

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I left this out earlier, and I apologize. It is a big part of the bail system. It is also to ensure their good behavior while out on bond. It is both presence on the court date and good behavior between the time the bond is posted and the time of that court date.

What the data shows us is that without one of these bills, there is an increase from 62 percent to 72 percent of recidivism. That helps our police officers and honors those who have been wounded, physically or psychologically, while serving in law enforcement, and those who answered the last call, like Officer Hall.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will vote to put this rule forward. I urge the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1275 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7711) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7711.

SEC. 12. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 7711 no later than three calendar days after passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. MCGOVERN. 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.

PROVIDING THAT SECTION 11 OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 1224 SHALL HAVE NO FORCE OR EFFECT

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 1274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1274

Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is simple. Two weeks ago, the Rules Committee met to provide for consideration of the farm bill, H.R. 7567, in addition to H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.

Nothing in this rule changes that. Instead, the rule before us makes a procedural change, which will allow H.R. 1346 and the farm bill, both, to be transmitted to the Senate separately for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1346. For too long, the people of western Minnesota, along with families and farmers across the entire country, have been subjected to frustrating, outdated, and unnecessary regulations.

Currently, our growers are subjected to patchwork regulations that effectively ban the sale of E15 during the summer months. The summer ban is a direct hit to the American taxpayer. It limits consumer choice, drives up prices at the pump during the height of the summer travel season, and restricts the market for homegrown biofuels.

Because of these antiquated rules, farmers have been forced to rely on temporary, short-term emergency waivers that create confusion rather than progress.

The legislation before us today changes that. It includes text for permanent, year-round E15 to finally provide the certainty that our agriculture and energy sectors deserve. We are moving past the era of temporary fixes and toward a future of long-term stability.

The benefits of E15 are clear and backed by significant data. First, this is a major win for American consumers. E15 is a lower cost fuel option, typically priced 20 to 40 cents per gallon less than regular unleaded gasoline.

In a time of fluctuating global energy markets, providing this relief is a ne-

cessity for hardworking Americans. In fact, E15 adoption would save American drivers an estimated \$27 billion a year on gas purchases, putting roughly \$200 back into the pocket of the average American household annually.

Second, this is a win for our national security and energy independence. Ethanol is produced within American borders by American workers. Every gallon we blend is a gallon of oil we do not need to import from foreign countries.

By leaning into domestic production, we are strengthening our energy independence and reinforcing our commitment to American-made energy.

The American people understand this. Eighty percent of citizens believe renewable fuels, like ethanol, are necessary for our energy independence, and 71 percent support increasing the availability of E15 to help lower prices.

Year-round E15 is a massive win for the American farmer. In western Minnesota, our corn growers are large supporters of the biofuels industry. They deserve a fair and consistent market for their product.

Full adoption of E15 would increase corn consumption by 2.4 billion bushels, supporting our rural communities and ensuring steady, predictable demand year-round.

Beyond the farm, the economic impact is staggering. Full E15 adoption would add \$25.8 billion to the U.S. GDP and support an additional 128,000 full-time jobs.

Beyond the economic and agricultural benefits, H.R. 1346 provides essential regulatory and market certainty. It enhances fuel supply chain stability and improves certainty for the entire fuel industry by eliminating unfair advantages for some refineries over others.

By reforming the small refinery exemption process, this bill helps the Environmental Protection Agency set renewable fuel standard annual volumes in a timely, transparent, and fair manner. It removes the reoccurring tension between refiners and agricultural stakeholders, allowing everyone from farmers to fuel retailers to better plan for the future.

It is important to address the technical advancements of vehicles since the current regulations were created.

□ 1320

E15 is legally approved for all vehicles built since 2001 or later, which accounts for more than 96 percent of the cars on the road today. Furthermore, E15 burns cleaner and reduces emissions that harm our health and our environment.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to keep hitting the pause button on American energy every summer. This legislation removes the hurdles that have stifled E15 for decades. It gives farmers the confidence they need to plan, and it gives consumers a lower-cost option when they need it most.

The American people are calling for solutions. This bill provides more

choice at the pump and lower prices for America. It is real savings and real money back in the pockets of hard-working Americans.

It is time for a permanent, nationwide solution that supports our growers, lowers costs for families, and reinforces our commitment to American-made energy.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is what happens when you try to make a deal by telling people what they want to hear. It is what happens when you come to an agreement by telling one group of people one thing and another group of people the total opposite.

That is the situation that Speaker JOHNSON finds himself in. He can't keep his word to his own Members, can't manage his own Conference, can't figure out how to pass a bill, and apparently can't keep his stories straight between the two groups he was negotiating with. The incompetence takes my breath away.

We are now wasting floor time to basically undo something Republicans did last week, to unattach an E15 bill from the farm bill after Republicans had us vote to attach an E15 bill to the farm bill. You can't make this stuff up.

That is what this is all about: shady backroom deals falling apart because Republican leadership can't keep its word and just hoped that everything would somehow work out and nobody would notice anything.

Former Speaker Kevin McCarthy used to do the same thing: promise everything to everyone, cut one side deal after another, and hope nobody noticed. How did that work out for him?

Maybe, just maybe, there is a lesson here. If you are going to make a deal, make an honest deal. If you are going to write a bill, know what is in the bill. If you are going to promise your Members something, maybe don't come back 3 weeks later and say: Actually, never mind.

I have to say I am a little surprised that some of my Republican colleagues from the Midwest are going along with this strategy because if you think separating E15 from the farm bill will help you get what you want, I have a degree from Trump University for you.

This is not some brilliant legislative maneuver. It is a quick way to make sure the Senate never takes it up. The reason I know this is because the way the bill is written. The reason why this doesn't have much of a future is because—get this—this bill will cost over \$2 billion, billion with a b, and none of it is offset.

What happened to the deficit hawks? \$2 billion, basically, that is just going to be added to the debt. It will be dead

on arrival at the Senate, and again I think everyone knows that.

If I represented a corn-producing State, I would not be thrilled that my leadership took one of my top priorities and pulled it out of a bill that possibly had a chance to move and said: Trust us.

I don't know whether the gentlewoman read the rule because it sounded a little bit confused here, but here is the rule. It is one sentence. It doesn't talk about bringing E15 to the floor. It doesn't allow for there to be a debate or an amendment on an offset so that we don't add \$2 billion to the credit card. It basically just is a rule that will detach E15 from the farm bill. That is it. I don't know. I wouldn't feel particularly comfortable if that is all that we were doing today, that that is all that the bill is accomplishing.

What we have here is a majority that cannot manage its own Conference, cannot keep its promises, and cannot pass its own agenda without completely breaking into disarray. The American people see this.

They see a Republican majority that spent weeks fighting with itself over the farm bill.

They see a Republican majority that cannot decide whether E15 belongs in the farm bill, outside the farm bill, attached to the farm bill, detached from the farm bill, or shoehorned into something else.

They see a Republican leadership that panders to the American people talking about lowering costs and inflation and then does none of it.

Here is the thing. Republicans are bad at governing because they do not actually believe in governing. They believe in power for the sake of power. They believe in theatrics. They believe in blaming everybody else. When the time comes to do the basic work of this House, they fall apart. They block amendments. They shut down debate. They cut food assistance and healthcare, while protecting the rich and powerful. They fund Donald Trump's vanity projects, while families are getting crushed by the cost of groceries, rent, gas, and medicine. They know that their agenda is unpopular, and that is why they are not trying to earn people's votes anymore. They have given up on that.

Instead of changing their agenda, they are changing the rules of democracy itself. Instead of earning votes, they are rigging maps. Instead of persuading people, they are silencing them. Instead of serving voters, they are choosing their voters. Just look at what is happening across this country.

Donald Trump demanded that red States start gerrymandering so Republicans can cling to power in this House, and Republican politicians lined up to do it—the hell with democracy, the hell with what the people want.

It is a very different story in States like Virginia where they actually had a vote on the new maps. People voted. Guess what. Voters approved a redis-

tricting plan to fight back against the staggering Republican assault on our democracy. A narrow majority on the Virginia Supreme Court tossed it aside—an awful, awful decision in my view.

Now, the United States Supreme Court has taken another wrecking ball to the Voting Rights Act, a law that for generations helped protect many communities from having their voices diluted and their powers stolen.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker, we are not going back to the days of Jim Crow. Too many people have fought too hard for equal representation in this country.

A party that is confident in its ideas does not need to make it harder for people to vote.

A party that is proud of its record does not need to dilute people's representation.

A party that knows how to govern does not spend its time making shady side deals and begging courts to save it from voters.

But this Republican majority is not confident, not proud, and sure as hell not competent. Case in point: today's rule, a rule to undo just one more mess of their own making.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a hell of a lot better than this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, as it often happens with the opposition, they stray off into every topic that they can think of and forget to focus on what we are here to talk about. What we are talking about is a rule to allow E15 to come to the floor to have a vote, so we are talking about energy independence. We are talking about saving Americans dollars on their gas bill. I just wanted to remind the public that that is what we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) to talk about E15.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for year-round E15, this rule, and the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, which finally makes it a reality.

For too long, Washington has prevented Americans from having more choices at the pump. E15 is an available, affordable, American-made fuel that can help lower costs, strengthen our energy independence, and support the men and women who feed, fuel, and clothe the world.

This is exactly the kind of commonsense, all-of-the-above energy policy that House Republicans were elected to enact—one that embraces American resources, reduces our dependence on foreign oil, and trusts the American people to make their own decisions.

In the Big First District of Kansas, our farmers work hard every day to produce the feedstocks that power American ethanol. Year-round E15 is a

win for those farmers, a win for consumers, and a win for American energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1346, this rule, and I support year-round E15.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, I think there is some confusion here. I have the rule. Maybe I have the wrong rule, I don't know, but the resolution says: "Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect."

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman if she could tell me where in this rule it says that we are bringing E15 to the floor. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman to tell me where in this rule it says that.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker and Mr. MCGOVERN, I believe that you understand that that is referencing the decoupling, and it does allow for E15 to be brought to the floor—I mean maybe not exactly in the language that is on the paper.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the other rule we did, it makes it in order. It is already in order. It can be called up right this second, but in this, it basically doesn't make it in order. There is nothing here that says that this bill will be brought to the floor. This decoupling makes it more likely that the Senate could ignore it.

It doesn't even guarantee that we are going to have a debate on the House floor on this, otherwise, it would say that specifically.

The rule that we are voting on today does not bring E15 to the floor. If it did, it would say it.

Again, this is a good education, I think, for my colleagues here. Read the rule because my friends on the other side don't always explain the rule correctly and here it is. It is one line, and it does not bring it up.

What it does is, it decouples E15 from the farm bill, which makes it more likely that the Senate will kill it if it ever gets over there.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will clarify. I think my point was that the opposition went off on a whole bunch of other issues, and from his own admission, this is about E15. This is about decoupling from whatever the technical language is in that amendment.

We are talking about E15, not about all of the other issues that he spoke about earlier, so I will focus on E15.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation for H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, which would finally allow the year-round sale of E15 fuel nationwide.

For States like Indiana, this bill is not just a fuel policy. It is about supporting our farmers, strengthening rural economies, and lowering costs of hardworking families. My district is home to the countless corn producers whose livelihoods depend on strong and reliable markets. Right now, corn prices are painfully low, and many farmers are facing significant uncertainty heading into another growing season.

Passing year-round E15 would provide immediate relief. Experts estimate this policy would increase corn demand by roughly 2.4 billion bushels and raise corn prices by approximately 35 cents a bushel. That matters to the family farms in my district. It means stronger markets, greater stability, and more confidence for producers making investments in the future.

The Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act is also a major win for American consumers. Year-round E15 is projected to save drivers nearly \$27 billion annually at the pump, with the average household saving around \$200 a year on gasoline purchases. This bill will bottom line lower prices at the gas pump and provide another source of fuel as we unleash American energy dominance.

Ethanol is already a powerful economic engine, generating more than \$9 billion in tax revenue in 2025 alone while supporting jobs across agriculture, transportation, and energy production. This is an American-made fuel that reduces dependence on foreign energy while supporting domestic manufacturing and agriculture at the same time. H.R. 1346 is a commonsense, bipartisan solution that benefits both producers and consumers.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to read the rule again for my colleagues on the Republican side: "Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect." Just like Midwest House Republicans if they agree to this deal.

Bottom line is, you fought to get this provision attached in the farm bill, and now we have a rule that basically detaches this issue from the farm bill. It doesn't even give us a pathway to bring it to the House floor. I am stunned by all of this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 8698, the Lower Prices at the Pump Act, which would make it a Federal crime for oil companies and gas stations to price gouge the American people under cover of President

Trump's illegal and misguided war in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, today, the average price of gas across the United States increased to more than \$4.50 per gallon. That is up from roughly \$3 per gallon a year ago before Trump launched this disastrous war.

What are Republicans doing about this price gouging? Nothing. Not a thing. They don't care if people are struggling to put gas in the tank. When asked just yesterday about the situation, the President said: "I don't think about Americans' financial situation." However, 1 month before the 2024 elections, Donald Trump said: "within 1 year, you are going to have electric bills and energy bills and gasoline for your cars is going to be 50 percent cheaper than it is right now." That is what Trump said. What a crock. What a crock. I need a neck brace for the whiplash here. If my Republican colleagues actually want to address the cost-of-living crisis, they will vote with Democrats to defeat the previous question, which would allow us to vote on legislation to bring down gas prices.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGUIRE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because people in the district I represent and across the country are being crushed by skyrocketing gas prices.

Prices have been rising since this President got into office for healthcare, for groceries, and now for gas prices because of this reckless war of choice.

Our constituents deserve better. They deserve immediate relief. They deserve better than emptying their wallet every time they fill up at the pump.

As we know from watching other crises, Big Oil and Gas will take any opportunity to pad their profits, so Congress should act now to protect consumers. That is why I am offering this bill, the Lower Prices at the Pump Act, the commonsense solution to protect the American people from price gouging.

The bill I am offering prevents Big Oil from price gouging in case they attempt to take advantage of the economic uncertainty and instability created by the war with Iran. They have done it before, and they could do it again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to join us to bring this bill up for a vote.

Our constituents are being crushed by prices across the board as it is, and

President Trump has told us that he is too preoccupied with his ballroom to care.

We must protect consumers at the pump to protect them from big corporations who might try to pull a fast one.

Our jobs are to make lives easier, not harder, for Americans, and the time to act is exactly right now. That is why I am asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up this important bill.

□ 1340

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), the great E15 leader.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of E15 year-round. This will lower gas prices. At a time when we need to help the family budget, today, we are doing something about it. Today, the Republicans are actually doing something to lower the gas prices for everyone in this great country.

I represent the Nation's largest agricultural district, and there is a reason why Iowa farmers and families are so passionate about this issue. It will expand the market for farmers. It will secure energy independence. It will lower the gas prices for all of our families.

Gridlock in D.C. has prevented the passage of E15 for over a decade. Today, we are finally taking action.

Trump called on Congress to get year-round E15 passed and to his desk when he was in Iowa earlier this year. I agree with President Trump that our farmers, our families, and our rural communities deserve this victory.

At the beginning of this year, I was appointed as co-chair of the E15 Rural Domestic Energy Council to find a solution, and that is what we have. From farmers to energy producers to fuel retailers to equipment dealers, support of year-round E15 spans all sectors of our economy.

In Iowa, the option to buy E15 means lower gas prices by up to 40 cents per gallon. It drives nationwide savings of about \$20 billion. It will boost corn demand by 2.4 billion bushels and increase farm income by \$14 million.

E15 is truly a game changer for our State, and we want to see these benefits shared across the country. After months of negotiation and listening to the voices of all stakeholders, it is time to get this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support E15 and lower gas prices for all families, small businesses, and the agricultural community. That is what this bill will do.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am just kind of amazed listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Republicans fought tooth and nail to get this at-

tached to the farm bill. I mean, they said this was like a huge, huge issue, and now, they are leading the charge to detach it from the farm bill. I mean, I don't get that.

That means that if it gets sent over on its own to the Senate, and it is not going to have an offset, then it is not going anywhere, even if you can pass it in the House.

I mean, it is a complete capitulation by midwestern House Republicans. I mean, it is stunning to me that my friends are caving like this.

This whole E15 debacle is a great example, I think, of just how dysfunctional Congress has become under Republican rule. Year-round E15 was included in a bipartisan, end-of-year spending package back in 2024, a deal that was negotiated by none other than Speaker JOHNSON. That was 1½ years ago.

Guess what happened. Elon Musk and President Trump blew up the deal. Musk tweeted about how much he hated the bill over 100 times and, over a 2-day span, threatened to fund primary challenges to anybody who voted for it. Then, later that second day, President Trump came out against the deal.

Fast forward to this January, where Republicans in support of year-round E15 threatened to vote against their own party's agenda until they got an up-or-down vote on their proposal. They said that this issue was existential to the farmers they represent.

Yet, in the end, they caved like they always do, and a deal was cut between midwestern Republicans and the leadership to create an E15 Rural Domestic Energy Council. They didn't get a solution. They got a do-nothing task force.

At the time, Representative MILLER-MEEKS of Iowa said that the Council was created because Republicans "failed in our primary duty to deliver immediate relief to rural America."

The partisan task force failed to produce a bill by the February 15 deadline, breaking another promise. Months later, at the end of April, text mysteriously appeared from some back room in the Capitol.

The text was filed by Representative FISCHBACH as an amendment to the farm bill. She even tried to sweeten the deal by adding billions of dollars in taxpayer-funded handouts to the oil industry, but that amendment was, once again, blocked by Republican leadership, and it never got a vote.

Instead, Speaker JOHNSON told one group of Republicans that E15 will get its own vote and be added to the farm bill, while telling a different group of Republicans the exact opposite.

Now, here we are, debating a bill to detach the E15 proposal from the farm bill after just passing a rule that combined the E15 proposal with the farm bill.

I hope my midwestern Republican friends take note. They all got bamboozled. If this rule passes, E15 will be delinked from the farm bill and ignored

by the Senate, and they will be back at square one.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FISCHBACH for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill allowing for year-round sale of E15 fuel and bringing much-needed certainty to our Nation's fuel markets.

I remind people often that the number one industry in the State of Illinois is agriculture. It is not anything in Chicago or elsewhere. It is agriculture. We lead the Nation in soybean production. We are second in corn production.

My own district is the 10th largest ag district in the country. I am proud to have nine ethanol plants that touch my district. The bill here today will help our farmers, help rural America, and help agriculture.

Right now, outdated Federal rules create unnecessary barriers to selling E15 during the summer months. This leads to confusion, market disruptions, and, ultimately, higher costs for consumers.

Refiners are forced to make decisions months in advance, often without clarity on whether E15 will even be allowed when the fuel reaches the pump. That uncertainty ripples across the entire supply chain.

H.R. 1346, which we are debating and voting on today, fixes this problem with a simple, commonsense solution, allowing for year-round sales of E15 while making reasonable reforms to the small refinery exemption process.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. This bill does not mandate anything. It does not force retailers to sell E15, and it does not force consumers to buy it. What it does is expand choice. It allows retailers to offer E15 year-round if it makes sense for their businesses and their customers.

That is why this legislation has earned support from a broad coalition—farmers, biofuel producers, refiners, and fuel retailers alike. Groups that don't always get along have come together because they recognize the value of certainty, transparency, and fairness in our fuel policies.

For consumers, this means more options and lower prices at the pump. For farmers in districts like mine, it means stronger demand for our homegrown crops and greater economic stability in our rural communities.

For our energy sector, it means a more predictable regulatory environment that supports investment and long-term planning. At a time when American families are sensitive to energy prices and our farmers are navigating tight margins, we should be doing everything we can to promote stability, expand opportunity, and support more domestic production.

Year-round E15 is a win-win-win. It is a win for consumers. It is a win for our

farmers. It is a win for American energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1346.

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

Mr. Speaker, a couple of things I will say to my friends who are talking about how important E15 is. Supporting the rule makes it less likely that it is going to become law. I don't understand the way they think.

In any event, the gentlewoman earlier chastised me for talking about other things besides this one-sentence rule. The reason why is because the Republican agenda sucks. It is awful. It doesn't address what real people are dealing with every day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the Trump administration's own analysis of rising food costs.

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

There was no objection.

[From USDA, Apr. 24, 2026]

FOOD PRICE OUTLOOK—SUMMARY FINDINGS
(By Hayden Stewart and Diansheng Dong)

FOOD PRICE OUTLOOK, 2026

This page summarizes the April 2026 Food Price Outlook forecasts, which incorporate the March 2026 Consumer Price Index and the March 2026 Producer Price Index numbers.

See the Overview page for Consumer Price Index and Producer Price Index datasets that include recent price changes and forecasts of price changes for all categories discussed in this summary.

Consumer Price Index for Food (not seasonally adjusted)

The all-items Consumer Price Index (CPI), a measure of economy-wide inflation, increased 1.0 percent from February 2026 to March 2026. It was up 3.3 percent from March 2025.

The CPI for all food increased 0.1 percent from February 2026 to March 2026. Food prices in March 2026 were 2.7 percent higher than in March 2025.

The level of food price inflation varied depending on whether the food was purchased for consumption at home or away from home:

The food-away-from-home (restaurant and other foodservice purchases) CPI increased 0.2 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and was 3.8 percent higher than in March 2025.

The food-at-home (grocery store or supermarket food purchases) CPI was unchanged from February 2026 to March 2026 and was 1.9 percent higher than in March 2025.

Rates of price change for the 15 food-at-home categories examined in the Food Price Outlook also varied widely. Average prices declined from February 2026 to March 2026 for eight of these categories, were unchanged for two categories, and increased for five categories. Two categories experienced a large price swing, defined as a 1-month price increase or decrease of at least 1.0 percent. Prices for sugar and sweets fell by 1.0 percent, while prices for eggs fell by 3.3 percent. No categories experienced a large price increase.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE (ERS) APRIL 2026
FORECAST

In 2026, prices for all food are predicted to increase 2.9 percent, with a prediction inter-

val of 1.3 to 4.6 percent. Food-at-home prices are predicted to increase 2.4 percent, with a prediction interval of 0.0 to 4.8 percent. Food-away-from-home prices are predicted to increase 3.6 percent, with a prediction interval of 2.8 to 4.5 percent.

The Food Price Outlook tracks and forecasts the annual percentage change in food prices by averaging observed and forecast prices for all months in the current year, compared to all months in the previous year. The Food Price Outlook does not forecast the 12-month year-over-year change from the month of the forecast. The Food Price Outlook forecasting methods are based entirely on statistical models that are fitted to recent trends in the data. These methods provide prediction intervals that narrow over the forecast period as more data become available and the degree of uncertainty declines. Discussions of price changes focus on the midpoint of these forecast intervals (titled "Mid" in the Food Price Outlook data files) and use the lower and upper bounds of a 95-percent prediction interval—based on past data the annual level of inflation is expected to fall in this interval 19 out of 20 times—to reflect the level of uncertainty (titled "Lower" and "Upper" in the workbooks, respectively). For a summary of forecasting methods used in the Food Price Outlook, see the article ERS Refines Forecasting Methods in Food Price Outlook.

RECENT HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Between the 1970s and early 2000, food-at-home prices and food-away-from-home prices increased at similar rates. However, between 2009 and 2019, their growth rates diverged; while food-at-home prices deflated in 2016 and 2017, monthly food-away-from-home prices rose consistently. Differences between the costs of serving prepared food at restaurants and retailing food in supermarkets and grocery stores partly explain this divergence.

In 2020, food prices increased 3.4 percent, including prices for food at home (3.5-percent increase) and food away from home (3.4-percent increase). This convergence in growth rates was largely driven by a rapid increase in food-at-home prices following the onset of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, particularly for meats and poultry, while food-away-from-home price inflation remained similar to its 2019 rate.

In 2022, food prices increased by 9.9 percent, faster than in any year since 1979. An outbreak of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) affected egg and poultry prices. The Russia-Ukraine war and economy-wide inflationary pressures, such as high energy costs, also contributed to food price inflation. Food-at-home prices increased by 11.4 percent. Food-away-from-home prices increased by 7.7 percent.

In 2023, food price growth slowed as economy-wide inflationary factors, supply chain issues, and wholesale food prices eased from 2022. Food-at-home prices increased by 5.0 percent. Foodaway-from-home prices increased by 7.1 percent.

Food prices rose by 2.3 percent in 2024 and 2.9 percent in 2025, slower than they had increased during 2020–23. Food-at-home prices increased by 1.2 percent in 2024 and 2.3 percent in 2025, lower than their historical average pace of growth (2.6 percent per year). Food-away-from-home prices rose by 4.1 percent in 2024 and 3.8 percent in 2025, still faster than their historical average (3.5 percent per year).

CPI FORECAST CHANGES THIS MONTH

In 2026, overall food prices are predicted to rise 2.9 percent. Food-away-from-home prices are predicted to rise 3.6 percent, faster than their 20-year historical average rate of price increase (3.5 percent). Food-at-home prices

are predicted to rise 2.4 percent, slower than their 20-year historical average rate of price increase (2.6 percent).

In 2026, among the 15 food-at-home categories examined in the Food Price Outlook, prices for 7 categories are predicted to grow faster than their 20-year historical average rate of growth. These include beef and veal, fish and seafood, fresh vegetables, processed fruits and vegetables, sugar and sweets, non-alcoholic beverages, and other foods. Prices for five other food-at-home categories are predicted to grow slower than their 20-year historical average rate of growth. These include pork, other meats, poultry, cereal and bakery products, and fresh fruits. Prices for eggs, dairy products, and fats and oils are predicted to decline in 2026 compared to 2025.

Beef and veal prices decreased by 0.4 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 after having increased by 1.4 percent from January 2026 to February 2026. Beef and veal prices were 12.1 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. The ERS Cattle & Beef—Sector at a Glance topic page reports that the U.S. cattle herd has decreased in size since 2019. However, according to analyses and forecasts reported in the ERS Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Outlook, consumer demand has remained strong in the face of tighter supplies. Beef and veal prices are predicted to increase 6.3 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 0.1 to 13.1 percent.

Pork prices rose 0.4 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 0.5 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Pork prices are predicted to increase 0.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -3.8 to 4.8 percent.

Poultry prices increased by 0.4 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 1.5 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Poultry prices are predicted to increase 0.7 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -2.6 to 4.1 percent.

Retail egg prices decreased 3.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 44.7 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. An ongoing outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) that began in 2022 has caused egg prices to increase by reducing egg layer flocks and egg production. Retail egg prices increased 32.2 percent in 2022, 1.4 percent in 2023, 8.5 percent in 2024, and 21.9 percent in 2025. However, USDA is projecting an increase in egg production in 2026 over 2025. There were fewer new detections of HPAI during the first quarter of calendar 2026 than there were during the first quarter of calendar 2025. Moreover, as discussed in the ERS Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Outlook, the availability of replacement pullets has been sufficient in 2026 to cover both regular flock turnover and unpredictable HPAI-related losses. Egg prices are predicted to decrease 29.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -40.0 to -15.6 percent.

Retail fresh vegetable prices increased by 0.9 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 7.5 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices for fresh vegetables are predicted to increase 4.8 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 0.3 to 9.5 percent.

Retail fresh fruit prices increased by 0.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 1.2 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices for fresh fruits are predicted to increase 1.0 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -2.2 to 4.4 percent.

Prices for sugar and sweets decreased by 1.0 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 8.1 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices have increased primarily for candy and chewing gum, a sub-component of the CPI for sugars and sweets that includes most types of chocolate candy.

Prices for sugar and sweets are predicted to increase by 8.1 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 5.5 to 10.7 percent.

Prices for nonalcoholic beverages decreased by 0.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 4.7 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices for nonalcoholic beverages have been increasing faster than the 20-year historical rate due in part to higher global coffee prices. Prices for nonalcoholic beverages are predicted to increase by 5.2 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 2.6 to 7.9 percent.

PRODUCER PRICE INDEX FOR FOOD (NOT SEASONALLY ADJUSTED)

A Producer Price Index (PPI) resembles a CPI in that a PPI reflects price changes over time. However, instead of retail prices, a PPI provides a measure of the average prices paid to domestic producers for their output. PPIs are reported for nearly every industry in the goods-producing sector of the economy. Three major PPI commodity groups are of interest to food markets: (1) unprocessed foodstuffs and feedstuffs, (2) processed foods and feeds, and (3) finished consumer foods. The farm-level and wholesale-level prices of commodities in these groups give a general sense of price movements across various stages of production in the U.S. food supply chain.

The PPIs are typically far more volatile than the CPIs, which are further down the supply chain. Price volatility decreases as products move from the farm to the wholesale sector to the retail sector. Because of multiple processing stages in the U.S. food system, the CPI typically lags movements in the PPI. The PPI is thus a useful tool for understanding what may soon happen to the CPI. ERS does not forecast industry-level PPIs for unprocessed, processed, and finished foods and feeds. However, these prices have historically shown a strong correlation with the all-food and food-at-home CPIs.

PPI FORECAST CHANGES THIS MONTH

Farm-level cattle prices decreased 2.7 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 16.2 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. A cyclical contraction of the cattle herd has resulted in tight cattle supplies and driven farm-level cattle prices higher. Farm-level cattle prices are predicted to increase by 7.5 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -2.8 to 19.6 percent.

Wholesale beef prices increased 2.8 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 19.7 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Wholesale beef prices are predicted to increase by 7.8 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -6.6 percent to 25.4 percent.

Prices for farm-level eggs rose 31.6 percent in 2025, primarily due to the spread of HPAI and reductions in egg production. However, U.S. egg production is recovering. Farm-level egg prices fell 12.5 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 83.6 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level egg prices are predicted to decrease by 73.0 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -84.3 percent to -44.9 percent.

Prices for farm-level milk rose 5.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 24.7 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level milk prices have been trending downward as U.S. milk production increases. Prices for farm-level milk are predicted to decrease 17.9 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -32.6 percent to 1.9 percent.

Vegetable prices can undergo large swings based on weather, production, seasonality, and other factors. Prices for farm-level vegetables decreased 7.1 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 after increasing 48.2 percent from January 2026 to February 2026.

Farm-level fresh vegetable prices were 49.0 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level vegetable prices are predicted to increase 16.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -2.0 percent to 40.3 percent.

Prices for farm-level fruit decreased 14.0 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 10.4 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level fruit prices are predicted to decrease by 6.0 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -16.3 percent to 6.0 percent. Prices for fruit, like those for vegetables, can undergo large swings based on weather, production, seasonality, and other factors.

Prices peaked for farm-level wheat in the first half of 2022 following the beginning of the Russia-Ukraine war. After decreasing by 23.1 percent in 2023, 22.3 percent in 2024, and 10.9 percent in 2025, farm-level wheat prices are predicted to increase 8.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -9.3 to 31.9 percent.

For official USDA farm-level price forecasts, see the World Agricultural Supply and Demand Estimates at a Glance report. For additional information, detailed explanations, and analyses of farm-level prices, see ERS outlook publications including the Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, Oil Crops, Wheat, Fruit and Tree Nuts, and Vegetables and Pulses reports.

See the Overview page for Consumer Price Index and Producer Price Index datasets that include recent price changes and forecasts of price changes for all categories discussed in this summary.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the USDA's April 2026 Food Price Outlook makes it clear that prices are not down. They are up. They are way up. Food prices are up 2.7 percent from last year. Restaurant prices are up 3.8 percent. Beef and veal prices are up over 12 percent. In fact, the average cost of a pound of beef is more expensive than the Federal minimum wage. I mean, let that sink in. Veal prices are up. Fresh vegetables are up 7.5 percent. Non-alcoholic beverages are up 4.7 percent. Grocery prices, overall, have gone up around 2 percent.

These are not Democratic talking points. These are the Trump administration's own numbers after 16 months of total Republican control in Washington.

They control the House. They control the Senate. They control the White House. They passed tax breaks for those who are well-off and well-connected, billionaires and millionaires. At the same time, they cut SNAP by \$200 billion. I hope they are proud of themselves.

They imposed tariffs. They started the war that is driving up food and gas prices. The price of fertilizer is going through the roof.

All they do is blame Biden, blame Democrats, and blame anyone, while they fail to find any solutions. They promised lower costs. What a crock. Their own USDA says that families are paying more because of their disastrous economic policies.

□ 1350

We are going to continue talking about things that my Republican friends think are extraneous because

these are real issues. These are real issues that everyday families are struggling with right now.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN), another great E15 leader.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. FISCHBACH for her leadership on this.

Here is the reality. Republicans and Democrats should all be wanting to help drive down costs for Americans right now: supply chain costs, costs for the home, and costs at the pump. Right now we have got a viable solution, 50 cents off per gallon with year-round nationwide E15. Whether you are filling up a truck or a tractor-trailer, a motor home or a minivan, this has a direct impact on families, and it is something we have been asking for in this Chamber for a long time on both sides of the aisle. Why hasn't this come to the floor for a vote?

I was just back in Iowa a couple weeks ago at a farmers roundtable in Atlantic, Iowa, and I heard the same question that I have heard from hundreds of roundtables in listening sessions across Iowa's 21 counties: How are we going to get year-round, nationwide E15 across the finish line? And when is Congress going to make sure that they are fighting for a waiver so that every spring our growers, our planters, and our farmers aren't asking this question?

Today, we have a chance to answer both those questions. This bill that we are about to vote on fixes the outdated regulations that have been holding E15 back for years and replaces it with a nationwide, permanent solution that is voluntary.

Importantly, throughout this fight, we have been able to focus on things that matter: American energy independence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have flown more combat missions in the Persian Gulf than I care to remember in my time with the U.S. Air Force all to be able to provide foreign energy sources to places like today in China where they consume 80 percent of the oil coming out of the Middle East. We should be focused on a domestic-based energy source, one that pairs up our traditional fuels with our biofuels, and this bill has that privilege of doing it.

Now, there is a lot of misinformation out there. There is insider lobbying going on, and there have been backroom deals on this very floor between people who are putting Iowa farmers and American consumers last.

I stood up. I was not going to let that happen. I am proud that we have been able to stand together in this. We have been able to negotiate and do what Congress should do: stand firm. They tried to kill it by making sure it never reached the floor, and foreign companies flooded this building with lobbying dollars. We have stood to reject that,

and I think we have been able to bring forward a strong path to make E15 year-round.

Just weeks ago, President Trump came to Iowa and said he would sign an E15 bill into law. The Vice President was just in my district on Tuesday and said that they would sign this into law.

This is an opportunity for American-made energy independence to start right here, not just in what we grow in our cornfields but what we produce in America. Every dollar saved at the pump is a dollar back in America's pocket.

I want to make sure that Iowa producers who support this industry receive the certainty that Congress will stop treating year-round access like a favor instead of recognizing it as a solution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman makes a strong case for his position. I don't know if he read the rule or not, but what he is doing with this rule is making it less likely that this will ever become law.

The reason why this was going to be attached to the farm bill is because I think my Republican colleagues understood that that may be a vehicle that was moving but that the Senate would not consider this legislation on its own.

Why is that? Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this measure would cost \$2.27 billion, billion with a b, and none of this is offset. If this were a program to help feed hungry people or if it were to help people get healthcare, my Republican friends would be quoting CBO left and right, but not in this case.

Some Republicans have a problem with the fact that this is \$2.7 billion added to the debt. My friends know that just sent over on its own, it is going nowhere in the Senate.

What we are doing today is Republicans are reversing their position. Again, Republicans insisted and fought to get this so that it would be attached to the farm bill, and now we have a rule that will unattach it to the farm bill. I don't know when the Speaker will bring this up for a vote, but I think everybody is pretty certain that the Senate isn't going to take it up, certainly not adding \$2.7 billion to the debt.

I don't understand the way my friends who claim to be champions for the farms in the Midwest—I don't understand why you flip-flopped on this issue, but you can explain that to your farmers.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, like most everybody here in the Chamber, I spend a lot of time at

home in my district. I am there every single weekend, and what you really hear related to energy is you hear three things:

First off, of course, people want lower prices at the pump. That is a no-brainer.

Secondly, of course, they want American energy dominance. They don't want to be reliant on others.

Then number three, they don't understand the role of outdated regulations. They would like more freedom to make their own decisions.

Well, boy, do I have a deal for them, and do I have a deal for us. Year-round E15 addresses all of those concerns.

Let's go to affordability first. We know that E15 is 40 or 50 cents a gallon cheaper than standard gasoline, and that will have a big impact on American families.

Secondly, when it comes to American energy dominance, I think most South Dakotans would rather our energy future be driven by what is going on in South Dakota cornfields rather than in Iranian oilfields. This is an incredible opportunity to make sure that we are able to buy more homegrown American fuel.

Now, number three, when we get to the freedom and rolling back outdated regulations, let's be really clear what this does. This just gives people more options at the pump. Nobody will be required to buy E15 at the pump. Nobody will be required to sell E15 at the pump. This is going to be the market at work.

What we know is that a 1970s-era EPA rule just tells Americans that, no, you can't—even if somebody wants to sell you E15 in the summer months—you can't buy it. What we know for those people who are concerned about environmental impacts is that E15 has a lower Reid vapor pressure than E10, so any smog concerns are not applicable. E15 is better for the environment in that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, almost no matter how you come down, whether you are concerned about affordability, whether you are concerned about geopolitics, whether you are concerned about over-regulation, E15 gives us the tools we need to move in the right direction.

I would close by saying this: I know the wheels of progress don't always turn quickly, but they are turning today, and when we vote off this House floor year-round E15, the winner will be the American people.

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

The gentleman just said the wheels of progress don't always turn quickly. Well, you guys are turning them backwards.

Nobody has explained to me why my Republican friends are leading the charge to undo what they demanded be done in the first place. So this doesn't smell right.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say on another issue that electric bills are up. Gas bills and prices are up. Grocery

prices are still too high. Inflation is at the highest rate it has been in 3 years.

And what is the President focused on? He is focused on a ballroom—get this—a ballroom, a billion-dollar security request tied to his White House makeover. Even some Senate Republicans are saying they need more details. Good. I hope they actually mean what they say. They should because the American people deserve the details, too. They deserve to know why Republicans can always find money for Donald Trump's wide range of vanity projects around D.C. but somehow can't find money to lower the costs for average working families.

Last year, Trump had his big birthday military parades. Tanks were in the streets. Troops were marching through Washington. It was a taxpayer-funded spectacle that the Army said cost tens of millions of dollars for a parade that just happened to fall on Donald Trump's birthday.

□ 1400

Now he has a laundry list of renovation requests. He wants to repaint the Eisenhower Executive Office Building. Meanwhile, preservationists are warning it could permanently damage a historic landmark.

He wants to turn the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Pool bright blue like a swimming pool in Florida. A Federal contract for that project has been reported in the millions, and preservation groups are suing because they say the administration skipped required historic review.

He wants a UFC fight on the White House lawn with a 4,500-seat arena built on the grounds of the White House. He wants race cars roaring down the streets of Washington in August. He wants a giant triumphal arch near Arlington National Cemetery, a 250-foot monument that veterans and historians are already fighting in court.

He wants to turn humble, public golf courses in D.C. into championship-level resorts while also using some areas as a dumping ground for remnants of his historic East Wing.

Mr. Speaker, none of this is serious or necessary. This is a rich guy decorating national buildings and monuments like they are one of his hotels and sticking taxpayers with the bill: enough money for the parade; enough money for the ballroom; enough for the blue reflecting pool, the UFC cage fight, race cars, the arch, and the golf courses.

I say to my Republican colleagues: Stop funding the vanity tour, and let's get back to work to actually helping hardworking people in this country.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close on E15, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest why we are here. Republican leadership made promises they could not keep, and they are now back here asking the rest of us to help clean up their mess. That is the whole story.

The longer this goes on, the more the American people lose faith not just in this Republican majority—I think they have lost faith in the Republican majority in this Congress—but in the basic idea that Congress can actually solve real problems.

Again, nobody can explain to me why, after defending this program, we are here with the rule to basically make it more likely that this will never materialize. This will go nowhere in the Senate.

Two-thirds of the American people say this country is headed in the wrong direction. And what do House Republicans do?

They gutted healthcare so that billionaires can get another tax giveaway.

They supported Trump's unpopular war, which has killed American servicemembers and driven up costs for everyday families.

Know why gas prices are going up? Look no further than the illegal, risky and reckless war that this President has launched.

Here is what is really frustrating: The majority in this Congress can't even bring itself to have a serious debate and vote on whether or not to authorize the use of military force in Iran. They step away. They don't want to get involved in that debate.

On Trump's ballroom, Republicans want to spend a billion dollars, billion with a b, on his tacky, stupid, vanity ballroom. That is what they would rather do than lower your costs and fight inflation. It is insane, and it is outrageous.

To my midwestern colleagues, again, who care about E15, I hope you got more than a handshake from your leadership, because once this gets separated from the farm bill, lots of luck.

Then what do you say to your farmers? What do you say to the people who you promised that you would fix this?

The bottom line is, we all know what is going on here. Again, the Senate is not going to take up an independent E15 bill. I stand corrected. Earlier I said that it costs \$2.2 billion. It is actually \$2.27 billion that it adds to the deficit and the debt.

This place is no longer a serious place to get stuff done, to solve problems. The American people are hurting. They are suffering.

I just did a townhall in Massachusetts, and all people wanted to talk about was how everything was more expensive. They were saying: What are you doing about the affordability crisis?

To be honest, the legislation being brought to the floor today by the previous rule and even now is not going to do anything to help lower costs for

anybody. That is sad because people are depending on us to help make their lives a little bit better, to help make their lives easier and more manageable.

People are hurting, and my Republican friends are just doing nothing. Legislation that amounts to press releases are now, you know, making it more difficult to pass legislation that my Republican friends say will help their farmers.

This is not the way government should be running.

I close by urging my colleagues to get their act together. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, vote "no" on the rule, and let's get back to doing the actual work of the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. We are here to move the E15 legislation forward. That is what we are here to do today.

It is interesting that the good gentleman from Massachusetts used his time to talk about almost everything except E15. I was happy to yield time to my colleagues to talk about E15 and the benefits and the advantages and what it could do for our farmers and energy independence.

I rise today to close this debate because the choice before us is clear. Do we continue with the status quo of emergency waivers, or do we finally provide permanent certainty that American families and farmers deserve?

We have spent decades hiding behind outdated regulations that do nothing but hike summertime fuel prices. Every single year, this country is forced to hit a pause button on American-grown energy. It makes no sense and, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am tired of it.

H.R. 1346 is about two things: lower costs and market stability. When families pull up to the pump, they should not be forced to pay more just because of what month it is on the calendar.

This is about providing real, permanent relief for hardworking Americans who are tired of seeing their pocketbooks take the fall for outdated red tape. This vote represents a choice between foreign oil and American energy independence. It is a vote for our corn growers across the country who are ready to fuel this country.

There is zero reason to rely on foreign countries for our energy needs when we can support American workers and strengthen our national security.

We are done with the era of temporary fixes that only create market instability. Our refiners, our retailers, and our rural communities deserve certainty.

E15 is cleaner. It is cheaper, and it is grown right here at home. Let's stop the games. It is time to pass a perma-

nent, nationwide solution that provides for our growers, puts American families first, and reinforces our commitment to American-made energy.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. That is the issue in front of us, to move E15 year-round forward.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1274 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8698) to protect consumers from gasoline and fuel price gouging, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8698.

SEC. 4. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 8698 no later than three calendar days after passage.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1445

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM) at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: