that the best way to address it is to pass a resolution congratulating themselves for the work that they have done. I am sure that is going to solve the problem. Republicans are on the case.

Again, with all respect to my colleague, I think he has been given an impossible assignment today: to defend that resolution. I suppose that is why he focused on some of the other bills that we are considering today, because that resolution is indefensible.

I suspect my Republican colleagues aren't necessarily watching today. I think me and my colleague from Texas are the only two Members of Congress in this Chamber. Nobody else is here—oh, of course, the Speaker as well—three Members. There is nobody else who will be here to debate this resolution.

I hope that some of my Republican colleagues, perhaps, may watch some of this and maybe decide tomorrow to vote against the rule because voting for the rule is an endorsement of Speaker JOHNSON's strategy to waste everyone's time, to waste our time, and to waste your time, and fundamentally, more than anything else, to waste the American people's time when there are real issues of consequence that merit our attention, our scrutiny, our inquiry, and our work.

The best way to stop this Chamber from debating meaningless and needless self-congratulatory resolutions is for a few Republicans to vote against the rule and to suggest that maybe there are some other issues that they would like this body to consider.

I hear a lot—you see all of this on social media all the time—my Republican colleagues who will demand votes on this legislation and that legislation, a laundry list of Republican priorities, none of which the House is considering, none of it. I guess we will find out, but I look forward to—I don't look forward, actually. I bemoan the fact. I suspect maybe Mr. MCGOVERN will be managing that rule next week when we do the congratulatory resolution on the resolution for the last resolution. We will have someone else debate that one because I suspect Mr. ROY and I will have grown tired of engaging in this debate.

In any event, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. May I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, I would note to my colleague from Colorado that the previous administration racked up a rather undistinguished list of antireliable energy policies and results. President Biden closed the Keystone XL pipeline on day one and rejoined the Paris Climate Accords, handicapping our industry.

In the final days of the administration, he used the stroke of a pen to grow a national monument by 85 percent and closed off thousands of acres to reliable energy production.

He closed off the Gulf of America to new oil and gas leasing. It is a decision thankfully reversed in the Big Beautiful Bill Act last summer. He single-handedly paused the exportation of liquefied natural gas, recognizing that LNG has the ability to free up the rest of the world from reliance on numerous of our enemies around the globe, and to create wealth and jobs and opportunities in the United States.

Biden's Department of Commerce sought to limit how fast boats could go in certain waters because of the Endangered Species Act. NOAA also abused the Endangered Species Act to deny oil leases.

Meanwhile, we have bills on the floor this week to try to reverse those issues. We have been dedicated to passing energy reform for the last 16 months. Just last week, we sent a number of bills to reform the Clean Air Act. There is issue after issue, some of which are recounted in the resolution the gentleman seems so hung up on spending time worrying about, when we have bill after bill that we are passing, some of which have become law and passed through the Senate and gotten to the President, but many of which are hung up by a Democratic Senate obstructionist that has the inability to actually move anything because of an artificial 60-vote threshold.

That is the simple reality. We are being hamstrung by resistance to our ability to deliver on the things that the American people sent us here to deliver upon.

The gentleman brought up the issue with respect to, I suppose, the motion to recommit that would be offered and that was offered as an amendment last night in committee. I wholly recognize that, yes, I opposed that amendment and have opposed it before because I do not believe that we should fund a Department of Homeland Security specifically isolating and pulling out Border Patrol and ICE. I just don't believe we should do that. I think it is wrong. I think we are setting a bad precedent. I think we are setting up a structure in which we are going to start saying we are going to have X pieces of these important—by the way, these are core functions that defend our way of life, defend our community, and defend our country. We can have debates about their policies. I understand that my colleagues want to add riders and want to add changes and impact policies attached to the funding, but we are set-

ting a terrible precedent by going down the road of saying we are going to carve out and say that we are not going to fund Border Patrol and ICE, which is the resistance. The American people understand that, because we have an obligation to fund all of the Department of Homeland Security. I believe that, and I think that is something that we should do. Whether we do that this way or whether we have to backdoor it through reconciliation, I am not sure I care. I think we should do it through appropriations, but I don't believe we ought to isolate it. We will see what the Senate does. We will see what the House does.

I am going to continue to stand up on the principle that Border Patrol and ICE should be funded fully through the appropriations process as the entire Department of Homeland Security should, whether it is FEMA, TSA, and every other function like Coast Guard, but that we should do it together: debate the policy, offer amendments on it, and move on.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first and foremost, I would just say the approach that my friend from Texas describes is wrong and imprudent and whatever adjectives he might characterize it as. That is the approach that Senate Republicans took, so the argument is best made to your colleagues in the upper Chamber. Republicans control the Senate, not Democrats. They passed that bill. They sent it here to the House, not once, but twice.

□ 1300

I understand that my colleague from Texas opposes that bill, and he has explained the reasons why he opposes it. I believe, as I said previously, that the vast majority of this House would vote in favor of that bill, which is why it ought to come up for an up-or-down vote. Let the chips fall where they may, no pun intended.

I will say this, Madam Speaker: I have been keeping meticulous count. I have a little, I guess you could call it, Biden bingo card here. I like to keep track. My colleague from Texas has mentioned Biden six times, six times and counting, in the last couple minutes.

I get it. I understand. He does not like Joe Biden. I understand. The message is received. Joe Biden isn't President anymore. Republicans have been in charge for 16 months. Republicans have had the majority for 16 months. Republicans have had complete control in Washington, the Senate, the Presidency.

What do Republicans have to show for it? Republicans have meaningless resolutions, whereas clause after whereas clause: We are wonderful. We have passed this resolution. We passed this bill. We are frustrated that some Senate Democrats have opposed it.

That is it.

This is 16 months of work.

Again, I would just say to you: I certainly can say very confidently that citizens in our country are not satisfied or pleased or heartened by the way in which this body is functioning. I think my colleague from Texas knows that too.

For the Republican voters out there, for those who believe in the House Republican Conference's policies or, you know, perhaps share their worldview, share their ideology, I am here to tell you they are not pursuing that agenda either. It is not that I disagree in this instance with the substance of what they are pursuing; it is that they are not pursuing any substance; it is that we are just wasting time.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would note that the reason that the former President's name comes up is because the lingering impacts of the previous administration continue. I mean, I already mentioned you have got the mother in Florida, but I can mention dozens and hundreds of examples of American citizens that have died as a result of people who were let in under the previous administration's policies, people who have died here today in America, policies we are trying to reverse and that we are trying to enforce against.

The lingering effects are fairly profound. I can assure you that the American citizens getting killed at the hands of criminals allowed into our country by the previous administration do not take solace in the fact that we now have a new administration, yet that administration is being hamstrung by virtue of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle's unwillingness to fund the very entities that try to stop the danger and the attacks on the American people.

That is what this is all about. That is what this all boils down to.

Again, I can assure you that the people I represent, the people I talk to across the State of Texas, are thrilled with tax cuts. They are thrilled with regulatory relief. They are thrilled with our actions in Venezuela. They are thrilled that we are reestablishing our strength in the Western Hemisphere and around the globe. They are thrilled that we are standing up to the cartels. They are thrilled that we designated the cartels as terrorists. They are thrilled that we stopped the flow at the border. They are thrilled that we have been enforcing the law and removing dangerous aliens. They are thrilled that our military has the highest recruitment and the highest enlistment in a generation because people actually believe in our country again. They are thrilled in the direction that this administration and this Congress wants to go, and they recognize that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are throwing up barrier after barrier

after barrier to be able to carry out the fundamental function of government, which is to defend the United States, defend our border, and do our job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, my colleague from Texas has spoken with great passion, great passion about any number of issues and policies that he favors and he would like to see accomplished. None of that has anything to do with the resolution that we are debating today. We might as well just—we can set aside a different time for Mr. ROY and I to engage in that debate.

Today, we are debating the resolution that is before us, a resolution that does nothing, achieves nothing, and changes nothing. As I said, it is a participation trophy.

I wish that I would have proposed perhaps a motion to recommit that would maybe change the name of this resolution to the participation trophy. We will have to think of that for next week. I have no doubt I will have another opportunity because I imagine that Speaker JOHNSON is going to keep this going for the next 7 months.

I am very curious about what participation trophy House Republicans intend to hand out to themselves next week. This week's was—I think rural America was the caveat that they added. Last week's was the big, beautiful bill—or not the big, beautiful bill. That is what Mr. ROY called it today. They changed it last week to the working families bill or something to that effect.

So anyway, we will have to see. I don't know. Maybe next week's resolution will be a commemorative resolution to congratulate House Republicans on the 14-day FISA extension that they passed, and we can spend a half an hour talking about all the ways that House Republicans have changed the country for the better. They are so desperate to convince Americans that they decided that a House resolution is a tool for them to make that case.

Again, there are better ways, Mr. Speaker, to spend this body's time.

I can't imagine that our Framers—that James Madison would have thought that this is how the House of Representatives would be functioning 250 years later. I can't possibly believe that.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I regret that our time for debate has come to a close. I will note, as I did last week, the fact that not a single member of the House Republican Conference is willing to come down to the floor and debate in support of these bills is telling. It tells you all you need to know. For those that are watching in the gallery and all of those

who might be watching from home on C-SPAN, there are 218 members of the House Republican Conference, 218. None of them, save for my colleague from Texas, were willing to come to the floor to speak in support of the resolution congratulating themselves for the work that they have done this year, not one.

What is even more fascinating, because, of course, as you know, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a long resolution, four or five pages, whereas clause after whereas clause recounting all of the bills and the resolutions that were passed last spring and last fall and last summer, and this winter, they gave this resolution to the newest member of the House Republican Conference. He has been in Congress for like 6 days, I think. He was sworn in last Tuesday or Wednesday.

I get it. I understand why they gave this resolution to the new guy. You know, it is a tough assignment to say your first bill is going to be a bill congratulating the rest of us for a job well done. That is a tough assignment.

Mr. Speaker, rural America is struggling. I know I don't need to tell you that. Rural farmers in my State are struggling. The cost of everything is going up. Trump's burdensome tariffs forced costs to skyrocket a year ago.

In 2025, 15,000 farms closed, 15,000 farms. The rate of bankruptcy for America's farmers has never been higher. It has never been higher. I challenge any of my Republican colleagues, those who, like me, represent rural communities and farmers and ranchers, I challenge them to go take this resolution to their constituents. Ask them whether they think that this House deserves applause and plaudits and credit and congratulations for a job well done.

□ 1310

I am pretty sure I know the answer. I urge my colleagues, if they, like me, are sick and tired of this place wasting time functioning in this dysfunctional way, then oppose the previous question, oppose the rule, oppose the underlying bills, and join us so that we can get back to the serious issues that face the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note that we are talking about rural America. Last summer, when we passed the largest tax savings for the American people in history, it included significant savings with respect to the death tax that cripples American farmers, and not a single one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle supported that.

We advanced that legislation. We advanced that tax reduction so that American farmers can pass down their farms to the next generation without having to give it up because of the burden of Federal Government.

My colleague invoked the Founders, that they couldn't imagine we would be

here having this discussion. I, in fact, think that the Founders would be quite pleased to see us on the floor reversing the regulatory state and reversing the burdens being placed on the American people that are limiting their ability to do what God gave them the ability to do.

That is what we are doing with respect to getting these barriers in the Endangered Species Act: the energy mandates on the Federal buildings, putting us into unreliable power rather than reliable power, and allowing ourselves to have geothermal production without barriers that stand in the way of the American people doing what they do best.

That is absolutely what the Founders would have envisioned us doing on the floor of the House of Representatives. I am proud to be doing that. I am proud of what we have been doing the last 16 months.

As I said before, the people whom I talk to when I go home to Texas are thrilled that our border is secure. They are thrilled our enlistments are up with our military. They are thrilled we are standing up to cartels. They are thrilled we are removing bad actors in this country.

They are thrilled we are removing the bureaucratic state. They are thrilled we are firing Federal bureaucrats. They are thrilled we held flat spending for discretionary spending for the last 3 years. They are thrilled that we have tried to make sure that we have money aside to be able to do what our Democratic colleagues refuse to do.

Today, I urge adoption of this rule, a rule to put forth legislation that will help the American people in the face of opposition from my colleagues here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1189 OFFERED BY
MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of the motion.

SEC. 7. 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. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WIED). 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 will be postponed.

FIRE IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMING EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS ACT

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1174, I call up 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, 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. 6387

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 “Fire Improvement and Reforming Exceptional Events Act” or the “FIRE Act”.

SEC. 2. AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA INFLUENCED BY EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS OR ACTIONS TO MITIGATE WILDFIRE RISK.

Section 319(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7619(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “OR ACTIONS TO MITIGATE WILDFIRE RISK” after “EVENTS”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “DEFINITION OF EXCEPTIONAL EVENT” and inserting “DEFINITIONS”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by redesignating clauses (i) through (iv), as subclauses (I) through (IV), respectively;

(C) by striking “(A)” and all that follows through “an event that—” and inserting the following:

“(A) EXCEPTIONAL EVENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘exceptional event’ means an event that—”;

(D) by amending subclause (III) of subparagraph (A)(i), as redesignated, to read as follows:

“(III) is an event that is—

“(aa) a natural event;

“(bb) caused by a human activity that is intended to mirror the occurrence or recurrence of a natural event; or

“(cc) caused by a human activity that is unlikely to recur; and”;

(E) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(i) EXCLUSIONS.—In this subsection, the term ‘exceptional event’ does not include—

“(I) ordinarily occurring stagnation of air masses;

“(II) meteorological inversions; or

“(III) air pollution relating to source non-compliance.”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) ACTION TO MITIGATE WILDFIRE RISK.—The term ‘action to mitigate wildfire risk’ means a prescribed fire or similar measure, undertaken in accordance with State approved practices, to reduce the risk and severity of wildfires.”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “March 1, 2006” and inserting “18 months after the date of enactment of the FIRE Act”;

(ii) by inserting “revisions to” before “regulations”;

(iii) by adding “or actions to mitigate wildfire risk” before the period at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting “including proposed revisions to regulations,” after “subparagraph (A).”;

(ii) by inserting “or action to mitigate wildfire risk” after “an exceptional event”;

(iii) by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “this section”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) REGIONAL ANALYSIS.—When more than one State notifies the Administrator of its intent to submit a petition pursuant to this section for an exceptional event or an action to mitigate wildfire risk for the same air quality event, or, if the Administrator determines such a multistate air quality event has occurred, the Administrator shall conduct regional modeling and analysis sufficient to satisfy the demonstration required for an exceptional event or an action to mitigate wildfire risk petition for such air quality event.

“(D) TRANSPARENCY.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the FIRE Act, the Administrator shall establish, and thereafter update monthly, a public website describing the status of all petitions submitted pursuant to this section for exceptional events and actions to mitigate wildfire risk.”;

(4) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (v) as clauses (iii) through (vi), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) the principle that actions to mitigate wildfire risk can play an important role in reducing the magnitude and frequency of wildfires”;

(5) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “or action to mitigate wildfire risk” before “must be”;

(B) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) a clear causal relationship must exist, or be reasonably expected to exist, between the measured exceedances of a national ambient air quality standard and the exceptional event or action to mitigate wildfire risk to demonstrate that the exceptional event or action to mitigate wildfire risk caused a specific air pollution concentration at a particular air quality monitoring location.”; and

(C) by amending clause (iv) to read as follows:

“(iv) there are criteria and procedures for the Governor of a State to petition the Administrator to exclude air quality monitoring data that is directly due to exceptional events or actions to mitigate wildfire risk from use in determinations by the Administrator with respect to—

“(I) area or source exceedances or violations of the national ambient air quality standards;

“(II) the designation, redesignation, classification, or reclassification of an area;

“(III) the demonstration by a State of attainment of a national ambient air quality standard;

“(IV) attainment determinations;

“(V) attainment date extensions;

“(VI) finding a State implementation plan to be inadequate; or

“(VII) preconstruction demonstrations under section 165(a)(3).”;

(6) by striking paragraph (4).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

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 insert extraneous material on H.R. 6387.

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. 6387, the FIRE Act, a bipartisan bill introduced by Congressman GABE EVANS of Colorado and co-led by Congressman ADAM GRAY of California.

The FIRE Act ensures that States are not penalized for wildfire mitigation practices like prescribed or controlled burns and brush clearing. States currently limit these practices for fear of falling out of containment of national air quality standards.

Unlike wildfires, prescribed burns do not automatically qualify as exceptional events under the current provisions of the Clean Air Act. This is because prescribed burns are human caused, likely to recur, and preventable. As a result, prescribed burns are often counted against States for the purpose of national air quality standards.

In 2016, the EPA amended the exceptional events rule in an effort to include prescribed burns, but the attempt failed. Only one prescribed fire qualified for the exceptional events exception in the last decade.

Congress must amend the Clean Air Act to allow wildfire mitigation to be included as an exceptional events exception.

□ 1320

Time has taught us that agency action is not enough to address the current statutory obstacles. The FIRE Act directly amends the Clean Air Act so that prescribed burns are treated as exceptional events and States are not penalized for wildfire mitigation measures. It provides clarity and predictability for air quality planning and encourages proactive wildfire measures.