



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2024

No. 79

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 7, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT FRANKLIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

ANIMAL PROTECTION CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in less than 8 months, I am going to conclude my 28 years here in the House. One of my major priorities and proudest accomplishments has been to chair the Animal Protection Caucus and lead the effort in a number of those provisions. It didn't start out that way, but the more I listened, the more I studied, this priority stood out.

My first major accomplishment dealt with animal fighting, a barbaric practice with hidden support in Congress and around the country. There are pockets of some States where this tradition continues, but it is a barbaric tradition. They train dogs and chickens to fight to the death, and it is often organized in rings of criminal elements, people who are involved with illegal gambling, drugs. It is indescribable in terms of the cruelty that is involved. There are times where there are children involved watching this, the drugs, the potential harm to animals.

Infections took place with the chickens. There were millions of chickens that had to be destroyed because of infections that spread through animal fighting. This all is hidden from the general public. When the focus was trained on it, we were able to gain momentum here and ultimately enact step-by-step painful accomplishments that cracked down on this cruel activity.

They are some of the worst people on the planet, as I mentioned, dealing with drugs, gambling, money laundering, and the risk to the animal's health. We watched how the agenda broadened to include other areas as well—performing animals, protections of elephants, big cats.

Again, public attention on the cruel and dangerous practices that helped us make significant progress broaden the agenda beyond just animal cruelty. What we found is that the care and welfare of people's pets was also important in terms of protecting families. We found repeatedly that people would put themselves in harm's way in conditions of flood and natural disaster because they didn't want to leave their pets. Domestic abusers would stay with the abuser because they were afraid of what would happen to their pets.

We worked to expand protections in shelters for disasters and domestic vio-

lence to be able to include people's pets so they would feel more comfortable actually availing themselves to the services.

I am pleased with the strength of the movement. It has gained momentum. My law school alma mater, Lewis & Clark College, had one of the first animal studies programs across the country. We are watching these spread in colleges and universities across the country, where more and more people are studying, learning, and protecting animal provisions.

I was pleased that we recently have a rule now that will end the horrific practice of animal soring. This is where you torture a horse by wounding it so that it will have that distinctive gait or it would have extraordinarily heavy weights on their legs to develop that distinctive gait that is prized by some people who show horses, but is hopelessly cruel to animals themselves.

Year after year, we had a majority of people in both Houses supporting legislation to end this practice, but we were thwarted time and again by the special interests who wanted to promote the Tennessee walking horses.

Finally, we have seen a rule that has been promulgated that will end it after years of struggle. It is one more signal that the animal welfare movement is alive, well, and gaining momentum. It is something I hope to put my energies into in the remaining time I have in Congress to build this bipartisan movement to protect animals and meet our responsibilities.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF MUSIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of music education. We

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2877

recognized Music In Our Schools Month last month, but today, I want to recognize the 10 school districts and 2 schools in my district that were named for outstanding support of music education.

Over the past 25 years, the National Best Communities for Music Education Award has honored more than 1,000 schools and districts in 43 States for their unwavering commitment to music education as an integral part of a well-rounded education for all students.

Every year, the National Association of Music Merchants Foundation recognizes school districts across the country that are among the best communities in the Nation for music education. The award program recognizes and celebrates outstanding efforts by teachers, administrators, parents, students, and community leaders who have made music education part of a well-rounded education.

This year, they recognized 975 school districts, with 10 across the 15th Congressional District. Whether it be music class, choir, concert band, marching band, or the school musical, having music access and education is important for students' development.

Music is an incredibly important component of a well-rounded education—support access to music education and inspire the next generation.

I congratulate Armstrong County School District, Bald Eagle Area School District, Bellefonte Area School District, Clearfield Area School District, Curwensville Area School District, DuBois Area School District, Lewisburg Area School District, Port Allegany Area School District, State College Area School District, and West Branch Area School District on this distinguished award.

The NAMM Foundation also recognizes individual school districts with the Support Music Merit Award. This award is an opportunity for an individual school—public, private, parochial, or charter—to be acknowledged for its commitment to music education. I congratulate the Saint Francis School and the Tidioute Community Charter School.

This recognition continues to highlight the hard work our educators do to provide a comprehensive education that includes the arts. I congratulate all the schools in our region that have been recognized for their efforts to promote a well-rounded education.

CONGRATULATING FULLERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT ON TURNIP THE BEET AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Fullerton School District for receiving the USDA's Turnip the Beet award.

The Turnip the Beet award recognizes schools that go above and beyond

to provide high-quality meals for children during the summer. Without initiatives like this, many students would not have access to nutritional meals through the day during the summer.

Not only did Fullerton School District win the Turnip the Beet award in 2023, but they also are one of seven California school districts to win the gold.

I congratulate the Fullerton School District for their commitment to our youth and their health and for receiving, of course, this well-earned recognition.

ADVANCING RESEARCH ON BREAKTHROUGH THERAPIES

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to tell you about the work my colleague, General JACK BERGMAN, and I are doing as co-chairs of the Congressional Psychedelics Advancing Therapies Caucus.

The PATH Caucus, as it is known, is addressing the rising mental health challenges faced by millions of Americans by advancing research on breakthrough therapies like psychedelics.

Almost 50 million Americans struggle with some kind of mental health issue, as well as our veterans. Of course, our veterans carry those hidden scars from their service to this country.

The issue of mental health has never been more urgent for America. That is why we are spreading awareness in Congress to increase Federal funding for more research and to chart a new path for those who are struggling with mental health.

Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to the American public to study how we can better address mental illness in this country.

RECOGNIZING CYBERPATRIOT CHAMPIONS TROY HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Troy High School students for their impressive victory in the national CyberPatriot cybersecurity competition.

The students on the team placed sixth amongst almost 3,000 in the open division. In the All Services division, students on Team W.A.T.T. placed first out of almost 1,400.

Led by their coach and teacher, David Kim, these students competed against thousands of other students in a series of cybersecurity tests, finding and fixing cybersecurity vulnerabilities like the ones we face on a day-to-day basis.

These Orange County students have shown us that America is safe in the future from cybersecurity attacks. As these Troy High School students return home to Orange County, they have made us proud and have shown us that we can rely on the next generation to keep America safe in the environment of cybersecurity.

HONORING ED MULICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor an exemplary figure in education from Utah, Mr. Ed Mulick, of Park City High School.

Just like the Olympians who go for gold on the mountains of Park City, Mr. Mulick has achieved the Sarah and Stephen Doilney Teaching Excellence Award for an unparalleled fifth time.

Awarded by the Park City Education Foundation, this achievement is not just a testament to his excellence but his enduring impact on generations of students.

Like a champion returning to the field season after season, Mr. Mulick has continually elevated educational standards and inspired countless students through his dedication and passion for biology.

Mr. Mulick has not always been a teacher. After college, he worked as a weekend recreation counselor in Alaska. He then transferred to the State's Municipal Parks and Recreation Department.

Ed and his wife, Dana, moved to Park City after he completed his teaching degree at the University of Utah. Dana grew up in Heber, where her father worked as a miner. They fell in love with Park City, where they purchased their home.

Mr. Mulick has worked solely at Park City High School during his 34-year career.

On receiving the award for a fifth time, Mr. Mulick was humbly quoted as saying: "It is quite an honor because there are so many great and deserving teachers in the school district."

I commend Mr. Mulick for his outstanding contributions to education and the lives he has positively shaped.

□ 1015

HONORING CASE GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Case Gibson from Lone Oak Middle School in Hunt County, Texas. It is with great honor and admiration that I recognize his remarkable bravery and selflessness.

During a medical emergency in September of 2023, Case Gibson demonstrated extraordinary courage and quick thinking, ultimately saving the life of a fellow student. Despite the intense and urgent situation, he fearlessly jumped into action, displaying a level of empathy, bravery, and maturity far beyond his years.

The heroic actions of Case Gibson on this day serve as a shining example of the exceptional character and leadership qualities he embodies, both within Lone Oak Middle School and the community.

In addition to his heroic deed, he is recognized for his outstanding academic achievements, his leadership skills, and his humble, respectful, and thoughtful demeanor.

Case Gibson is hereby honored and celebrated for his exceptional bravery, selflessness, and heroism in saving the life of his fellow student during a medical emergency in September of 2023, and for that I extend my gratitude.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT J.B. MCNATT

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to honor Staff Sergeant J.B. McNatt of Greenville, Texas, who recently marked his 100th birthday on April 18, 2024.

Staff Sergeant McNatt is a true example of courage, sacrifice, and commitment. He served our Nation with honor in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II, during which he worked as a pilot in multiple duty assignments.

His dedication to our Nation and its values extended far beyond his military service, as he contributed to the betterment of our society in the postwar years in his hometown.

Staff Sergeant McNatt serves as both an inspiring testament to the resilience of the human spirit and a living reminder of the sacrifices made by the Greatest Generation in the pursuit of freedom. For this, I extend my eternal gratitude.

REMEMBERING NATHANIEL "RAY" TUCK, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nathaniel "Ray" Tuck, Jr., who passed away at the age of 52 on February 11, 2024, after battling cancer for the past 2½ years.

Ray was born in Roanoke, Virginia, on April 30, 1971, to Nathaniel Ray and Barbara Z. Tuck. He later graduated from Radford University and earned a doctorate of Chiropractic from the National University of Health Sciences in 1997.

After graduating, Ray joined his father's chiropractic clinic in southwest Virginia, where they practiced together for many years. His son, Nathaniel R. Tuck, III is currently in chiropractic school, hoping to continue the family legacy.

During Ray's incredible career, he served as the president of the Virginia Chiropractic Association, chairman of the board and later president of the American Chiropractic Association, and he was also appointed to be the chiropractor on the Virginia Board of Medicine.

Ray is survived by his wife, Bonnie, of 29 years; his daughter, Abi Dolgos and her husband, Dakota Dolgos; grandson, Gatlin Dolgos; his son, Nathaniel; his son's girlfriend, Abby E. Markham; his mother, Barbara; his sister, Amelia Martin and her husband, Buddy Martin; his brother, Ben M. Tuck and his wife, Priyam Chipper.

I wish them peace and strength during this difficult time.

I was lucky to know Ray personally, as my daughter, Abby, has dated his

son, Nathaniel, for a number of years. Nathaniel and Abby met when they were both pages in the Virginia House of Delegates. I have to tell you, we were sharing carpooling duty, and all the kids said Ray was the cool one, and somehow I was not. I found this shocking, but it is true.

Ray was quite a great guy, and I was glad to have the opportunity to know him. He was a good man, and we will all greatly miss him.

RECOGNIZING KELLY LUNGREN MCCOLLUM

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Kelly Lungren McCollum, my chief of staff since my election to Congress in 2010. Kelly is retiring from Capitol Hill today, having served several Members in Congress for more than 25 years. She joins us here on the floor.

She is the daughter of former Congressman Dan Lungren. Kelly was born in Long Beach, California. Upon her father's first election to Congress, her family moved to the Washington, D.C., area in 1979. As you can see from the picture, she was a very young member of the Reagan Revolution.

Raised in Vienna, Virginia, Kelly attended our Lady of Good Counsel Catholic School. She graduated from high school in 3 years and started at Santa Clara University. Shortly thereafter, Kelly began a career, in August of 1994, as a congressional staffer for then United States Representative James Inhofe, who at that time was running for Oklahoma's open U.S. Senate seat.

After her service to the Sooner State, Kelly returned to Capitol Hill and entered a new chapter of her professional life, serving as chief of staff to U.S. Congressman Jeff Fortenberry.

Around the same time, she would meet her loving husband, Jason, whom she has been married to for nearly 18 years. This is a picture of Kelly and I, not Jason and Kelly, earlier this month at the Capitol.

Kelly would continue in Congress, dedicating a period of time to the legislative team of U.S. Representative Louie Gohmert before the beginning of a 13½ year career as my chief of staff.

As my chief, she will best be remembered as a true professional, a dedicated servant to the people of Virginia's Ninth District, and a source of responsible leadership for my staff, colleagues, and family.

I have to tell you, my wife made it a whole lot easier for her because they tell jokes about me back and forth all the time. I also will tell you of one fateful day when it had been kind of a hard day. I am changing the spelling to protect the innocent. People who know me know that I am not that great of an administrator. I love legislating, I love serving the people, but administrating and running an office is not my thing. She had a hard day, and she said: I hope they won't think I am a witch, to which I smiled and responded: Kelly, I hired you to be the witch. You have got to run this place, and I greatly appreciate it.

Most importantly, she has been a great friend. I congratulate Kelly on her remarkable career. Her institutional knowledge, loyalty, and leadership are qualities that will be missed in my office and many others. I wish her nothing more than the best.

STANDING WITH THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the unacceptable and insensitive actions of the L.A. County Board of Supervisors.

One week ago, the board proclaimed April 30, 2024, as Jane Fonda Day. Black April, which the Vietnamese community has commemorated on April 30 for decades, is a deeply meaningful day because it marks the fall of Saigon.

Instead of standing with the Vietnamese civilians and American soldiers who were displaced, tortured, brutalized, and killed during and after the Vietnam war, Jane Fonda allied herself with the Communist Viet Cong.

For some reason, the board chose to honor someone with a history of such disdain for innocent Vietnamese and American veterans on the somber anniversary of the fall of Saigon.

By elevating Hanoi Jane over the Vietnamese community, Americans who sacrificed their lives, and the loved ones they lost to communism, the board has offended the freedom-loving Vietnamese Americans who bear such tragic and painful memories of the Vietnam war.

I call on the board to rescind this awful proclamation immediately and unequivocally stand with the Vietnamese community.

COMMEMORATING VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, as the co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Vietnam Caucus, I rise today to commemorate Vietnam Human Rights Day.

The district I represent includes Little Saigon, which is home to the largest population of Vietnamese anywhere in the world outside of Vietnam. Many of my Vietnamese constituents are first-generation Americans, like me. The stories they tell of fleeing communism to find freedom in the United States are both tragic and inspiring. Many of them still have families in Vietnam, where the human rights situation continues to be cause for grave concern.

The Communist government there routinely oppresses its own people, arresting and detaining journalists and critics simply for expressing themselves.

I am proud to join my Vietnam Caucus co-chair, LOU CORREA, to introduce a resolution condemning the Vietnamese Government, calling for the release of political prisoners, standing

with the Vietnamese people, and urging the administration to take immediate action to pressure the Vietnamese Government to respect human rights.

I welcome all of my colleagues to join me and the Vietnamese-American community as we continue working to ensure human rights for all people.

PIMA COUNCIL ON AGING SALUTES CENTENARIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 37th Salute to Centenarians recently hosted by the Tucson Medical Center in Pima County. It is the largest gathering of all centenarians in the United States.

Honorees include retired generals, race car drivers, actors, and my friend Walter Ram, a World War II veteran. I am so grateful to represent them in Congress.

Arizona's Sixth District has more than 143 centenarians, making this the largest centenarian gathering in the United States.

I will continue to fight for our seniors in Congress. Recently, I introduced, with DON DAVIS from North Carolina, the Oversight of Medicare Billing Code Cost Act, which will increase transparency with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid. We must do everything in our power to protect Medicare and Medicaid for our seniors.

I am so proud to be representing great people like this in the district and will continue to fight for our seniors like this group of great centenarians.

CONGRATULATING DEPUTY CHIEF LAWRENCE BOUTTE

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Deputy Chief Lawrence, known by his friends as Butch, Boutte on his retirement from the Sierra Vista Police Department in March.

With a law enforcement career spanning 26 years, Butch was committed to serving his community both on and off the force. His knowledge and leadership skills helped to shape the Sierra Vista police station.

Even before his career with the police department, Butch was no stranger to public service. He served in the Army for 4 years in military intelligence as an electronic warfare interceptor/locator.

Last year, Butch joined 11 other Arizonans in being recognized by the Canyon Vista Medical Center and the Legacy Foundation of Southeast Arizona in their Veterans Wall Ceremony.

As he enjoys a well-deserved retirement, he leaves behind an incredible legacy in Sierra Vista.

Laura and I join the entire community of Sierra Vista, Cochise County, and Arizona's Sixth District in thanking the deputy chief for his service. Men and women like him, who dedicate

their lives to the safety of their neighbors, represent the very best of us.

OUR BORDER IS BROKEN

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: Our border is broken and has been for a long time.

For 3 years, Americans across the Nation, and especially in border communities like mine, are suffering the consequences of this historic crisis every single day.

The ineffective open-border policies implemented by Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas have made our country less safe at a time when the world is most dangerous.

Disturbingly, new documents subpoenaed by the Homeland Security Committee uncover the egregious lengths Secretary Mayorkas goes to to ensure inadmissible migrants are let into the United States. The committee found that DHS used over 50 airports, including in my home State of Arizona, to help illegally process more than 400,000 inadmissible migrants into the country through their unlawful mass parole program.

Implementing this program was not done for the benefit of the public or for urgent humanitarian need. It was done as an unlawful sleight of hand by Secretary Mayorkas to hide the true scale of the crisis he created from the American people.

□ 1030

The Immigration and Nationality Act clearly states that parole may only be granted on a case-by-case basis for significant public benefit or urgent humanitarian need.

These flights are none of these things. Granting mass parole to hundreds of thousands of inadmissible migrants in this district is in direct violation of the law and is yet another in a long list of failures by the DHS Secretary that has been derelict in his duties.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN-ELECT LUKE LETLOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VAN DUYNE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, today we are going to be voting on legislation to name a post office in Rayville, Louisiana, after Congressman-elect Luke Letlow.

Madam Speaker, I had known Luke for many, many years and had the chance to work with him. I want to tell you a little bit about his background.

Luke, his whole life, was a little guy. He grew up kind of small. I bet when he was growing up, he looked at that as a handicap, maybe, as being a shorter, smaller person in stature.

As Luke got older and grew taller and got bigger, he never forgot about the lessons that he learned about being the little guy.

All throughout his career when he was working for the Louisiana congress-

sional delegation for Congressman Cooksey and for Congressman Ralph Abraham, when he worked for Governor Jindal of Louisiana, Luke always, always stood up and fought for the little guy.

I am going to say it again. I bet that when he was growing up, he looked at it like a deficit, he looked at it like a handicap, but, wow, what he did later in life and how he took those experiences that he had and parlayed them, he used them, and he never forgot what it was like.

Oftentimes in government, the people that are heard, the people that are listened to are the ones that have the lobbyists, have the money, have the power, have the influence.

Luke made sure that that wasn't the case. It was the person who had an issue, the person who had a problem. No issue was too small. No community was too small.

Luke was born and raised in the town of Start, Louisiana, and I have to make reference to this. His dad is a firefighter, and their shirts say Start Fire. I always got a kick out of that. These people are looking for job security. They are pyromaniacs.

But seriously, he grew up in Start, Louisiana, in this very, very small community. Throughout his career in government, all he did was stand up for and fight for these small communities, to make sure that these communities were not left out, were not left behind.

To tell you a little bit about Luke, I think he would probably make Jeff Foxworthy look sophisticated. Luke would say some of the funniest things, had these hilarious sayings, but he was one of the brightest, most clever people.

I often thought of him as a scoundrel, but I don't mean that in a negative sense at all. Luke was a rascal, incredibly clever in what he did and always focused on outcomes. I can't even begin to express my sadness for Luke's early departure at just 41 years old. I can't even begin.

If Luke were here, if he served in Congress, if he were able to continue his public service, I have no doubt that we wouldn't be naming post offices after Luke. We would be naming large buildings. We would be naming large boulevards and streets.

Part of me is saddened by the fact that we are naming a post office—I will say it again—because if he were here, I know he would accomplish nothing but greatness.

I also think about Luke, where he is now in Heaven, and I am sure that he has his own little corner, and he has streets of gold named after him. I am sure that he has his gaggle of people, and he is holding court up there doing amazing things.

One of the things that Luke was most excited about was when Start got a Dollar General. Start got a Dollar General. He could get—what was it, the Dr. Pepper and the Reese's or Kit Kat or whatever it was that he loved.

He is an amazing man. It is an absolute honor that we are able to name something after him today. I miss him greatly.

I know that he loves his wife, JULIA, his son Jeremiah, and his daughter, Jacqueline. I know that when they look back at his history and the work that he has done, the legacy he has left, they are going to be incredibly proud. I love that we are here today able to vote for a post office for him.

God bless you, my brother, and God bless your family.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Teach us to number our days, O Lord, that we may gain a heart of wisdom. In the narrow boundaries of time, we pray we show our appreciation for the gift that You have given us and would live each day to its fullest.

Let us face what You put before us with the strength You so graciously provide for us.

May our work be effective, not just in accomplishing the goals we set, but in fulfilling the purpose You have bidden us to carry out.

When life is tedious or challenging, may our journey through the uncertainty and around the overwhelming obstacles become an opportunity to be a testimony to Your faithfulness and steadfast love.

As so many approach us with needs and burdens too heavy to carry alone, may we be quick and willing to share the load.

God, only You know what each day will bring us, but in the passing shadow of this day, may the breath of our lives reveal the eternity of Your grace plan.

In Your sovereign name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CELEBRATING TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Teacher Appreciation Week. This week honors America's hardworking, dedicated, and passionate teachers.

The National Education Association and the National PTA team up each year to recognize the contributions our teachers make every day to shape the minds of their students. Our teachers push students to achieve their best. They nurture and motivate them and show students how to realize their full potential.

Teachers are some of the most powerful professionals in the entire world. They lend a caring hand and extend a loving heart. They make differences in the lives of our students academically, emotionally, and physically.

I thank every teacher in America for the job they do, the hours they work, the patience they show, and for the impact they have on so many lives. A special thank you and congratulations to my sister, Sherri, who will be retiring in just a few weeks after 30 years of service as a teacher.

HONORING AMERICA'S EDUCATORS

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

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, today marks Teacher Appreciation Day, which is a chance to honor the educators who have guided us, inspired us, showed us kindness, and recognized our potential, and I want to thank just one of many today.

Anyone who knows me knows I am a stickler for clear, concise writing, and I credit my appreciation for a good turn of phrase to Yvonne Vish, my ninth grade English teacher at Lyons Township High School in La Grange, Illinois. She must have spent hours going over our papers to correct every

wrong word, dangling participle, and misplaced modifier. She did so much to help me become an effective communicator, a skill that has helped me my whole life. I thank Miss Vish for her patience and dedication, both of which unquestionably made a difference for me and for many others.

BIDEN DESTROYS JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the jobs report last week was fewer jobs than anticipated, as Biden policies of spend, borrow, and tax destroys jobs.

Stephen Moore, of the Committee to Unleash Prosperity explains: "We have way, way too much government growth and borrowing, and too little private-sector growth.

"In the first quarter of this year, the Federal Government borrowed \$500 billion.

"Most of the new jobs in the economy were government dependent."

Worse yet, Biden claims that he has created jobs, which is actually COVID recovery.

The New York spectacle continues of corrupt Judge Merchan persecuting Donald Trump as violent protesters demanding death to Jews take over the streets. Judge Merchan is corrupt in that he has conflicts of interest. Judge Merchan is corrupt in that he has provided and denied a change of venue. Corrupt Judge Merchan has selective persecution. Corrupt Judge Merchan has concealed the witness list and confuses misdemeanors. Corrupt Judge Merchan has denied President Trump his First Amendment rights of free speech.

As a former town judge myself, I especially know Judge Merchan is corrupting the rule of law. Judge Merchan is a disgrace to the American people.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF CLYDE VANCE DUNNAM

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Waco's longest serving lawyers for over seven decades, Clyde Vance Dunnam. He was part of a venerable legal family in the Waco community who saw his career last for seven decades and was part of a family law firm that dates back almost 100 years.

Clyde Vance Dunnam graduated from Baylor with his undergrad in business administration and Baylor Law School and was proud to be part of a law firm that included not only his sons but also his grandchildren.

He practiced law literally his entire adult life and gained a reputation as one of the most skilled and most successful trial attorneys in the history of

central Texas. Mr. Dunnam also mentored just a countless number of attorneys in central Texas in the Waco area, and his memory will live for a long time through those many attorneys.

In addition to being a very successful attorney, he also held leadership positions in the Masonic Lodge, the Scottish Rite, and so many other organizations.

As serious a demeanor as Mr. Dunnam had, he was first and foremost a family man. I will never forget how proud he was at his granddaughter's wedding.

My prayers go out to his wife, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren during this difficult time.

REMEMBERING FAMILY FRIEND DON LEEBERN, JR.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember a close family friend, Don Leebern, Jr.

He was 6'3" in stature, but he was a whole lot larger than that in life. He was a Georgia football player, and he played in the AFL, but he was also a highly successful businessperson. In addition, he was also a person who gave back to society, his community, serving on boards and foundations.

The last time I had dinner with Mr. Leebern, he grumbled about the fact that his wife was making him eat healthy and he was going to have to order off the healthy side of the menu. After he grumbled, he promptly ordered right.

The reason I say that is because he dearly, dearly loved his family. A man who will be truly missed, Don Leebern, Jr., led a life well lived.

DON'T CUT SNAP BENEFITS

(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, in an effort to appease the MAGA wing of their party, Republicans are insisting on a \$30 billion cut to SNAP benefits as part of the long overdue farm bill reauthorization.

SNAP benefits put food on the table for over 40 million Americans every single day. Investing in SNAP improves health outcomes for participants, lowers healthcare costs, supports farmers who grow our food, and boosts our local economies.

The provision Republicans are targeting for deep cuts has given SNAP recipients an extra \$1.40 per person per day to afford nutritious food amid rising food costs. By preventing USDA from making scientifically based benefit updates in the future, Republicans are taking food away from children, seniors, vulnerable adults, and people with disabilities.

It is a rotten thing to do. It is a stupid thing to do, and it means their bill has no chance of gaining the bipartisan support it would need to pass on the House floor.

I beg my Republican colleagues, drop the partisan attack on SNAP and work with Democrats to advance a farm bill that supports our local farmers, continues investments in conservation efforts, and reduces hunger.

CONGRATULATING MCALLEN PUBLIC LIBRARY

(Ms. DE LA CRUZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the McAllen Public Library, a cornerstone of our community, on receiving the prestigious 2023 Achievement of Library Excellence Award for the 10th consecutive year.

The library's commitment to enhancing literacy and providing educational opportunities is unparalleled. From hosting the annual South Texas Book Festival to offering essential coding classes and vibrant summer reading programs, our library ensures that the flame of knowledge burns bright across the RGV.

This award recognizes past achievements and is a testament to the enduring impact our library has on enriching lives and fostering community growth.

UPLIFT PUBLIC EDUCATION

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Happy Teacher Appreciation Week. I thank America's teachers for all that they do for our children, families, and our country. As a former educator, I know exactly the sacrifices they make each and every day.

A shout-out to Mr. Eldridge, Mr. Harrell, and my favorite teacher of all time, Ms. James, for making me the person I am today. I also offer a huge shout-out to Melissa Oppenheimer Bowman, my wife, who is a third-grade teacher right now in the Bronx.

We need to make sure we continue to support our teachers, as they are educating the next generation of visionary, humanitarian leaders for our country and for the world. Let's never leave our teachers behind and let's always uplift public education.

□ 1215

LAHAINA NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

(Ms. TOKUDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, before there was a Front Street or a

banyon tree, Lahaina was known as Lele. It was the home and final resting place of countless "ali'i," "chiefs," serving as the capital of the Kingdom of Hawaii and including "storied and sacred landscapes," "wahi pana," like Loko Mokuhinia and Moku'ula.

Lele was often referred to as the "Venice of the Pacific," with fishponds, productive wetlands, and freshwater canals. Over the decades, the diversion of water removed almost all traces of this once-fertile area.

As we set out to rebuild, we must do so grounded in Lahaina's history and culture. Last week, I introduced the Lahaina Heritage Area Act to assess the future designation of the historic Maui town as a national heritage area.

National heritage area designations support community-driven conservation and restoration efforts through recognition, Federal funding, and technical assistance.

Of the 62 heritage areas across the United States, none are in Hawaii. With support from colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I can think of no better way to lift up our community's desire to rebuild "righteous," "pono" than by making Lahaina Hawaii's first national heritage area.

Mahalo.

NATIONAL TEACHERS DAY

(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, no matter if a task is great or small, finish it or not at all.

The lesson here is that we should always complete what we start, no matter how challenging it may be. We should never give up. I learned this valuable lesson from Mr. Little in his wood shop class, and it still sticks with me today.

Teachers share inspiring and life-changing lessons with their students every day. We all have a teacher who has taught us an important lesson that we still remember.

Our favorite teachers take us beyond a textbook and teach us life lessons that we carry with us forever. On National Teachers Day, we pause to recognize our dedicated teachers who are making a difference.

Teaching is a noble profession. Teachers have had a profound impact on doctors, lawyers, preachers, and, yes, believe it or not, Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, I give a special shout-out today to all the teachers of eastern North Carolina.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Ms. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Teacher

Appreciation Week. In particular, I recognize Ryan Berglund who was just named Wake County's Teacher of the Year last night.

A Sustainable Agriculture Academy teacher at Millbrook High School in Raleigh, Ryan didn't always plan to be a teacher.

He was a professional welder and equipment fabricator. Today, 64 of his students have become welders, leaving high school with the skills needed to succeed in the workforce.

Madam Speaker, 1 week isn't enough to properly thank all of our country's outstanding educators for what they do every day.

Let's keep fighting for better pay for teachers in North Carolina and across the country. Ryan wisely says: I always will put as much as possible as I can into it, but I need them to put in more than I am, and when they are doing that, you will see true success.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6192, HANDS OFF OUR HOME APPLIANCES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7109, EQUAL REPRESENTATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 109, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO "STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121"; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2925, MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1194

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6192) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are

waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7109) to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all persons. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability 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 Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Financial Services 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. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 118-416 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) 30 minutes 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 (Ms. MALOY). The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, H. Res. 1194, providing for the House's consideration of several pieces of legislation.

The rule provides for H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act, to be considered under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees and provides for one motion to recommitment.

Additionally, the rule also provides for H.J. Res. 109, a joint resolution associated with a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121."

H.J. Res. 109 would be considered under a closed rule, and it provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, to be considered under a structured rule. It also provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024 to be considered under a closed rule.

It also provides 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

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

Beginning with H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act, Madam Speaker, I am glad this rule provides for consideration of this legislation, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

The core premise of this legislation is simple. The Census should be an accurate reflection of this country's citizenry.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, noncitizens comprise approximately 6.7 percent of the Nation's 333 million people.

Including noncitizens in the apportionment of congressional districts will directly impact representation in Congress.

This, to me and most Americans, seems to be a way to take Representatives away from red States and add them to blue States; to literally change the makeup of this body by diluting the influence and number of red districts and adding blue districts in their place.

Under President Biden's watch, nearly 4.7 million illegal aliens have been released into the country, and more than 1.8 million known illegal alien got-aways have escaped into the United States. When added up, these numbers are larger than the population of 32 States.

This isn't simply a constitutional argument. This is a deliberate effort by Joe Biden and the Democrat machine in Washington.

On day one of taking office, President Biden issued Executive Order 13986 requiring noncitizens to be counted in the Census both for the purposes of enumeration and determining congressional apportionment.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue. Having an accurate count of U.S. citizens for the purpose of congressional representation should not be a partisan issue. Yet, here we are with two sides debating the question of who should be counted.

This is a question firmly in Congress' purview. In Department of Commerce v. New York, following the Trump administration's attempt to reinstate a citizenship question on the decennial Census, the Supreme Court made clear this decision is up to the Congress.

I appreciate the leadership of the authors of this bill to ensure Congress is carrying out that responsibility. I hope this measure will have the full support of my colleagues.

Moving on to the financial sector, as a member of the Financial Services Committee, I am glad to see floor consideration of H.J. Res. 109.

This legislation addresses an SEC action that bypassed proper rulemaking procedures. Rather than following the processes laid out by the Congressional Review Act and Administrative Procedures Act, the SEC relied erroneously on a staff accounting bulletin.

You don't have to take our word for it. SEC Commissioner Hester Pierce is on record having said the staff accounting bulletin may not be the appropriate vehicle through which to make this accounting change.

Beyond that, however, this rule brings more uncertainty into the crypto industry by going beyond clarifying how to account for digital assets.

Indeed, this rule effectively requires banks and financial institutions to place digital assets on their balance sheets.

This makes it unclear if customers' assets will be lost if the custodian becomes insolvent. It also increases capital, liquidity, and other requirements for financial institutions in order to manage the risk associated with these assets that should never really be on their books.

The digital assets ecosystem needs more clarity, not less. My colleagues and I on the Financial Services Committee have worked hard this Congress to provide clear rules of the road for digital assets innovation. This rule clearly does the opposite.

□ 1230

The rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act.

One thing we all have come to expect from this administration is the persistent attacks on American energy and consumer choice. This legislation is another attempt by the Republican majority to defend against the latest attack as the focus of congressional Democrats has now turned inside every American's home.

The Biden administration is now willing to reduce the affordability and reliability of everyday household appliances in pursuit of an out-of-touch, unrealistic, and unaffordable green agenda.

Under the guise of increased efficiency, the administration has offered new rules on home appliances that will raise costs, thus making these household necessities less available, especially to people of modest means. This is at a time when homeowners are already spending 34 percent more on home appliances than they did less than two decades ago.

When Americans are struggling to pay for food under the crushing reality of Bidenflation, they now must also worry about affording the appliances they use to prepare it. Instead of relief, the administration offers more obstacles. That is why we need to pass H.R. 6192.

Finally, the rule provides for H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024. Simply put, our country is blessed with a diverse array of abundant natural resources. We must be responsible stewards of these resources, but responsible stewardship does not mean abandoning the resources that we have. It does not mean making ourselves more reliant on other countries in the name of unrealistic agendas that are divorced from national needs and our own national security.

This bipartisan bill provides certainty where certainty is lacking and allows necessary projects to responsibly move forward.

I look forward to consideration of all of these pieces of legislation and urge the passage of this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. NEGUSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today is a serious day, a serious moment for this institution. Apparently, according to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the House Republicans, we are gathered here today to discuss a very consequential question, a consequential issue facing the country, Madam Speaker: home appliances. Toasters, microwaves, and refrigerators are the topics, Madam Speaker, that House Republicans have chosen to waste this institution's time on.

Of all the challenges facing the country, of all the issues facing our community, apparently their top priority is the so-called Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act.

Madam Speaker, you may recall that Republicans noticed a Rules Committee meeting on this very same bill just a few weeks ago. That bill was then hastily removed. We assumed it was because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were essentially shamed into pulling it from the agenda, that they realized a bill on home appliances probably doesn't meet the moment, considering all the real crises that we have going on. Apparently, that shame only lasted for a few weeks because today's legislation, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, is back for round two.

Just to be clear, Madam Speaker—I know you are aware of this—this is a package deal. This isn't the only appliance bill that Republicans have noticed for this body to consider. The Liberty in Laundry Act is the real title of a bill that House Republicans would like this body to consider, as well as the Refrigerator Freedom Act, the Clothes Dryers Reliability Act, the Affordable Air Conditioning Act, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act. Those bills, I guess, didn't make the cut for this particular rules debate. I suppose we will take those up next week.

Madam Speaker, this House should be focused on addressing the consequential challenges of our time, not on political games and messaging bills.

How far this body has fallen. The same august Chamber where James Madison and Abraham Lincoln once served is now debasing itself, debating the fate of microwaves and toaster ovens because that is how House Republicans have decided to spend their time and their majority.

My colleagues, regrettably, unfortunately, are out of touch with the priorities of the American people. The

American people expect, rightfully so, for this Chamber to address the issues that they care about, not waste time on nonsense bills.

By the way, Madam Speaker, the rest of the measures that we will consider today, unfortunately, are more of the same. H.R. 7109, the so-called Equal Representation Act, is plainly unconstitutional. Any plain reading of the Constitution and the 14th Amendment makes clear that this bill is unconstitutional. House Republicans are pushing forward anyway.

Another bill that we are considering today is yet another CRA, this time on apparently a bulletin that was issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission. I have lost count of how many days we have wasted in the last 17 months considering CRAs. Every week, another CRA is submitted by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

One would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that House Republicans would have learned their lesson a year ago after wasting our time on CRAs for the lesser prairie-chicken and the northern long-eared bat, that perhaps this House could focus its attention on more substantive matters. Unfortunately, that has not been the case.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the last bill that this body will consider this week, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, is a bill that I know is familiar to you, Mr. Speaker. It is to me. We voted on a rule about this particular bill 7 days ago.

Why is it back before us a week later? I will tell you why. Republican leadership has lost control of the Rules Committee. They lost control months ago. Now, they often lack a procedural majority here on the House floor.

Last week, our colleague, Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ, introduced a motion to recommit. The motion to recommit was very simple. It pointed out the fact that the Republicans' mining bill would allow foreign adversarial nations to mine American land for free. What happened to that motion to recommit? It passed. Six Republicans joined every Democrat in supporting that motion to recommit.

Those familiar with "Schoolhouse Rock!" would understand that that means the bill goes back to committee, the House Committee on Natural Resources, where I serve, Mr. Speaker, and where you serve, so that we could work out the issues that this body, on a bipartisan basis, identified with this bill 7 days ago. Instead, House Republicans have brought the very same bill back to this body for its consideration without going to the Natural Resources Committee.

I have no idea how the six Republicans who voted for the motion to recommit last week can possibly defend or rationalize a vote against the motion to recommit this week. I suppose we are going to find out.

Mr. Speaker, there are better ways for this Chamber to be spending its time. I implore the Speaker and my colleagues on the other side of the

aisle: Let's get serious. Let's work together to address some of the consequential challenges that face our respective States and our country. Let's stop with these nonsense bills. I implore you.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree it is ridiculous that we must consider legislation like the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, but that is the level of ridiculousness that the Democratic Party has forced us into with their out-of-touch, woke agenda. The priorities of the American people are protecting their right to consumer choice, not to be policed in their own homes. Democrats are fighting for woke corporations. Republicans are fighting for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding the time.

With the ongoing migrant crisis in New York State, my district has sadly been on the front lines of Democratic policies that reward those who have broken our laws to come into this country illegally.

With thousands of illegal immigrants now residing in hotels, shelters, and public facilities across my State, my constituents and other New Yorkers have seen what happens when their hard-earned tax dollars are spent on programs that enable a completely avoidable crisis. It is as if Governor Hochul and Mayor Adams put up a neon sign saying: Come on in. New York is open for business.

Illegal immigrants know if they cross the border and ask to be sent to New York, they will be fed, clothed, housed, and even given a debit card. We are looking at half a million illegals in New York alone and nearly 10 million who have crossed our southern border to be released into the interior of the United States.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want these noncitizens to be represented here in Congress. It is unconstitutional and completely ridiculous. It is a threat to the very sovereignty of the United States of America.

Democrats want to make citizenship mean nothing. A nation without borders is not a nation, especially when you allow anyone from any country to vote in our elections and be represented in our government.

Now, thankfully, our courts have stopped reckless attempts to allow noncitizens to vote, but we need to ensure that Congress is representative of our citizens and our citizens alone. That is what our Nation's Founders intended, and it is the only way to uphold the principles of our democracy.

Allowing representation for noncitizens is also a slap in the face to every immigrant who went through the proper channels and came here legally, the

right way, to search for the American Dream. They respect our laws, have sworn allegiance to the United States of America, and deserve to be represented fairly here in Washington.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Equal Representation Act before us today because it is time that we stop rewarding States like my home State of New York and California for their destructive sanctuary policies.

With the absence of a citizenship requirement for apportionment in congressional districts, we have allowed a perverse incentive to take hold where Democrat-run sanctuary States are rewarded with greater representation in the Halls of Congress and greater sway in the electoral college simply by counting millions of illegal aliens who have broken our laws and taken advantage of these States' destructive policies. It sends the wrong message to the world about the value of citizenship and our respect for our own laws and own government.

Mr. Speaker, we are effectively allowing those who are not U.S. citizens to have a significant say in the future of U.S. elections. This is a wrong that, for the sake of the American people and our own sovereignty as a nation, must be corrected.

It is simple. Allowing noncitizens to vote and be represented in Congress dilutes the voice of the American citizen and opens the door to manipulation and exploitation of our electoral system.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Equal Representation Act and look forward to its consideration on the floor.

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

Just two quick points. One, with respect to everything that my colleague from New York just articulated, this bill has nothing to do with noncitizens voting. It does not address that whatsoever. I am not sure what bill the gentleman from New York was talking about, but it is not the bill that this body is considering.

Secondly, I would just say, with respect to comments made by my friend from Indiana, I think she used the phrase "woke agenda." Apparently, appliances are now woke, according to my colleagues. I don't know what a woke microwave or a woke refrigerator looks like, but that is the new target of House Republicans.

It is good to know we are going to be spending hours on the floor this week debating the future of woke microwaves. The House Republican agenda is coming to a home near you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

□ 1245

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bills under this rule, and, in particular, to the so-called Equal Representation Act. I filed an amendment to this bill with Representative CLEAVER to ensure that the Census not only fully counts the U.S. population but that it counts it accurately.

When the Census occurs, incarcerated people are counted as residents of the towns where they are imprisoned rather than the places they call home. This practice tends to reduce the population in urban areas, where most prisoners are from, and inflate the populations of rural areas, where most prisons are located. Ultimately, prison gerrymandering creates a gross inequity of representation at the expense of urban areas and communities of color.

The over 1 million incarcerated people in the United States are being used as pawns to falsely increase the voting power of areas that do not represent their interests.

My amendment, which was blocked from reaching the floor, would have required the Census Bureau to count incarcerated people at their last place of residence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the so-called Equal Representation Act and instead support efforts to end prison gerrymandering.

Mrs. HOUCIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, this is just one piece of the Democrats' green agenda that is fast-tracking a path to all electric vehicles and appliances at a time when our grid can least afford it without any consideration for grid stability.

This move to all EVs and electric appliances in our homes is not something that consumers are ready for, and it is not something that consumers want. The American people want to have choice and affordability, and the actions of the Democrats on this issue are the opposite of that.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say that insofar as my colleague from Indiana wants to have a debate about climate change or a debate about electric vehicles or renewable energy, I am certainly open, and I welcome that debate. I suspect it would be a robust one.

That is not the debate that Republicans have initiated on the House floor. The debate this week is about freedom for refrigerators. Again, these are not bills that we conceived of. They are Republican bills.

So the notion that this debate is focused or centered on some of what the gentlewoman from Indiana described is just not consistent with the bills that are actually before the House.

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule under debate and to oppose H.R. 7109, the so-called Equal Representation Act.

This GOP bill is designed to fundamentally change who is included in the U.S. Census by undercounting, especially, our Hispano communities.

Now, let me be clear, first and foremost, this bill violates the U.S. Constitution and the 14th Amendment and is designed specifically to dilute who

counts in America—quite literally who counts—because the bill would stop millions of Americans from filling out the Census.

Now, let's not forget that Donald Trump tried to do this in the 2020 Census, and the courts had to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the Supreme Court found?

It found that the arguments in support of that effort were not only flawed and contrived but unconstitutional. That is right. This is not a partisan issue, as was said by the gentlewoman across the aisle. This is a constitutional issue. I brought a copy of the Constitution for my friends across the aisle to do some reading if they would like to actually see what it says in the 14th Amendment.

In fact, not only is this not a partisan issue, both Republican and Democratic former Census Bureau directors argued that the implementation of the citizenship question would lower response rates especially for our Hispanic communities. A Harvard study showed that 6 million Hispanic Americans would remain unaccounted for.

Undercounts would have devastating implications not only for our electoral system but the well-being of our families and communities because Federal aid grants and other funds in our States fundamentally are determined by the Census, things like maternal health grants, healthcare for our children, and mental health services for our veterans. An undercount would result in dramatic underfunding in areas with large immigrant and Hispanic populations, like my home State of New Mexico where more than 50 percent of the State identifies as Hispanic.

New Mexico is a place where we already struggle and where we have the worst social, economic, and health outcomes in the country due to a history of underfunding and underrepresentation, which is why instead of attacking representation, we should be focused on barriers to representation. That is why I filed an amendment in the Rules Committee to do just that.

Now, unfortunately, my friends across the aisle in the Rules Committee ruled it out of order because not only are they not interested in improving the Census, they are obsessed with determining who counts, with who is American, and who should have access to the American Dream, including at the ballot box.

I say that is not the America that my ancestors immigrated to, that is not the America that our Founding Fathers formed and fought for, and that is not the America our people are asking us to fight for.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to read this document here, the U.S. Constitution.

Mrs. HOUCIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just unpack some of those arguments made against this bill, that H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act, will discourage immigrants from participating in the Census.

Revealing that someone is not a citizen does not reveal if someone is here illegally. The individual could have lawful permanent residence, they could be a nonimmigrant residing in the U.S. during an authorized period of stay. Moreover, the Census Bureau must follow strict rules of confidentiality and cannot disclose data tied to an individual respondent in the decennial Census. It can only share aggregate information not attributed to a particular person.

Furthermore, even if respondents were reluctant to complete the Census questionnaire, they would still likely be enumerated by the Census Bureau using other methods, such as review of official records to determine the inhabitants of a particular address or by using proxy information such as reliable information from a neighbor.

Also, there was an argument that H.R. 7109 would skew the distribution of Federal assistance away from States and localities.

This argument is a red herring. H.R. 7109 makes absolutely no changes whatsoever to any laws implicating Federal assistance. Noncitizens would still be counted in the decennial Census. They would only be excluded from the congressional apportionment base.

One other argument that has just been made is that H.R. 7109 fundamentally misunderstands how apportionment was designed by the Framers of the Constitution.

While Democrats may claim that the *Evenwel v. Abbott* Supreme Court decision requires the phrase "whole number of persons" in section 2 of the 14th Amendment to be interpreted as any resident, regardless of citizenship status, section 5 of the 14th Amendment permits the use of implementing statutes for the 14th Amendment. It is this implementing statute which H.R. 7109 amends to explicitly exclude noncitizens from the apportionment base.

Beyond that, the historical context surrounding the phrase "whole number of persons" was specifically chosen to make clear that the drafters rejected counting individuals as partial persons. It does not in any way signify that any person taking up residence in a State should be counted for the purpose of apportionment, and certainly not that noncitizens must be included in the apportionment base.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, the argument made by my colleague from Indiana with respect to the last argument made, the supposed legal argument, is completely without merit. It contravenes the plain language of the 14th Amendment and generations of precedent. So the notion that somehow the arguments we are making to follow the plain text of the Constitution and the way in which the 14th Amendment has been construed for generations, that that argument would not govern

this particular debate to me just doesn't hold water.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would ensure every woman has full access to essential reproductive healthcare including abortion care.

Far too many States have enacted laws to either ban some or all abortions which Republicans have declared numerous times is their goal.

So while my Republican colleague wants to debate freedom and choice when it comes to household appliances, microwaves, I will give them a chance here today to instead ensure freedom and choice in reproductive healthcare for women across this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, to discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), who has been a tireless leader on this issue among so many others from California.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, the legislation this body brings to the floor each week speaks volumes about our priorities.

While House Democrats are defending our fundamental freedoms by fighting back against extreme MAGA Republican attacks on abortion care and fertility services like IVF, the majority believes that rather than protecting the rights of women in this country, it is essential that we protect the so-called rights of home appliances.

The difference could not be starker. In a time of unrelenting attacks on reproductive rights and when 21 States have banned, either fully or partially, abortion access, House Republicans have chosen to do nothing. They have chosen to pretend that women are not dying, that they are not being forced to carry unwanted pregnancies, and they are doing nothing to protect IVF or birth control.

Instead, they are bringing up a rule today to consider legislation to protect home appliances.

It seems that House Republicans would like toasters and microwaves to have more rights than women in this country.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question on this rule, my Democratic colleagues and I will offer my bill, the Women's Health Protection Act, or WHPA. WHPA is a Federal solution to the extremist Supreme Court decision to strike down Roe v. Wade. It will restore the right to everyone, no matter what State you live in, to receive abortion care.

In a world where doctors are being threatened with prison time for doing

their jobs, it would protect the rights of providers to provide abortion care. This is the legislation the body should be considering today, not bills protecting blenders and coffee makers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a respected member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because Republicans think appliances have more rights than people and because they think that creating and perpetuating nonsense culture war issues will win them votes.

Today, we have a bill titled Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act. Republicans say it is government overreach to regulate appliances, but Republicans will regulate women's personal healthcare decisions. Republicans will protect appliances but let women suffer and die from pregnancy complications.

Republicans want freedom for refrigerators but will take away women's freedom to choose an abortion based on her own faith in consultation with her own doctor and loved ones.

Republicans will take away women's freedom to choose an abortion after rape or incest, but they will go to bat for your gas stove.

They care about freezers but could care less about affordable childcare. Instead of helping women with childcare costs, which would help families with the high cost of living, Republicans would rather force these access costs on consumers.

Yesterday, I introduced an amendment to the rule from Representative CHU and me which changes the title of the bill to the Hands Off Our Bodies Act and strikes the text and replaces it with the Women's Health Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, 65 percent of Americans oppose the overturning of Roe v. Wade. They want us to protect women. However, this amendment didn't pass.

This bill is part of a quartet of bills coming out of the Energy and Commerce Committee with titles like the Liberty in Laundry Act, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, and the Affordable Air Conditioning Act.

These titles turn the cry for reproductive healthcare rights on their head. Not only are they insulting to women who are fighting for their rights, they are demeaning to women who will remember in November.

□ 1300

Do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think the American women will vote Republican based on these misnamed appliance bills? Women are not so gullible. We will remember.

We will remember that 184 House Republicans have cosponsored bills that

threaten IVF access nationwide. We will remember that Republican legislators are putting women's lives at risk when my colleagues criminalize abortion.

The majority is robbing States of the healthcare they need as obstetricians and gynecologists are fleeing those repressive States. Republicans are forcing women who undergo pregnancy complications to sit until they are near death in hospital parking lots.

Women will remember that Democrats believe women can, should, and must make their own decisions about their bodies. Republicans think appliances have more rights than people. However, I call on Republicans to prioritize women over appliances and reject this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just make note of a few things with regard to the Equal Representation Act. We have heard some comments from our Democrat colleagues that this is somehow unconstitutional.

The court case referenced in Department of Commerce v. New York, the lower court dismissed the plaintiff's claims under the Enumeration Clause, permitted claims under the Administrative Procedures Act and Due Process Clause.

However, the Supreme Court upheld requiring the citizenship question only on the claims under the Administrative Procedures Act and not on constitutional grounds, saying that it is Congress' responsibility to determine whether and how this should take place. That is what we are doing here today in the Equal Representation Act by saying precisely that noncitizens should not count in congressional apportionment.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, this is not particularly complicated. Since 1790 and the first population tally done in the United States, citizens and non-citizens have been included. Never before has the 14th Amendment been construed as the way that the gentlewoman from Indiana proposes now. It is a radical view that is not supported by the plain text of the Constitution or the amendments thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are also here today to debate Republicans' terrible mining rule, which would open millions of acres of public lands to foreign-owned mining companies.

I find it ridiculous that we are here today because, just last week, this House voted in favor of my motion to recommit, and that motion to recommit said: Let's send this back to committee. Let's send it back to committee to consider my amendment, which would have banned foreign adversaries, like China, from being able

to take our public lands and resources for free.

Unfortunately, almost every Republican said: It is all right for Chinese corporations to mine our data for TikTok, but the majority said: No. We want them to be able to take our gold, our silver, our copper, our resources, for free, to China.

Thankfully, six Republicans voted in favor of the MTR; but instead of going back to committee to consider it, we are back here again because the Rules Committee put the bill back on the floor without that amendment. If my colleagues believe that American resources belong with American corporations, Members should vote against this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on the Equal Representation Act. This bill would restore the one-person, one-vote principle in apportionment. Only citizens are eligible to vote for candidates for Federal offices, including Members of Congress and electors for President of the United States.

However, under the current practice, noncitizens, including lawful permanent residents, nonimmigrants, and even illegal aliens are wrongly included in a State's population for purposes of the apportionment calculation. Thus, States with higher proportions of noncitizens residing in that State are advantaged over States with a lower concentration of noncitizens.

In the case of illegal aliens, the status quo is particularly concerning as some States or major metropolitan areas within those States have declared themselves sanctuary jurisdictions, shielding illegal aliens from Federal immigration law enforcement, with some even providing special services to the illegal alien population residing in those jurisdictions.

Illegal aliens incentivized to move to those jurisdictions, who reside in that State on Census day, and who are enumerated in the Census, would add to the State's population for the purposes of apportionment.

It is appropriate for Congress to direct the Census Bureau to collect one of the most fundamental data points regarding individuals residing in the United States: Whether or not they are a citizen.

Article I of the Constitution requires the Census of the population to be taken every 10 years. This is directed by law. The Supreme Court has explained that Congress is permitted by the Constitution to inquire about citizenship on this questionnaire, on the Census. Adding a citizenship question to the decennial Census is an appropriate exercise of Article I authority over the Census and is the responsibility of Congress.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, not to belabor the point, but when the gentlewoman from Indiana uses the phrase

"current practice," what she is referring to is the entirety of American history.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. For hundreds of years, this is the way population counts have been done. That is why the current practice is consistent with the plain reading of the 14th Amendment, a plain reading of the Constitution, and hundreds of years of precedent. What House Republicans are proposing is a radical departure from it.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Founders never would have intended a U.S. President allowing 6.7 million illegal immigrants into the country, including terrorists and the drug cartels. I think that is probably not something that was envisioned by the Founders.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today's rule is, unfortunately, a testament to the House Republican playbook since assuming the majority—chaos, political theater, and infighting. This Republican-controlled House has passed the lowest number of laws for the first year of session in nearly 100 years. It is safe to say it is the least productive Congress in any of our lifetimes.

House Republicans have been focused on other priorities: A baseless, politically motivated impeachment inquiry into the President that went nowhere; impeachment proceedings against the Secretary of Homeland Security, which were immediately dismissed by the Senate, the first time that the Senate has dismissed Articles of Impeachment without trial after the reading; and now microwaves, freedom for refrigerators, and liberty for laundry.

That is the focus of this House Republican majority. It makes sense that Republicans would spend their time on such ridiculous legislative efforts given the chaos that the majority has engulfed this body into—the vacating of the Speaker 7 months ago, seven rules that have failed on the House floor as Republicans engage in open rebellion against their own leadership.

The American people are tired, Mr. Speaker, of the political stunts and the messaging bills. They are tired of the infighting. They want to see leadership, and that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what they have seen through the leadership of Democratic Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES and a united House Democratic Caucus.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that House Democrats have rescued this failing House Republican majority at nearly every turn. It was House Democrats who ensured that the U.S. didn't default on its debt last year, House Democrats who kept the government funded, House Democrats who carried the votes on the NDAA, and House

Democrats who got the national security supplemental bill across the finish line and to the President's desk.

At every opportunity, Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have used this Chamber to stand against legislation that would hurt average Americans. While House Republicans are busy fighting each other, House Democrats are fighting for the American people, and we will continue to do that each and every day. We implore our Republican colleagues to join us.

One way my colleagues could do so is to oppose the previous question, the rule, and the underlying bills, and we implore them to do the same.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, we, once again, have before us today the opportunity to move legislation that could have a positive effect on the everyday lives of all Americans, whether that is pushing back on the overreach and the administrative uncertainty of this bureaucratic state, or protecting the core functions of government agencies and protecting our very system of government.

The choice we have before us in this rule is clear, and we must take action.

H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act, ensures that the Census count only U.S. citizens for congressional apportionment and Presidential electors. This should not be a novel concept. It should just be a minimum standard.

H.J. Res. 109 provides clarity in the digital assets sector, an area where the United States should be leading. Congress must provide clear rules of the road for digital asset innovators. However, the rule proposed by the SEC does just the opposite.

With respect to home appliances, I think we should all agree that less intrusion by the government is the answer here. This administration's reckless pursuit of its green agenda surely could stop in our kitchens, can it not?

At a minimum, we shouldn't be making living in this country more unaffordable than it already is by this administration. H.R. 6192 is a step in the right direction.

Regarding our natural resources, our country is blessed with a diverse array of abundant natural resources. We ought to use those resources responsibly. H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, is responsible and worthy of our support.

I look forward to moving these bills out of the House this week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1194 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 proceed to the

consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. 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 recommend.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and 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. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OBERNOLTE) at 1 o'clock and 31 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:

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3354;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1194; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1194, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SECRETARY OF STATE MADELEINE ALBRIGHT POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfin-

ished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3354) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 North Hatcher Avenue in Purcellville, Virginia, as the "Secretary of State Madeleine Albright Post Office Building", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 28, answered "present" 3, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 179] YEAS—371

- Adams Crawford Hayes
Aderholt Crenshaw Hern
Agular Crockett Hill
Alford Crow Himes
Allen Curtis Hinson
Allred D'Esposito Horsford
Amo Davids (KS) Houchin
Amodei Davis (IL) Houlahan
Arrington Davis (NC) Hoyer
Auchincloss De La Cruz Hoyle (OR)
Babin Dean (PA) Hudson
Bacon DeGette Huizenga
Balderson DeLauro Hunt
Balint DelBene Issa
Barr Deluzio Ivey
Barragan DesJarlais Jackson (IL)
Bean (FL) Diaz-Balart Jackson (NC)
Beatty Diaz-Balart Jackson (TX)
Bentz Dingell James
Bera Doggett Jayapal
Bergman Donalds Jeffries
Beyer Duarte Johnson (GA)
Bice Dunn (FL) Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis Edwards Jordan
Bishop (GA) Ellzey Joyce (OH)
Bishop (NC) Escobar Kamlager-Dove
Blumenauer Eshoo Kaptur
Blunt Rochester Espallat Kean (NJ)
Boebert Estes Keating
Bonamici Evans Kelly (IL)
Bost Ezell Kelly (MS)
Bowman Fallon Kelly (PA)
Boyle (PA) Feenstra Kennedy
Brown Finstad Khanna
Brownley Fischbach Kiggans (VA)
Buchanan Fitzgerald Kildee
Bucshon Fitzpatrick Kiley
Budzinski Fleischmann Kilmer
Burchett Fletcher Kim (CA)
Burgess Flood Kim (NJ)
Bush Foster Krishnamoorthi
Calvert Fox Kuster
Cammack Frankel, Lois Kustoff
Caraveo Franklin, Scott LaHood
Carbajal Frost LaLota
Cardenas Fry Lamborn
Carey Fulcher Langworthy
Carl Gaetz Larsen (WA)
Carter (GA) Gallego Larson (CT)
Carter (LA) Garamendi Latta
Cartwright Garbarino LaTurner
Casar Garcia (IL) Lawler
Case Garcia, Mike Lee (CA)
Casten Garcia, Robert Lee (FL)
Castor (FL) Gimenez Lee (NV)
Castro (TX) Golden (ME) Lee (PA)
Chavez-DeRemer Goldman (NY) Leger Fernandez
Cherfilus Gomez Lesko
McCormick Gonzales, Tony Letlow
Chu Gonzalez, Vicente Levin
Ciscomani Vicente Lieu
Clark (MA) Good (VA) Lofgren
Cline Gooden (TX) Lucas
Clyburn Gottheimer Luetkemeyer
Cohen Graves (LA) Luna
Cole Graves (MO) Luttrell
Comer Green (TN) Lynch
Connolly Green, Al (TX) Mace
Correa Griffith Malliotakis
Costa Guest Maloy
Courtney Guthrie Mann
Craig Harder (CA) Manning

- Mast Pfluger Stefanik
Matsui Pingree Steil
McBath Pocan Stevens
McCaul Porter Strickland
McClain Posey Strong
McClellan Pressley Suozzi
McClintock Quigley Swalwell
McCollum Ramirez Sykes
McCormick Raskin Takano
McGarvey Rodgers (WA) Tenney
McGovern Rogers (AL) Thanedar
McHenry Rogers (KY) Thompson (CA)
Meeks Rose Thompson (MS)
Menendez Ross Thompson (PA)
Meng Rouzer Timmons
Meuser Ruiz Titus
Mfume Ruppertsberger Tokuda
Miller (OH) Rutherford Tonko
Miller (WV) Ryan Torres (CA)
Miller-Meeks Salazar Torres (NY)
Molinaro Salinas Trahan
Moolenaar Sanchez Turner
Moore (UT) Sarbanes Underwood
Moore (WI) Scalise Valadao
Moran Scanlon Van Drew
Morelle Schakowsky Van Dwyne
Moskowitz Schiff Van Orden
Moulton Schneider Vargas
Mrvan Scholten Vasquez
Mullin Schrier Veasey
Murphy Schweikert Velazquez
Nadler Scott (VA) Wagner
Napolitano Scott, Austin Walberg
Neal Scott, David Waltz
Neguse Self Wasserman
Newhouse Sessions Schultz
Nickel Sewell Waters
Norcross Sherman Watson Coleman
Nunn (IA) Sherrill Webster (FL)
Obernolte Simpson Wenstrup
Ocasio-Cortez Slotkin Westerman
Omar Smith (MO) Wexton
Owens Smith (NE) Wild
Pallone Smith (NJ) Williams (GA)
Palmer Smith (WA) Williams (NY)
Panetta Smucker Williams (TX)
Pappas Sorensen Wilson (FL)
Pascrell Wilson (SC)
Pelosi Spanberger Wittman
Peltola Stansbury Stanton
Perez Stantton Womack
Peters Stauber Yakym
Pettersen Stee Zinke

NAYS—28

- Biggs Greene (GA) Nehls
Brecheen Harris Norman
Burlison Harshbarger Ogles
Cloud Higgins (LA) Perry
Clyde Joyce (PA) Steube
Collins Loudermilk Tiffany
Crane Massie Tlaib
Davidson Miller (IL) Weber (TX)
Duncan Mills
Gosar Moore (AL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

- Grothman Rosendale Roy

NOT VOTING—27

- Armstrong Ferguson LaMalfa
Baird Foushee Landsman
Banks Garcia (TX) Magaziner
Carson Granger Mooney
Carter (TX) Grijalva Pence
Clarke (NY) Hageman Phillips
Cleaver Huffman Reschenthaler
Cuellar Jackson Lee Spartz
Emmer Jacobs Trone

□ 1403

Messrs. BRECHEEN, HIGGINS of Louisiana, WEBER of Texas, DUNCAN, and MOORE of Alabama changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mses. PINGREE and HOULAHAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6192, HANDS OFF OUR HOME APPLIANCES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7109, EQUAL REPRESENTATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 109, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO "STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121"; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2925, MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1194) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6192) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7109) to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all persons; providing for consideration of the bill (H.J. Res. 109) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121"; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 200, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—204

Aderholt	Bucshon	D'Esposito
Alford	Burchett	Davidson
Allen	Burgess	De La Cruz
Amodei	Calvert	DesJarlais
Armstrong	Cammack	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Carey	Donalds
Babin	Carl	Duarte
Bacon	Carter (GA)	Duncan
Balderson	Chavez-DeRemer	Dunn (FL)
Barr	Ciscomani	Edwards
Bean (FL)	Cline	Ellzey
Bentz	Cloud	Emmer
Bergman	Clyde	Estes
Bice	Cole	Ezell
Biggs	Collins	Fallon
Bilirakis	Comer	Feenstra
Bishop (NC)	Crane	Finstad
Bost	Crawford	Fischbach
Brecheen	Crenshaw	Fitzgerald
Buchanan	Curtis	Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann	LaLota
Flood	Lamborn
Fox	Langworthy
Franklin, Scott	Latta
Fry	LaTurner
Fulcher	Lawler
Gaetz	Lee (FL)
Garbarino	Lesko
Garcia, Mike	Letlow
Gimenez	Loudermilk
Gonzales, Tony	Lucas
Good (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Gooden (TX)	Luna
Gosar	Luttrell
Graves (LA)	Mace
Graves (MO)	Malliotakis
Green (TN)	Maloy
Greene (GA)	Mann
Griffith	Massie
Grothman	Mast
Guest	McCauley
Guthrie	McClain
Harris	McClintock
Harshbarger	McCormick
Hern	McHenry
Higgins (LA)	Meuser
Hill	Miller (IL)
Hinson	Miller (OH)
Houchin	Miller (WV)
Hudson	Miller-Meeks
Huizenga	Mills
Hunt	Molinaro
Issa	Moolenaar
Jackson (TX)	Moore (AL)
James	Moore (UT)
Johnson (LA)	Moran
Johnson (SD)	Murphy
Jordan	Nehls
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse
Joyce (PA)	Norman
Kean (NJ)	Nunn (IA)
Kelly (MS)	Obernolte
Kelly (PA)	Ogles
Kiggans (VA)	Owens
Kiley	Palmer
Kim (CA)	Perry
Kustoff	Pfleger
LaHood	Posey

NAYS—200

Adams	DeLauro
Aguilar	DeBene
Allred	Deluzio
Amo	DeSaulnier
Auchincloss	Dingell
Balint	Doggett
Barragan	Escobar
Beatty	Eshoo
Bera	Espallat
Beyer	Evans
Bishop (GA)	Fletcher
Blumenauer	Poster
Blunt	Frankel, Lois
Bonamici	Frost
Bowman	Gallego
Boyle (PA)	Garamendi
Brown	Garcia (IL)
Brownley	Garcia, Robert
Budzinski	Golden (ME)
Bush	Goldman (NY)
Caraveo	Gomez
Carbajal	Gonzalez
Cardenas	Vicente
Carter (LA)	Gottheimer
Cartwright	Green, Al (TX)
Casar	Harder (CA)
Case	Hayes
Casten	Himes
Castro (FL)	Horsford
Castro (TX)	Houlihan
Cherfilus-	Hoyer
McCormick	Hoyle (OR)
Chu	Ivey
Clark (MA)	Jackson (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Clarke (NC)
Clyburn	Jayapal
Cohen	Jeffries
Connolly	Johnson (GA)
Correa	Kammlager-Dove
Costa	Kaptur
Courtney	Keating
Craig	Kelly (IL)
Crockett	Kennedy
Crow	Khanna
Dauids (KS)	Kildee
Davis (IL)	Kilmer
Davis (NC)	Kim (NJ)
Dean (PA)	Krishnamoorthi
DeGette	Kuster

Reschenthaler	Ramirez
Rodgers (WA)	Raskin
Rogers (AL)	Ross
Rogers (KY)	Ruiz
Rose	Ruppersberger
Rosendale	Ryan
Rouzer	Salinas
Roy	Sanchez
Rutherford	Sarbanes
Salazar	Scanlon
Scalise	Schakowsky
Schweikert	Schiff
Scott, Austin	Schneider
Self	Scholten
Simpson	Schrier
Smith (MO)	Scott (VA)
Smith (NE)	Scott, David
Smith (NJ)	Sewell
Smucker	Sherman
Staubert	
Steel	
Stefanik	
Steil	
Steube	
Strong	
Tenney	
Thompson (PA)	
Tiffany	
Timmons	
Turner	
Valadao	
Van Drew	
Van Dуйne	
Van Orden	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Waltz	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Wenstrup	
Westerman	
Williams (NY)	
Williams (TX)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Womack	
Yakym	
Zinke	

Sherrill	Tokuda
Slotkin	Tonko
Smith (WA)	Torres (CA)
Sorensen	Torres (NY)
Soto	Trahan
Spanberger	Underwood
Stansbury	Vargas
Stanton	Vasquez
Stevens	Veasey
Strickland	Velázquez
Suozzi	Wasserman
Swalwell	Schultz
Sykes	Waters
Takano	Watson Coleman
Thanedar	Wexton
Thompson (CA)	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Williams (GA)
Titus	Wilson (FL)
Tlaib	

NOT VOTING—26

Baird	Foushee	Landsman
Banks	Garcia (TX)	Magaziner
Boebert	Granger	Mooney
Burlison	Grijalva	Pence
Carson	Hageman	Phillips
Carter (TX)	Huffman	Sessions
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Spartz
Cuellar	Jacobs	Trone
Ferguson	LaMalfa	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1411

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 199, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

AYES—205

Aderholt	Collins	Gonzales, Tony
Alford	Comer	Good (VA)
Allen	Crane	Gooden (TX)
Amodei	Crawford	Gosar
Armstrong	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Arrington	Curtis	Graves (MO)
Babin	D'Esposito	Green (TN)
Bacon	Davidson	Greene (GA)
Balderson	De La Cruz	Griffith
Barr	DesJarlais	Grothman
Bean (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Guest
Bentz	Donalds	Guthrie
Bergman	Duarte	Harris
Bice	Duncan	Harshbarger
Biggs	Dunn (FL)	Hern
Bilirakis	Edwards	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (NC)	Ellzey	Hill
Boebert	Emmer	Hinson
Bost	Estes	Houchin
Brecheen	Ezell	Hudson
Buchanan	Fallon	Huizenga
Bucshon	Feenstra	Hunt
Burchett	Finstad	Issa
Burgess	Fischbach	Jackson (TX)
Burlison	Fitzgerald	James
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (LA)
Cammack	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Carey	Flood	Jordan
Carl	Foxx	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Franklin, Scott	Joyce (PA)
Chavez-DeRemer	Fry	Kean (NJ)
Ciscomani	Fulcher	Kelly (MS)
Cline	Gaetz	Kelly (PA)
Cloud	Garbarino	Kiggans (VA)
Clyde	Garcia, Mike	Kiley
Cole	Gimenez	Kim (CA)

Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills

Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild

Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Baird
Banks
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cuellar
Ferguson
Foushee
Garcia (TX)

Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Magaziner

Mfume
Mooney
Norman
Pence
Phillips
Sessions
Spartz
Trone

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1417

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to vote during the first vote series. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted:

YE A on roll call No. 179, H.R. 3354, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 North Hatcher Avenue in Purcellville, Virginia, as the “Secretary of State Madeleine Albright Post Office Building;”

NO on roll call No. 180, the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1194; and

NO on roll call No. 1861, H. Res. 1194, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6192, H.J. Res. 109, H.R. 2925, and H.R. 7109.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, due to a district commitment, I was unable to cast three votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted:

YE A on Roll Call No. 179, H.R. 3354, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 North Hatcher Avenue in Purcellville, Virginia, as the “Secretary of State Madeleine Albright Post Office Building;”

YE A on Roll Call No. 180, the Previous Question on H. Res. 1194; and

YE A on Roll Call No. 181, H. Res. 1194, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6192, H.R. 7109, H.R. 2925, and H.J. Res. 109.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1204

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Kennedy (to rank immediately after Mr. Suozzi).

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

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

There was no objection. The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RELATING TO “STANDARD FOR DETERMINING JOINT EMPLOYER STATUS”—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Pursuant to the order of the House of May 6, 2024, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 98) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to “Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status”.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto messages, see proceedings of the House of May 6, 2024, at page H2840.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the veto message on H.J. Res. 98.

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

There was no objection. Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of overriding President Biden’s veto of H.J. Res. 98. A vote in favor of this resolution will nullify the Biden administration’s attempt to redefine what it means to be a joint employer under the National Labor Relations Act.

After receiving bipartisan support from both Chambers, Congress sent H.J. Res. 98 to the President’s desk showing our broad disapproval of the new joint employer rule. Now, with President Biden’s veto, the message from the administration is clear: Franchise businesses are not welcome partners in the Biden economy.

NOES—199

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego

Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse

Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

In fact, the Biden administration wants to return to the harm done during the Obama-Biden administration, when this rule was first in effect and cost the economy more than \$30 billion and nearly 400,000 jobs on an annual basis for the 5-year period until President Trump, thankfully, reversed the rule.

It also benefited the Democrats' favorite trial lawyers when lawsuits against franchise businesses increased by 93 percent.

The joint employer rule overturns legal precedent that was in place from 1984 to 2015. It is a direct attack on the thousands of small businesses that make up the healthy and growing franchise sector.

Currently, a business is considered an employer only if they exercise direct and immediate control over an employee's essential terms and conditions of employment. However, the new rule establishes that two or more businesses are in a joint employer relationship if one employer merely exercises indirect control over another company's employees.

Under this standard, something as simple as a franchisor giving a franchisee a company handbook could be interpreted as exercising indirect control.

Changing the definition of who controls a business creates confusion and threatens the independence of so many successful small business owners.

Biden's rule will saddle franchisors with liability for independent franchise owners, over which they do not have control. Inevitably, the result of this rule will be less growth, more lawsuits, and the functional transformation of businessowners into middle managers.

It is already very difficult to operate a small business today in Biden's America. The administration's response to high inflation, low workforce participation, and high interest rates, which are causing so much economic hardship from Bidenomics, is to aggressively pursue an anti-employer, antiworker, pro-union-boss agenda.

We must protect the model that is currently working for businesses and eliminate the threat of this new rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of overriding the President's veto of H.J. Res. 98, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise once again in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 98, the Congressional Review Act resolution to repeal the National Labor Relations Board's joint employer rule, which the board finalized last October.

Workers should be able to negotiate for higher pay, better benefits, and safer workplaces through their unions. Regrettably, this is not the case for millions of Americans, including janitors, housekeepers, cooks, and many others who are employed through subcontractors or temp agencies.

The rise of what is called the fissured workplace, where firms increasingly use overlapping arrangements of contracting, subcontracting, and temping, has weakened workers' bargaining power and allowed large corporations to evade bargaining obligations and liabilities.

□ 1430

For example, if an employee of a subcontractor unionized, the subcontractor would be unable to actually bargain over pay, hours, workplace safety, or other issues. That is because the actual contract is with the prime contractor who essentially sets the terms and conditions of employment for the employee, and the subcontractor is just administering the terms of that contract. Bargaining with the subcontractor becomes essentially useless because the subcontractor is paid based on assumed wages, and they don't have the ability to change those wages. The prime contractor needs to be at the table if someone is thinking of negotiating wages at all.

Additionally, by evading bargaining obligations, the prime contractor, who is actually setting some or all of the terms of conditions of the work, can actually shift liability for an unfair labor practice onto the subcontractor or the temp agency.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRB's new rule fixed the problem by ensuring workers can negotiate with all entities who actually control their working conditions. This also protects small businesses from being held liable for labor violations that are a result of the larger firms' actions.

This isn't about franchising. No franchisor has ever been found to be a joint employer under any of the various joint employer rules, including this one.

H.J. Res. 98 would undermine workers' ability to exercise their rights and reinstate the deficient Trump-era rule that narrowed the joint employer standard. Under the Trump-era standard, employers who control the working conditions could easily evade their obligations to collectively bargain with employees. That would have the effect of reducing the earnings of workers.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the Trump-era rule would reduce workers' hard-earned paychecks by about \$1.3 billion. Conversely, the Biden joint employer rule is estimated to raise workers' earnings.

So we should not go backwards. The Biden-Harris administration's joint employer rule empowers workers and protects small businesses, so I applaud President Biden for his veto of H.J. Res. 98.

So let's be clear. This is not about the joint employer rule. We have already had that debate back in January.

This is a debate about the Republican majority's inability to do basic arithmetic. Overriding the President's veto requires two-thirds, or 290 Members, of

the House. That is not going to happen. This measure only passed with 206 votes, nearly all of them from Republicans, so anybody who can count knows the Republican majority does not have the votes to override the veto.

So why are we taking this up?

It is because we are just a metaphor for the Republicans' failed agenda. Instead of taking time to do something constructive, we are taking precious floor time on this doomed override vote when we could be doing something better like raising the minimum wage, or making workplaces safer and healthier, or ensuring women receive equal pay for equal work, or combating child labor, or establishing paid sick leave, or strengthening workers' ability to organize and collectively bargain.

However, that is not what we are doing. All that is happening now is what has happened during the whole 118th Congress: the House majority insists on spending floor time on votes like this that have no chance of succeeding.

So House Democrats believe we can do better. We remain focused on the priorities and others that lower costs and grow the middle class. That is what we ought to be focused on.

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is and always will be about labor unions. That is essentially what my friend from the Commonwealth of Virginia just said. However, we need to go back to pro-growth policies when real wages were growing for everyone, when unemployment was at a record low for everyone, and there were millions more Americans working during the Trump administration.

Bidenomics and Bidenflation don't work. This is a recession back into the past here. It is not going to work. We are not responsible for what the Senate does, Mr. Speaker. We are not responsible for what the White House does. The Senate actually agreed with us on this on a bipartisan basis, and the House did this on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES).

Mr. JAMES. I thank Mr. GOOD for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues and you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been said that government doesn't create jobs, but they sure know how to kill them.

I agree with that.

Listening to my colleagues here today, I have to restate, Mr. Speaker, that the American Dream is worth fighting for.

Franchises create the surest and shortest path for entrepreneurs, working people in my district, and all across the country to achieve the American Dream. The reason we are here again is because we are giving our colleagues the opportunity to tell the American people that they will choose them and

their American Dream over the special interests and political selfishness that choosing their own best interests may lead to.

The right to collectively bargain was established by this body in 1935, and the right to work was enshrined in Michigan's constitution just last year. However, once again, the Biden administration has gone too far.

Franchise businesses are the path out of situations for people in urban America, rural America, and everywhere in between.

The Biden-led National Labor Relations Board resurrected a policy that, when imposed during the Obama Administration, saw jobs lost and dreams crushed. The last rule saw 376,000 lost job opportunities in the franchise sector.

It was also said what might happen, what could happen, and what should happen, and then I heard fixing a problem. It sounds like people who have never had the chance to live under the rules they are creating are now creating organizations and structures that they won't have to live under. This is exactly the reason we were elected to come here to represent our constituents' interests and not the interests here, Mr. Speaker.

Thanks to President Biden's policies, we have inflation and regulation, not success and determination.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle are willing to bet on America and are willing to bet on the entrepreneurial spirit while also respecting the right to collectively bargain without burdensome regulations that we know stifle the American Dream.

The President's veto is clear.

Mr. Speaker, while the President and the Vice President go around the country saying they are friends of small business, their administration is literally putting policies in place that crush it.

The only reason our colleagues would not vote to override this veto is because they are in lockstep with the administration, prioritizing politics over people. They have the opportunity to vote along with us, to overturn these harmful policies to allow Americans to self-determine without threat to their right to collectively bargain.

This is a clear opportunity to get this right, and I hope my colleagues on the other side will support our endeavor to do the right thing for the people in our districts who, no doubt, shed blood, sweat, and tears to make their dream a reality.

As our President seeks to make the case to the American people, he should not assume that small business is the enemy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to get some job numbers rather than just adjectives and everything on the table.

The fact is that President Trump during his 4 years lost over 6 million

jobs, but President Biden so far has created over 15 million, the longest period of time with unemployment under 4 percent since the 1960s.

Before you start excusing President Trump because of a pandemic, he had a pandemic for about 10 months, President Biden had a pandemic for 2 years.

So this legislation the President has vetoed, I think it is helpful just to read the President's message of why he vetoed the resolution.

He said: "I am returning herewith without my approval H.J. Res. 98, a resolution that would disapprove of the National Labor Relations Board's rule entitled 'Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status.'

"Since day one, my administration has fought to strengthen workers' right to organize and bargain for higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions. The NLRB's rule would prevent companies from evading their bargaining obligations or liability when they control a worker's working condition—even if they reserve such control or exercise it indirectly through a subcontractor or other intermediary. If multiple companies control the terms and conditions of employment, then the right to organize is rendered futile whenever the workers cannot bargain collectively with each of those employers.

"Without the NLRB's rule, companies could more easily avoid liability simply by manipulating their corporate structure, like hiding behind subcontractors or staffing agencies. By hampering the NLRB's efforts to promote the practice and procedure of collective bargaining, Republicans are siding with union-busting corporations over the needs of workers and their unions. I am proud to be the most pro-union, pro-worker President in American history. I make no apologies for my administration protecting the right to organize and bargain collectively.

"Therefore, I am vetoing this resolution.

"Joseph R. Biden, Jr."

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have to hand it to my friend from Virginia. He is resilient, but he has got a tough job trying to defend the economic record of the current administration.

We have got some 4 million people less working than were working when he became President. Everyone knows that under the previous administration, again, we had record-low unemployment and record-high labor participation. Now we have a record-low labor participation rate.

We had unemployment that was at record lows for everyone during the previous administration and real wage growth under the previous administration.

Now we have 40-year high inflation. Inflation was nonexistent before this

President got into office. We have 20-year high interest rates which are further crushing the American people. We have got our credit being downgraded because of the reckless, excessive, wasteful, and unprecedented spending which will cause interest rates to go even higher.

Mr. Speaker, you can't fool the American people. You can't tell them it is good when they know that it is bad. They are suffering at the grocery store, they are suffering when they pay the utility bill, they are suffering at the gas pump, they are suffering when they make the mortgage payment or when they make the rent payment, and they are suffering when they are unable to afford to buy a home, especially for young people starting out.

This is all a direct result of bad policy from this President. This is just one more example as he vetoes the will of the American people reflected in a bipartisan manner by both Houses of Congress sending him legislation to overturn this rule, and yet he has vetoed it and has forced us to try to overcome his veto today.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Virginia is prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this resolution in support of the President's veto from SEIU, AFL-CIO, and the Teamsters.

NOVEMBER 2, 2023.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 12.5 million workers represented by the AFL-CIO, the 2 million workers represented by SEIU, and the 1.2 million workers represented by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, we write to urge you to support the National Labor Relations Board's ("NLRB" or "the Board") recent final rule addressing joint-employer status under the National Labor Relations Act ("NLRA" or "the Act"). This important rule will ensure that workers have a real voice at the bargaining table when multiple companies control their working conditions. Accordingly, the undersigned unions strongly oppose any effort to nullify or weaken the rule, whether by legislation or resolution under the Congressional Review Act.

The rule, published on October 27, 2023, rescinds the Trump NLRB's 2020 joint-employer rule and replaces it with an updated standard that is based on well-established common-law principles and consistent with recent D.C. Circuit decisions identifying critical flaws in the Trump NLRB's approach to this issue. The Board's updated rule is welcome and necessary because the Trump rule was harmful to workers' organizing efforts, inconsistent with the governing legal principles, and against the policies of the Act.

The crux of this issue is simple—when workers seek to bargain collectively over their wages, hours and working conditions, every entity with control over those issues must be at the bargaining table. The Act protects and encourages collective bargaining as a means of resolving labor disputes. Collective bargaining cannot serve that purpose if companies with control over the issues in dispute are absent from the bargaining table. The Trump rule offered companies a roadmap to retain ultimate control

over key aspects of workers' lives—like wages and working conditions—while avoiding their duty to bargain. This standard left workers stranded at the bargaining table and unable to negotiate with the people who could actually implement proposed improvements.

Companies are adopting business structures specifically designed to maintain control over the workers who keep their businesses running while simultaneously disclaiming any responsibility for those workers under labor and employment laws. Such businesses often insert second and third-level intermediaries between themselves and their workers. These companies seek to have it both ways—to control the workplace like an employer but dodge the legal responsibilities of an employer. This phenomenon is often called workplace “fissuring.”

Fissured workplaces, sometimes involving staffing firms, temp agencies, or subcontractors, often leave workers unable to raise concerns, or collectively bargain with, the entity that actually controls their workplace. In such arrangements, multiple entities may share control over a worker's terms of employment. For example, if employees of a subcontractor were to unionize and bargain only with the subcontractor, it might simply refuse to bargain over certain issues because its contract with the prime contractor governs those aspects of the work (e.g., pay, hours, safety, etc.). This harms workers because the entity that effectively determines workplace policy is not at the bargaining table, placing workers' desired improvements out of reach.

The way to ensure that workers can actually bargain with each entity that controls their work is to readily identify such entities as “joint employers.” The Act requires joint employers to collectively bargain with employees over working conditions that they control. But the Trump NLRB's joint employer rule was designed to help companies with such control escape bargaining. The rule's standard for finding a joint employment relationship was unrealistic and overly narrow. It conditioned a company's joint employer status on proof that it actually exercised substantial direct and immediate control, discounting its reserved or indirect power to control a small list of working conditions. This conflicts with the governing common law principles, which make clear that a company's power to control working conditions must bear on its employer status (and thus its bargaining responsibilities under the Act) regardless of whether it has formally exercised that power. The new final rule correctly rescinded the Trump rule.

Critics of the new rule claim that its joint employer standard will outright destroy certain business models or dramatically change operations. Opponents claim, for example, that companies will be required to bargain over issues they have no control over, or will be automatically liable for another entity's unfair labor practices. This is simply untrue and a further attempt to leave workers with no opportunity to bargain with controlling entities. The final rule makes it clear that a joint employer's bargaining obligations extend only to those terms and conditions within its control. And current Board law—unchanged by the rule—only extends unfair labor practice liability to a joint employer if it knew or should have known of another employer's illegal action, had the power to stop it, and chose not to.

Similarly, critics claim that the new standard imposes blanket joint employer status on parties to certain business models like franchises, temp agencies, subcontractors, or staffing firms. This is also untrue. The rule does not proclaim that all franchisors are now joint employers with

their franchisees, or that any company using workers from a temp agency is automatically their employer. The particular business model used by parties in any case is not determinative. Instead, the Board looks at every case individually, and grants companies a full and fair opportunity to explain the underlying business relationship and dispute whether they control the relevant workers' essential terms and conditions of employment. The Board conducts a fact-specific, case-by-case analysis that considers whether the putative joint employer controls essential terms and conditions of employment.

Make no mistake, the Board's rule may well result in the employees of a staffing firm, for example, being treated also as employees of the firm's client, but only if the client controls the employees' terms and conditions of employment. That is the only way workers can meaningfully bargain at work. But even in that situation, the workers are deemed employees only for purposes of the NLRA and collective bargaining, and the client would be obligated to bargain only about the terms it controls. It would still be up to workers to choose whether they want to organize a union and collectively bargain with their employer or employers. Nothing in the NLRB's rule alters employers' responsibilities under any other state or federal law (e.g., tax laws, wage and hour laws, or workplace safety laws) or requires any changes to business structures. But it does make clear their responsibility under the NLRA to show up at the bargaining table.

The new rule is clear and commonsense: there is no bargaining obligation for an entity that cannot control workplace policies or working conditions. And for good reason—their presence at the bargaining table would be pointless. Workers have no interest in bargaining with a company that lacks the power to implement the workplace improvements they seek.

This rule simply invokes a more realistic joint employer standard on par with the standard enforced during the Obama administration, allowing a company's indirect or reserved control over working conditions to be sufficient for finding joint employer status. Workers' right to collectively bargain cannot be realized if the entity that has the power to change terms and conditions of employment is absent from the bargaining table.

For the reasons explained above, the undersigned unions oppose any effort to nullify the Board's rule. In particular, we urge Congress to oppose efforts to nullify the rule under the Congressional Review Act (“CRA”). Here, a successful CRA disapproval resolution would be particularly harmful: it would revert the NLRB's joint employer standard to the Trump Board's 2020 rule, which stymies workers at the bargaining table. And further, as explained above, at least one federal appeals court has strongly suggested that provisions of the 2020 rule are inconsistent with the NLRA, so litigation would likely invalidate that rule as well. This would create confusion for the workers, unions, and employers regulated by the NLRB. Not only could the two standards be nullified, leaving the Board's joint employer analysis in limbo, but the NLRB's ability to address that limbo would be unclear due to CRA limitations.

The CRA provides that once a disapproval resolution is passed, the underlying agency cannot issue a subsequent rule in “substantially the same form” as the disapproved rule unless it is specifically authorized by a subsequent law. Thus, if the Board's new rule is nullified under the CRA, and the prior Trump rule is invalidated by federal courts, the NLRB would be limited in issuing a

clarifying rule. To avoid confusion and ensure stability for workers, unions, and employers, Congress must steer clear of using the CRA to address the joint employer standard.

For these reasons, we ask that you support the NLRB's joint employer rule and oppose any effort to weaken or nullify the clarified standard.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the United Steelworkers, in support of the President's veto.

UNITED STEELWORKERS

Pittsburgh, PA, November 14, 2023.

Re: United Steelworkers urges a NO vote on H.J. Res. 98, which would invalidate the National Labor Relations Board's new Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status.

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 850,000 active members of the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW), I write to oppose a misguided and short-sighted Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution—H.J. Res. 98. If this resolution passes, American workers will increasingly face a fractured workplace and lose access to federally protected collective bargaining rights.

Updating the NLRB joint employer standard is necessary as employers are increasingly using “fissured” workplace models to keep the parent company from having to bargain with workers employed by the smaller contracted companies. The continued contracting out and increased usage of temporary workers leads to terrible outcomes for the most vulnerable, precisely because these workers lack the ability to meaningfully organize and collectively bargain with their appropriate employer(s).

For example, a 2014 National Employment Law Project report found that workers at subcontracted firms receive wages from 7–40 percent lower than their non-contracted out peers. That same study also showed that workers in subcontracted firms suffer higher rates of wage theft and unpaid overtime. Analysis from ProPublica has also shown that temp workers are at an increased risk of workplace injury. Lastly, and perhaps most chillingly, child workers have been found in meatpacking plants, while auto-supply chains in the South have had children as young as 14 years old working for subcontracted firms—sometimes with deadly consequences. If this resolution passes, Congress will have made it easier for corporations to shirk responsibility of their employment oversight, and make it harder for the American labor movement to stop labor abuses such as wage theft, unpaid overtime, workplace injuries, and child labor.

The NLRB had to act as the result of a partisan rulemaking process during the Trump administration. Prior to 2020, the NLRB's assessment of a joint employer standard had been guided by common law for over 50 years. The NLRB, as a quasi-judicial body, would use case decisions to substantiate its joint employer standard.

The Trump administration's NLRB dramatically broke with precedent and created a regulatory rulemaking process to establish a new joint employer standard. Through this final rule, the previous NLRB added non-statutory and non-common law requirements to the NLRB joint employer assessment—notably, the requirement that an employer must “possess and exercise . . . substantial direct and immediate control” over a worker's “essential terms and conditions of employment” to be considered joint employers.

The problem with this Trump era rule is that it significantly constrained the NLRB's

ability to exercise jurisdiction over cases, and limited the scope of the joint employer standard on when the NLRB can weigh in. With such a weak standard, employers were able to simultaneously influence a worker's wages, hours, and working conditions—all while being inoculated from having to bargain over those issues with their workers.

By returning to common-law principles in this new standard, the NLRB provides “a practical approach to ensuring that the entities effectively exercising control over workers’ critical terms of employment respect their bargaining obligations under the NLRA”.

Unfortunately, Representative James John (R-MI-10), along with 29 other Republicans, introduced a Congressional Review Act resolution to repeal the NLRB’s return to past precedent. USW strongly opposes the use of a CRA to undermine the NLRB. If a CRA were to be successfully used, it would prevent the federal agency from ever issuing a substantially similar rule, freezing in perpetuity a process that was designed to evolve with employment practices.

USW opposes H.J. Res 98 in the strongest terms and will educate union membership on any floor vote outcome. The NLRB’s released joint employer standard returns the country to prior precedent, and strengthens the legal right of millions of workers across this country to collectively bargain with their appropriate employer(s). Again, I urge you to support this new standard and oppose H.J. Res. 98.

Sincerely,

DAVID MCCALL,
International President.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, lastly, I include in the RECORD a letter from dozens of labor and civil rights organizations in support of the veto.

NOVEMBER 20, 2023.

Re: NLRB Joint Employer Rule CRA.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Hon. BERNIE SANDERS,
Hon. BILL CASSIDY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Hon. ROBERT “BOBBY” C. SCOTT,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The undersigned organizations write to share our opposition to the Congressional Review Act (CRA) challenge to the National Labor Relations Board’s 2023 Joint Employer Rule.

Millions of workers in precarious and subcontracted work depend on the joint-employer doctrine to protect their right to organize under the NLRA. In labor-intensive and underpaid industries like retail, hospitality, fast food, janitorial, construction, and delivery, workers hired through intermediary subcontractors like staffing agencies and specialized contract firms are effectively deprived of their labor rights because the law fails to recognize who their employers are. They provide work central to the hotels, retail operators, fast food chains, construction contractors, delivery companies, and other corporations that rely on their labor but are unable to hold those employers accountable when their labor rights are violated. While this harms a broad range of workers, it has particularly damaging impacts for women, Black workers, immigrants, people of color, and people with disabilities who disproportionately hold precarious, low-paid jobs.

The Board’s new rule reaffirms that, under the NLRA, a worker may be jointly-employed when more than one entity shares or co-determines the essential terms and condi-

tions of their work. What matters is not the corporate structure or what the companies call the work relationship; what matters is who has the power to control the essential terms of employment, like pay, discipline, and health & safety on the job.

Now, large corporations and industry trade groups are pushing Congress to vote for a CRA resolution to overturn the rule. Despite the claims made by these self-interested groups, the joint employer rule is a simple and necessary course correction that:

Rescinds the misguided 2020 rule, which improperly narrowed the NLRA’s coverage and unmoored the legal standard from the common law, by requiring workers to show that a business had “substantial direct and immediate control” over the essential terms of employment;

Grounds the legal analysis in the common law, building on the Obama-era Browning-Ferris decision that the 2020 Trump rule overrode;

Affirms that companies are liable for committing unfair labor practices (such as terminating workers for exercising their right to organize) and required to bargain with their workers as joint employers, where they control the essential terms and conditions of employment;

Accounts for forms of control that are “indirect” and “reserved,” as well as direct and actually exercised, in determining whether or not there is an employment relationship; and

Recognizes that the “essential terms and conditions of employment” include workplace health and safety, and direction as to how to complete the work, as well as control over pay and discipline.

This rule is a major step toward safeguarding the labor rights of millions of workers in subcontracted employment, ensuring that corporations cannot skirt the law simply by outsourcing responsibility for their workers. Should a CRA to overturn this rule be brought to the floor, we strongly urge all Members of Congress to vote No.

Sincerely,

A Better Balance; AFL-CIO; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); APALA; Asian American Pacific Islander Civic Engagement Collaborative of New Virginia Majority; Bruckner Burch PLLC; Care in Action; Caring Across Generations; Center for Economic and Policy Research; Center for Law and Social Policy; Cincinnati Interfaith Workers Center; Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues; Communications Workers of America (CWA); Community Legal Services, Philadelphia; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces.

CRLA Foundation; Demand Progress; Demos; Economic Policy Institute; Endangered Species Coalition; Equal Rights Advocates; Feminist Majority Foundation; Impact Fund; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Japanese American Citizens League (JACL); Jobs to Move America; Jobs With Justice; Justice & Accountability Center of Louisiana; Justice at Work; Justice in Motion.

Kentucky Equal Justice Center; KIWA; Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Legal Aid at Work; Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy; National Advocacy Center of the Good Shepherd; National Center for Law and Economic Justice; National Council for Occupational Safety and Health; National Domestic Workers Alliance; National Education Association; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Employment Law Project (NELP); National Institute for Workers’ Rights; National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families.

National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; National Women’s Law Center; New

Jersey Association on Correction; North Carolina Justice Center; Northwest Workers’ Justice Project; Public Justice Center; Restaurant Opportunities Centers United; Santa Clara County Wage Theft Coalition Service Employees International Union; Shriver Center on Poverty Law; TechEquity Collaborative; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Legal Aid Society; The Women’s Employment Rights Clinic (WERC) at Golden Gate University (GGU); Transport Workers Union of America.

UAW; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW); Women Employed; Worker Justice Center of New York; Worker Power Coalition; Workers Defense Action Fund; Workplace Fairness; Workplace Justice Lab at Rutgers University; Workplace Justice Project at Loyola Law Clinic; Worksafe; Young Invincibles.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate that the credit rating that was threatened was the result of the Republicans threatening a default on our debt. That wasn’t anything the Democrats had done.

Again, I just reiterate that under Biden over 15 million jobs were created. Under Trump over 6 million were lost. We have had the longest period of time of unemployment, under 4 percent, since the 1960s. I think that is a fairly easy record to defend.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, in closing, there is no reason to override the President’s veto, and the votes aren’t going to be there. Unfortunately, this is how the Republicans have operated during the 118th Congress. This is going to be the least-productive Congress in history.

In contrast, under Democratic leadership, last Congress, we delivered on significant results. We created millions of jobs, reduced unemployment to record lows, and, under this administration, kept it under record lows. We have saved more than a million people’s pensions under the multi-employer pension fund, and we helped tens of thousands of businesses because they were legally obligated to pay into those failing funds until the businesses went broke.

We delivered historic funding for education. We improved child nutrition. We brought the number of uninsured Americans down to the lowest level ever. I think we can take credit for all of that.

By prioritizing and wasting time on efforts like this, the Republican majority is failing to live up to the same standard that Democrats have lived up to.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for vetoing H.J. Res. 98 and protecting American workers. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this override effort and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Virginia said it himself. The unions, the Teamsters and the steelworkers, are for this. That is reason enough to oppose this.

We talked about the credit being downgraded. It is unprecedented in the country, twice to have our credit downgraded during this President's time in office.

The previous President had record job growth and a roaring economy until the pandemic hit. Under this President, of course, some of the jobs that were lost in the pandemic have been recovered, but not all of them.

Again, we have a record-low labor participation rate, meaning the percentage of those able-bodied, working-age Americans who are working is at an all-time low. We don't count those individuals who aren't looking for work in the unemployment numbers. They don't count. You have an artificially low so-called unemployment rate because there are record numbers of Americans on Federal assistance, as we have stripped away all the work requirements for cash welfare, for food stamps, and for housing assistance.

While we on this side measure success by how many people we get off of government assistance, the other side measures success by how many people are on government assistance programs as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to try to grow the amount of people who are paid not to work, which further causes economic harm.

We cannot just cut our spending on our way to prosperity. Again, in this country, we have to grow our way by going back to pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, in testimony before our committee on this issue, the president of the International Franchise Association said: The rule would make franchisees merely employers of and/or co-employers with their franchisor. This will significantly diminish the value of the business that they have spent their entire careers building.

We know his statement is true because we have seen this policy play out before. Years ago, when President Obama's NLRB advanced a similar rule, the International Franchise Association conducted a study on its impact, and research showed that the indirect control standard cost the industry, as my friend from Michigan said, as much as \$33 billion annually, killed almost 400,000 jobs, and, once again, increased lawsuits against franchise businesses by 93 percent.

The franchise model represents an opportunity to pursue the American Dream. Congress must stand up for the 9 million franchise workers across the country and override President Biden's veto.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HANDS OFF OUR HOME APPLIANCES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6192

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6192.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1450

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6192) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOYLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 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 gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Biden administration has waged a war on American energy, and this war has made its way into Americans' homes.

President Biden and the Department of Energy's Secretary Granholm have sacrificed appliance affordability and reliability in their pursuit of a radical rush-to-green agenda. In the name of energy efficiency, the Biden administration has issued rules on home appliances that would drive up costs and make these popular products less reliable and available to the American families.

The Biden administration's new rules do not save a significant amount of energy and are not cost effective. The

Biden administration's rules discourage the use of natural gas in favor of the electrification of appliances, regardless of the cost, reliability, or availability. Just look how the minority tried to ban gas stoves before my Save Our Gas Stoves legislation and public outcry dialed it back.

House Republicans are leading to protect Americans from Federal mandates that increase costs, fail to result in significant energy savings, are not practical, and eliminate the performance features of product choices.

My legislation, H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, fights back against the Biden administration's radical agenda and will preserve the affordability, availability, and quality of the household appliances Americans rely on every day.

Enacted in 1975, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, also called EPCA, provides specific criteria the Department of Energy must follow in order to propose a new appliance efficiency standard. It is supposed to result in a significant conservation of energy, be technologically feasible, and economically justified.

The problem is that current law doesn't define the parameters for these criteria, so the Biden administration has ignored these critical consumer protections by proposing and finalizing standards that violate the statute.

My bill will define how much energy or water has to be saved. My bill will define that any additional upfront costs to install a new appliance that has new mandated energy efficiency standards will be recuperated within a reasonable period of time.

H.R. 6192 will protect affordability by requiring the Department of Energy to consider the full lifecycle cost of appliances when determining if the new standard is economically justified. The bill requires a 3-year or less payback to the consumer and requires consideration of the cost for low-income households.

No longer will the Biden administration be able to say a savings of 12 cents per month is economically justified, as they have done before, and no longer will a customer have to hold onto their appliance for 8 to 10 or longer years just before they see any cost savings.

The bill establishes a minimum threshold for energy or water savings that must be achieved before imposing new standards. The bill requires that any new standard must achieve at least a 10 percent reduction in energy or water usage. The bill prohibits the Secretary of Energy from banning products based on what type of fuel the product uses so there can be no more natural gas bans.

The bill requires that any new standard cannot affect the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product or the lifespan of the products. Americans want their appliances to work. The bill will allow the Department of Energy to amend or revoke prior standards if they don't save the

consumers money and if the appliance doesn't work.

Last week, I asked Secretary Granholm in committee some very basic questions about the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that appliance regulations should be technologically feasible?

Secretary Granholm said: Yes.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that appliance regulations should not increase net cost for consumers?

Secretary Granholm said: Yes.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that appliance regulations should save a significant amount of energy?

Secretary Granholm said: Yes.

I stated to her: Efficiency mandates increase the upfront costs of appliances, which can really hurt low-income families and renters who do not have the luxury of waiting years for the energy savings to break even.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that 3 years is a reasonable payback period for efficiency regulations?

You know what? Secretary Granholm said she thought the payback should be done within 1 year.

Thus, folks, Secretary Granholm is on record supporting every key element of my bill.

In January of this year, the Fifth Circuit Court found that the Department of Energy has abused the law. In their opinion, they said: Department of Energy “. . . failed to adequately consider appliance performance, substitution effects, and the ample record evidence that Department of Energy's conservation standards are causing Americans to use more energy and water rather than less.”

It is time to reform the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. Like our laws set speed limits to determine at what speed we are breaking the law, it is time to define what economically justified and technologically feasible mean. It is time to fight back against the radical agenda set by the Biden administration. It is time for energy efficiency laws to actually save Americans money, actually save energy and water, and actually preserve Americans' consumer choice.

Mr. Chair, I ask both Republicans and Democrats to support my bill, H.R. 6192, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6192, legislation that actually should be titled the Republicans raising energy bills on American families act, because that is exactly what this bill does.

This bill is just the latest in the Republicans' polluters over people agenda that will drive up annual energy costs on hardworking American families.

Now, this bill is a blatant attempt by House Republicans to derail the successful and effective energy conserva-

tion program. Energy efficiency standards save Americans money on their energy bills, boost innovation by modernizing appliances for the future, and reduce greenhouse gas pollution in our ongoing efforts to combat the climate crisis.

American families, Mr. Chair, are already saving up to \$500 a year on utility bills thanks to the energy efficiency standards that are already in place. The Biden administration has been busy with additional actions that will collectively save Americans \$1 trillion over the next 30 years.

Setting energy efficiency standards is something that the Department of Energy is required by Congress to do. The Biden administration has been busy acting because the previous Trump administration refused to do its job and neglected to finalize 25 appliance efficiency standards.

H.R. 6192 takes an axe to energy conservation standards. It slows down the standard setting process. It allows future administrations to revoke existing standards and bans States from setting their own conservation standards.

If this bill were to become law, manufacturers will be faced with market uncertainty and a regulatory about-face every time the government changes hands. That is problematic for future innovation, particularly considering that many of the efficiency standards finalized by the Department of Energy were reached through consensus recommendations made by appliance manufacturers and efficiency advocates.

The Department of Energy has a robust process for setting efficiency standards, and this process works. All standards must be economically justified and technologically feasible.

Let me be clear—because we are likely to hear a lot of fear-mongering and misinformation today from my Republican colleagues—energy efficiency standards are not bans and they do not impact existing appliances in Americans' homes. This legislation is nothing more than an attempt to scare consumers so Republicans can protect their polluter friends.

Now, instead of legislating on important, pressing issues, Republicans today are pushing a bill that will increase energy prices for American families. This Republican Congress is the least productive of any Congress since the Great Depression. This bill is only being brought to the floor because Republicans can't assemble the votes to actually accomplish anything for the American people. They talk about freedom for appliances but refuse to consider any legislation that would give women freedom over their reproductive health.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation because it will raise energy costs on American families, stifle American innovation, and exacerbate the climate crisis. It is time that Republicans stop wasting our time on partisan messaging bills that have no chance of becoming law.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who is the chair of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, and I thank Congresswoman LESKO for leading this effort and many others in this Congress.

Throughout hearings in this Congress, the House Energy and Commerce Committee has heard countless times how the Biden administration's energy policy puts special interests over affordability and reliability for Americans.

Through the Department of Energy's appliance standard program, the Biden administration has abused their authority by setting aggressive standards on a variety of home appliances.

Mr. Chair, I don't want Americans to be fooled about this. This effort by the Biden administration isn't about saving American consumers' money, it is solely about ending American's use of natural gas, period.

They started with gas stoves and now they have announced plans to impose burdensome regulations that will raise the cost and reduce the performance of dishwashers, air conditioners, refrigerators, clothes washers and dryers, and several other products that Americans rely on every day.

This is part of their whole-of-government approach to pursuing climate policy over all else.

Secretary Granholm said in our DOE budget hearing just last week: We are obsessed with reducing the amount of energy Americans use. This administration hates fossil fuels and anything that uses fossil fuels.

Their solution is to reduce emissions and preserve energy reliability. Instead of harnessing the abundant resources we have in this country, they want to reduce the quality of life for Americans by telling them how to cook their food and wash their clothes, how much water they can use, and what type of car they can drive.

Congresswoman LESKO's bill puts energy affordability and reliability ahead of the dark money climate lobby this administration is beholden to. This bill reforms the Department of Energy's appliance standard setting process to clarify the DOE's regulatory authority and prohibits new standards that are not cost effective or technologically feasible.

Because of this administration's reckless spending and regulatory agenda, the cost of everything is increasing in the United States of America.

The last thing they should be doing is making the home appliances that Americans rely on even more expensive.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense bill and thank Congresswoman LESKO, again, for leading this important effort.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding the time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6192, a Republican bill that will burden American families with higher costs.

This is not a serious bill, Mr. Chair, but it is emblematic of the least productive Congress in modern times. Rather than focus on improving the lives of our neighbors back home and lowering costs, MAGA extremists have been embroiled in shutdowns and showdowns, a tiresome soap opera, so they bring an unserious bill like this to distract from their dysfunction.

I have heard Members on the other side of the aisle make excuses for not getting anything done. They say that this is a closely divided Congress, but, Mr. Chair, that was true in the last Congress when the Democrats were in control, and we passed a host of important new laws that solved problems and cut costs for the folks we represent back home. We focused on bringing down the cost of living and putting more money back into the pockets of working families by passing the PACT Act that expands VA healthcare and benefits for veterans exposed to burn pits, Agent Orange, and other toxic substances, to provide generations of veterans and their survivors with the care and the benefits that they have earned. About 4,000 veterans in my district alone have filed claims.

We passed the American Rescue Plan to help America boost back and build the strongest economy in the world after the pandemic.

We passed a historic infrastructure law that is rebuilding our roads and bridges, delivering clean water, cleaning up pollution, and expanding access to high-speed internet. We passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and we passed the very important historic Inflation Reduction Act that truly is putting money back into the pockets of families back home. Remember, that is the law that capped insulin at \$35 a month. I have 74,000 people in my district with diabetes, and thousands of my neighbors are saving about \$440 per month.

More people have affordable health insurance because of the tax credits in the Inflation Reduction Act. Over 100,000 of my neighbors will save about \$520 in premiums this year under the ACA. That is the law that now allows Medicare to negotiate drug prices for the highest drugs. It caps out-of-pocket costs for our older neighbors who rely on Medicare. It is a godsend.

The IRA is also lowering the cost of energy and reducing pollution to unleash a major clean energy manufacturing boom across America. Over 500 new clean energy projects all across the country, creating well over 250,000 new jobs.

The key to delivering all of these cost savings to the American people is putting people over politics. Instead, MAGA extremists keep America stuck in the politics of chaos all the time where nothing gets done, so the GOP defaults to another bill that helps the oil and gas industry. That is what this is all about because energy efficiency standards are popular. Three out of five Americans support making them stronger.

American families want innovative, efficient appliances. Why? Because they save money, and they save energy. Take the refrigerator, for example. Compared to refrigerators of the 1970s, when the first efficiency standard was proposed, refrigerators today are cheaper up front and they do a better job of keeping groceries cold, and they use about 75 percent less energy. Plus, they save American families hundreds of dollars a year on their electricity bills thanks to the innovation spurred by energy efficiency standards.

The Department of Energy and the Biden administration have collaborated with industry to develop strong energy efficiency standards as Congress already has directed. This means huge cost savings for American families, money back into their pockets at a time when they really need it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to side with the people and their pocketbooks rather than politics or the polluters' best interest. Please vote "no" on this Republican bill and let's get back to work.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 6192.

Mr. Chair, I will start off by thanking the sponsor, Mrs. DEBBIE LESKO of Arizona, and the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee for advancing this bill through regular order.

The United States is blessed with tremendous natural resources. We have the cleanest oil and gas in the world, emissions-free nuclear, hydropower, and renewables.

We also have the world's best workforce and an innovative spirit that has contributed to technological breakthroughs that have changed the world.

For centuries, American innovation has led to new technologies that have improved people's lives from the lightbulb and the home refrigerator to air-conditioning, the washing machine, and the dishwasher.

These inventions are engrained in modern life, and they were not the result of some aggressive government regulation or mandate, but of American ingenuity.

Sadly, the Biden administration's war on American energy is now reaching inside American's homes. Through sue and settle agreements with radical environmental activists, the Department of Energy has reached backroom

deals to impose new regulations on dozens of appliances that Americans rely on every single day.

Last year, the Biden administration attempted to ban gas stoves. Thankfully, DOE changed course after bipartisan opposition and an overwhelming vote by Congress to reverse the ban.

These new mandates are forcing people to spend more on less reliable options. This comes at a time when Americans are already being crushed by rising costs thanks to Bidenflation.

By continuing to double down on policies like this, the Biden administration is showing just how out of touch they are with the financial struggle the vast majority of Americans are feeling. Americans simply cannot afford President Biden's rush-to-green agenda.

The bill led by Mrs. LESKO seeks to protect Americans from Federal mandates that result in minimal energy savings while significantly driving up costs for consumers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. It ensures that DOE is only allowed to adopt efficiency regulations on home appliances that are cost effective, technologically feasible, and save a significant amount of energy.

This is going to benefit Americans across the country. It should be a bipartisan issue, and that is why I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in sending a strong message to the Biden administration.

In closing, I will, again, thank Mrs. LESKO for her hard work on the bill.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), the chair of the Democratic Policy and Communications Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to these partisan energy appliance bills.

Time and time again in this Congress, Republicans have brought and continue to bring partisan messaging bills to the floor that are just meant to rile up people and get their base upset while continuing to put off the work that the American people sent us here to do: to work together to really solve some of America's problems.

H.R. 6192 isn't the first anti-efficiency bill we have seen on the House floor. My Republican colleagues are obstructing the work that we have been sent here to do. We have a lot of serious problems, like reducing the cost of prescription drugs and helping everybody have access to healthcare.

The Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, along with the other anti-efficiency bills out there, like very serious bills—Liberty in Laundry Act, Refrigerator Freedom Act, Clothes Dryers Reliability Act—are just bills with

names to get your attention, but all they do is delay and weaken popular energy efficiency programs, courting favors with polluters.

Unfortunately, they show that I have colleagues who don't want to save American consumers money on their energy bills. They keep peddling these blatant lies that the Biden administration is going after Americans' household appliances. They are not, nor did they try to take away our gas stoves last year. There is a lot of drama out there not based in truth.

I have a brand-new gas stove. Actually, it is a year old, and I have yet to use it. That is how often we get to cook. Nobody is going to take it away from me, and I bought it in the midst of that whole debate. Secretary Granholm has said that she owns a gas stove and that nobody is going to take it away from her.

The fear-mongering is nothing more than political—I don't know what word I want to use because I love my friends—but it is designed to scare consumers and is not based on facts.

The American people sent us here to work together in a bipartisan manner to find commonsense solutions, like working together to extend funding for the Affordable Connectivity Program that expires this month and helps millions of Americans have access to and afford broadband. We saw what happened during COVID when so many people didn't have access to the internet.

Instead of doing something that will help everyday working Americans, we are focused on partisan messaging bills. Instead of working on the real issues facing the American people, we are choosing, yet again, to waste our time debating appliances.

Mr. Chair, we need to stop playing games, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

President Biden's tenure in office has been largely defined by this administration's self-inflicted crises, including an energy crisis that has crept its way into the homes of American families.

The Biden administration's war on American energy has not only led to higher prices at the pump, but now families' home appliances are on the chopping block—yes, their home appliances.

Under the guise of energy efficiency, the Department of Energy has issued burdensome standards on household appliances that would drive up costs and reduce availability for these in-demand products, and we don't even know if they work.

I cannot fathom why the Federal Government would tilt the scales of what appliances Americans should and should not buy. That should be a free-market decision.

Common sense tells us demand should be consumer and market-driven, not government-manufactured. Nonetheless, in this administration's pursuit of a radical, rush-to-Green New Deal agenda, common sense has taken a back seat.

H.R. 6192 will preserve the affordability, availability, and quality of household appliances and protect Americans from Federal standards that increase costs, fail to result in significant energy savings, and are not practical.

When I came to Congress, never in my wildest imagination would I have thought that I would stand here on the House floor to defend my constituents' appliances and gas stoves, but this is where we are under this administration.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), our Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of New Jersey for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chair, the House of Representatives, of course, is the institution the Framers designed to be the closest to the American people. The first institution mentioned in the United States Constitution is the people's House, the place where President Abraham Lincoln declared that America is "the last best hope of Earth," the place where FDR made clear the importance of defending democracy against the tyranny of Nazi fascism. It is the place where President Lyndon Baines Johnson talked about the importance of the Voting Rights Act and made clear to America that we shall overcome.

The House of Representatives is a special place.

Earlier today, I was told you need to get to the House floor to deal with a signature piece of legislation from the extreme MAGA Republicans in this 118th Congress. I wondered to myself, is it going to be about inflation, lower costs, housing affordability, public safety, dealing with the challenges at the border, Social Security, Medicare? What is it going to be about?

It turns out the signature piece of legislation for the extreme MAGA Republicans this week, this month, this year is the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act. This is what we are dealing with on this magical House floor, with all the challenges that the American people are confronting. Liberty for laundry, defending the dignity of dishwashers, fighting for freedom of refrigerators is what we are doing? You can't make it up. You can't make it up.

As House Democrats, we are going to defend democracy. Extreme MAGA Republicans are working on defending the dignity of dishwashers.

As House Democrats, we are going to protect and strengthen Social Security. Extreme MAGA Republicans apparently are interested in protecting gas stoves against phony accusations of oppression.

House Democrats are going to defend reproductive freedom. Extreme MAGA Republicans are focused on the freedom for refrigerators.

We believe in a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions, period, full stop. We believe in women's healthcare, in protecting the women of America against extreme MAGA Republican overreach. Instead of leaning into the protection of reproductive freedom, instead of trying to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, my Republican colleagues want to criminalize abortion care and impose a nationwide ban and then waste time on the House floor as it relates to the liberty of laundry. You can't make this up.

Mr. Chair, I urge my Republican colleagues to partner with us. If they want to push back against overreach, then push back against the pro-Putin extreme overreach on their side of the aisle that doesn't want to defend democracy and freedom here and abroad. It is undermining it.

We extend the hand of partnership, as we have repeatedly done, to solve real problems for the American people, but those problems have nothing to do with the dignity of dishwashers, the freedom of refrigerators, or the liberty of laundry.

Let's get back to doing the real business of the American people. Vote "no" against this legislation.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Chair, over the past 3 years, the Biden administration has fought to enact a far-left energy agenda that stifles innovation, raises prices, and halts economic growth. Burdensome regulations that fail to decrease energy usage and cost consumers more to buy appliances should not be enacted.

This legislation would put a stop to the Department of Energy's continued crackdown on American-made appliances and implement minimal thresholds for energy or water savings that would need to be met before any new regulations could be created.

The Biden administration's war on energy is reaching into the American home, and it is closing the door to your refrigerator and draining your dishwasher. Ultimately, it would cost American families more money.

Further, this bill would ensure that the Secretary of Energy cannot unilaterally ban products because of the type of fuel that they use.

In order to lower prices and to protect our energy independence, it is vital that we continue to utilize energy resources like natural gas that is underneath the feet of my constituents in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act.

With everything going on in our world and in our country today, I, like Leader Jeffries, am disappointed that the precious time we have on this House floor to move legislation is dedicated to unnecessary, unhelpful, and unasked-for bills about home appliances.

Rights for refrigerators, liberty for laundry, dignity for dishwashers—how about instead we turn our attention to the rights, liberty, and dignity of women in America?

In my home State of Texas and across the country, women's rights to make their own decisions about their bodies, their families, and their futures are being stripped away by State legislatures and local governments. Why is it that this majority does nothing for them?

For example, as States ban abortion and limit access to reproductive healthcare, more and more Americans have been forced to travel, sometimes long distances and oftentimes to other States, to get the reproductive healthcare that they need.

In response to the exercise of this constitutional right to travel, one of the chief privileges and immunities for citizens in the Constitution, lawmakers are trying to take away this right, too.

□ 1530

Multiple cities in Texas have enacted ordinances to prohibit anyone from traveling on their roads or through their towns if the purpose is to get somewhere else to get an abortion.

In Alabama, the attorney general wants to prosecute groups that help women obtain abortions out of State.

Just last week, a man in Texas took legal action to investigate his former partner who had traveled to a State where abortion is legal.

These things are happening in the United States today, as we sit here today. This unconstitutional interference with our rights and our liberty and our dignity is what this body should be considering. That is what this body should be concerned about.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would strike the current bill text and replace it with the text of my bill, H.R. 782, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. This amendment reaffirms the fundamental constitutional right to travel across State lines for the purpose of obtaining reproductive healthcare as well as for healthcare providers providing care to out-of-

State residents and those assisting people traveling for this purpose.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

Mrs. Fletcher moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6192 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike sections 1 through 3 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE ABORTION SERVICES PROHIBITED.

(a) INTERFERENCE PROHIBITED.—No person acting under color of State law, including any person who, by operation of a provision of State law, is permitted to implement or enforce State law, may prevent, restrict, or impede, or retaliate against, in any manner—

(1) a health care provider's ability to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State;

(2) any person or entity's ability to assist a health care provider to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State, if such assistance does not violate the law of that State;

(3) any person's ability to travel across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided;

(4) any person's or entity's ability to assist another person traveling across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided; or

(5) the movement in interstate commerce, in accordance with Federal law or regulation, of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief, and for such compensatory damages as the court determines appropriate, including for economic losses and for emotional pain and suffering. The court may, in addition, award reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action to a prevailing plaintiff.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "abortion service" means—
(A) an abortion, including the use of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy; and

(B) any health care service related to or provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) The term "health care provider" means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, physician's assistant, or pharmacist) that is—

(A) engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) licensed or certified to perform such service under applicable State law.

(3) The term "drug" has the meaning given such term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, each Indian tribe, and each territory or possession of the United States.

(e) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the fundamental right to travel within the United States, including the District of Columbia, Tribal lands, and the territories of the United States, nor to limit any existing enforcement authority of the Attorney General or any existing remedies available to address a violation of such right.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I would like to go over some of the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have accused this bill of mine of doing.

First, Mr. PALLONE, who I respect, said this bill will raise energy bills. Absolutely not. In fact, if you read the bill, it couldn't be clearer because the text states: The Secretary cannot issue a new standard if the energy efficiency standard results in additional cost to consumers. It is very clear. In fact, the whole goal of this bill is to save consumers money and also make sure that their appliances actually work.

My fellow colleague, Representative CASTOR, said: We need to side with the people. Well, that is exactly what my bill does. I will tell you why. Let me give you some examples of what our current Department of Energy is doing and why this isn't a waste of time to be talking about because this is for the people. This is for every household in America that has to pay more money because of these crazy Department of Energy regulations.

Let me give you some examples: For clothes washers, the Department of Energy estimates that its standard could save as little as \$9 for certain models over the average lifetime for the appliance, which is estimated to be 13.4 years, \$9 over 13.4 years. Wow.

For dishwashers, the analysis by the Department of Energy under Biden finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront cost by 28 percent, and it could take consumers 12 years to pay back the increased cost on a product that may only last 7 to 12 years.

My bill is for the people.

Here is another DOE rule under the Biden administration: For refrigerators and freezers, the Department of Energy's own analysis finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront cost to replace that refrigerator or freezer by 25 percent, and it could take

consumers 10 years to pay back the increased cost for a product that may only last 14 to 15 years.

Here is another example: For air conditioners, the Department of Energy's own analysis finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront cost by 30 percent, and it could take consumers 4 years to pay back the increased cost for a product that may only last 9 years.

Here is another one: For clothes dryers, Biden's Department of Energy's own analysis—I am talking about their analysis, not mine—shows that it would take between 6 years and 46 years to pay back the increased cost, depending on the type of dryer and the product features.

The payback periods for many of these appliances are uneconomical. For example, under Biden's Department of Energy, the payback periods for proposed clothes dryer standards are 6 years for electric, 18 years for electric compact, 20 years for vented electric compact, 5 years for vented gas, 11 years for ventless electric compact, and 46 years for ventless electric combination washer/dryer.

With all due respect to my Democratic colleagues, who say this is a waste of time—we are wasting time, we should be talking about all of their priorities. No. Republicans are here. We are standing up for the average, commonsense, everyday American who can't afford groceries anymore, let alone these crazy, radical standards that the Biden administration is pushing through that will increase their costs.

That is why I am doing this bill. We want appliances that not only work, but we don't want to bankrupt the American people with all these crazy, radical, Biden rush-to-green energy policies.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. PALLONE for his leadership.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the House Republicans' ridiculous Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, which would strip away commonsense energy efficiency standards that will save our constituents hundreds of dollars every year on their utility bills and save \$1 trillion and cut greenhouse gas pollution by over 2.5 billion metric tons over the next 30 years.

However, House Republicans want to put polluters over people by stoking fear that someone is coming after their household appliances. News flash: No one is coming after anyone's household appliances.

We should be focused on the issues that the American people want us to focus on. Indeed, none of my constituents nor a majority of the American people are clamoring for Congress to protect their household appliances.

Do you know what they are clamoring for? They are clamoring for Con-

gress to do something about the fact that they have lost reproductive freedom and the ability to make healthcare decisions without interference from politicians since the Supreme Court gutted *Roe v. Wade*. Now over 40 percent of women of reproductive age live in a State with an abortion ban or extreme restrictions.

They want us to do something about the fact that barriers to their exercise of the right to vote have been put in place since the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act.

They want us to do something about the fact that the impacts of climate change such as, sea level rise, increased temperatures, major storms increasing, and pollution is having an impact on their health, their businesses, their communities, and even our military readiness, as we heard from the Secretary of the Navy last week.

Democrats are fighting to put people over politics and address these issues that actually matter to the American people. I urge my Republican colleagues to do the same. Vote "no" on this bill, and let's get back to work.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues keep saying: Do something that the people really care about. This is something that the American people really care about.

Let me show you a Wall Street Journal article from today. It is from today. It is titled, "Biden is Coming for Your Air Conditioner." It says: "Your next new home air conditioner could set you back \$12,000 or more, with Federal regulators contributing to the rising cost of staying cool."

I am from Arizona. We need air conditioners. People are just trying to get by right now because of the inflation under Biden. Biden's economics—Bidenomics, as he calls it—is costing people money.

The Energy Department in January 2023 issued a new efficiency standard for residential air-conditioning systems. It necessitated a major redesign that increased costs by \$1,000 to \$1,500 per air conditioner.

It isn't clear that consumers will ever earn back in long-term energy savings the steeper upfront costs they are paying.

Next up is an Environmental Protection Agency regulation scheduled to take effect in 2025. It will require air-conditioning equipment makers to use new refrigerants deemed sufficiently climate friendly. The only refrigerants being used by manufacturers that meet the EPA's new green standards are classified as mildly flammable.

Manufacturers in earnings conference calls have estimated that the price of compliant equipment will increase the price of the air conditioner at least 10 percent. The switch to flammable systems will also require additional technician training and extra installation steps that are likely to increase labor costs for installations and repairs.

I wish that I didn't have to sponsor this bill. I mean, if you asked me a

number of years ago would I sponsor this, I would have thought it wasn't necessary. However, under the Biden administration, they have just gone crazy. I don't know if radical environmentalists are bending the ear of President Biden or what is going on because, as I have demonstrated, this isn't helping Americans. This is a radical agenda that is increasing the prices on everyday Americans, and we can't afford it. That is why this bill is necessary.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, Republicans have spent the last year and a half attacking all of the Biden administration's efforts to lower energy costs for American consumers.

Rebates for energy efficient appliances to lower energy bills; Republicans are furious.

Incentives to spur investment in clean energy to drive down bills; Republicans attack that.

Efforts to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower gas prices for Americans; Republicans were incensed.

Forgive me, Mr. Chairman, but I just find it all too much, especially because not a single colleague of mine on the other side of the aisle has made as much as a peep since the Federal Trade Commission last week revealed that the CEO of the largest American independent producer of crude oil was colluding with OPEC to keep oil prices high.

That is the real scandal, Mr. Chairman: The CEO of an American company working together with representatives of the Saudi Government to raise prices for Americans. Even worse, he tried to persuade his competitors to do the same and drive the price of crude oil up to \$200 per barrel in a display of naked greed.

If my Republican colleagues were serious about wanting to lower energy costs for Americans, they would hold hearings. They are in charge. They are in the majority. They should hold hearings and put legislation on the floor to deal with this scandal instead of standing here debating the freedom of appliances.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans claim they want to lower energy costs, but their actions speak louder than their words. They are beyond furious if you try to use technology to lower the energy consumption of household appliances and save Americans money, but a Big Oil CEO colluding with OPEC nations to pick American pockets, you would be hard pressed to get Republicans to care about that.

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

□ 1545

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call out the problems that I have heard on the floor today from the other side of the aisle.

Republicans have claimed that they care about energy costs. They keep saying over and over again that they care about energy costs, but their actions and their vote shows that that is just not true.

The Biden administration's efficiency standards are estimated to save consumers \$1 trillion over 30 years. That is \$1 trillion.

Water heater standards will save American households \$7.6 billion, refrigerator standards will save Americans \$36 billion, and clothes washer and dryer standards will save Americans a combined \$39 billion.

The bottom line is Republicans don't want Americans to realize those savings. They want Americans to be stuck with older, energy-guzzling appliances that cost more money every time you turn them on. I think it is ridiculous, and so should everyone else in this Chamber.

Republicans claim they are concerned about the higher upfront costs of these appliances, but 2 years ago when the Inflation Reduction Act was passed, which contained \$9 billion in rebates and other investments in lowering the cost of energy-efficient appliances, well, Republicans all voted "no," every one of them.

Let's review. The Republicans don't want to make positive economic investments because they are concerned about the up-front costs, but then they also refuse to take action to lower those up-front costs.

If you brought this mentality to the private sector, you would probably be fired in a heartbeat. That is the orthodoxy in today's Republican Party.

Lowering energy costs for consumers via efficiency gains used to be a bipartisan issue. These efficiency standards and the process for achieving them have been around for 50 years, and every so often, we have the Department of Energy both under Democrats and Republicans coming forward with efficiency standards.

We made real progress on this in 1992 and again in 2005, but somewhere along the way, Republicans decided to become the party of higher energy costs rather than the ones fighting for the American homeowners, and it is a real shame.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. This bill is going to raise energy costs. This bill is going to stifle innovation. This bill is going to do nothing, obviously, to address the climate crisis.

It is just going nowhere, and we are wasting our time when we could be doing things that are more important than addressing affordability for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, sometimes I feel like it is *deja vu*. I remember

standing here and talking about my Save Our Gas Stoves bill.

My Democrat colleagues—not all of them because some of them voted with me on my bill—said the same arguments. This is a waste of time. We are not banning stoves. The Americans don't care about this.

Well, guess what? That bill passed the U.S. House of Representatives with bipartisan support, and then guess what? It worked because the Department of Energy dialed it back.

Originally, according to their own analysis, they were going to effectively ban 96 percent of all the current models of gas stoves. Now, it is only 3 percent. We won. The American people won. That is why I am doing this bill.

When my friend, Mr. PALLONE, says, well, these energy efficiency standards will save all kinds of money, what he is not saying is all of the money that it is going to cost extra up front for these new, revised standards, and that is if the thing even works well.

Let me remind my colleagues what this bill actually does and why it is needed. It is a commonsense bill. It will protect affordability by requiring the Department of Energy to consider the full life cycle cost of appliances when determining if the new standard is economically justified.

The bill requires a 3-year payback. The Secretary of Energy said, oh, it should only be 1 year, so there shouldn't be any problems with my bill.

The bill establishes minimum thresholds for energy or water savings that must be achieved before imposing new standards.

My Democrat colleagues say they want to save energy and water. So do I. Let's put it in the bill. Let's say, okay, it has to save 10 percent.

The bill prohibits the Secretary of Energy from banning products based on what type of fuel the product uses, just like they were trying to do with the gas stoves.

The bill requires that any new standard cannot affect the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product or the life span of the product.

You know why? Because Americans, when they buy new appliances, want them to work as good as the ones that they have now.

The bill will allow the Department of Energy to amend or revoke prior standards if they don't save consumers money and they don't work.

This is a commonsense bill. It should be a bipartisan bill. I don't know why my Democrat colleagues are fighting it so hard because it says it has to save the consumers money.

It is all about helping the American homeowner who is struggling with Bidenomics right now. I am telling you: People in my district, they complain about the prices of groceries. They are complaining about the price of gas.

When their air conditioner, when their water heater, when their dish-

washer starts to fail, and they have to buy a new one, they don't want to pay a whole bunch more, and they want it to work as well as their current one has done for years.

That is the purpose of my bill. That is why I ask my Democratic colleagues and my Republican colleagues to support my bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6192

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 "Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act".

SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 325(m)(1) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, for any product, publish a notice of proposed rulemaking including new proposed standards for such product based on the criteria established under subsection (o) and the procedures established under subsection (p)."

(2) AMENDMENT OF STANDARD.—Section 325(m)(3) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) AMENDMENT OF STANDARD.—Not later than 2 years after a notice is issued under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish a final rule amending the standard for the product."

(b) PETITION FOR AMENDED STANDARD.—Section 325(n) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(n)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "AN AMENDED STANDARD" and inserting "AMENDMENT OR REVOCATION OF STANDARD";

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or revoked" after "should be amended";

(3) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall grant a petition to determine if energy conservation standards for a covered product should be amended or revoked if the Secretary finds that such petition contains evidence, assuming no other evidence were considered, that such standards—

"(A) result in additional costs to consumers;

"(B) do not result in significant conservation of energy or water;

"(C) are not technologically feasible; and

"(D) result in such covered product not being commercially available in the United States to all consumers."; and

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking "NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS." and inserting "NEW, AMENDED, OR REVOKED STANDARDS.";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively (and by conforming the margins accordingly);

(C) by striking “Not later than 3 years” and inserting the following:

“(A) Not later than 3 years”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Not later than 180 days after the date of granting a petition to revoke standards, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

“(i) a final rule revoking the standards; or

“(ii) a determination that it is not necessary to revoke the standards.

“(C) The grant of a petition by the Secretary under this subsection creates no presumption with respect to the Secretary’s determination of any of the criteria in a rule-making under this section.

“(D) Standards that have been revoked pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be considered to be in effect for purposes of section 327.”.

(c) CRITERIA.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 325(o) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)) are amended to read as follows:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DESIGN.—Any new or amended energy conservation standard prescribed by the Secretary under this section for any type (or class) of covered product shall be designed to achieve the maximum improvement in energy efficiency, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water efficiency, which the Secretary determines is technologically feasible and economically justified.

“(B) TEST PROCEDURES.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product if a test procedure has not been prescribed pursuant to section 323 with respect to that type (or class) of product.

“(C) SIGNIFICANT CONSERVATION.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product if the Secretary determines that the establishment and imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of—

“(i) energy; or

“(ii) in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water.

“(D) TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE AND ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary determines that the establishment and imposition of such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified.

“(3) FACTORS FOR DETERMINATION.—

“(A) ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—Prior to prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for any type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary shall conduct a quantitative economic impact analysis of imposition of the energy conservation standard that determines the predicted—

“(i) effects of imposition of the energy conservation standard on costs and monetary benefits to consumers of the products subject to such energy conservation standard, including—

“(I) costs to low-income households; and

“(II) variations in costs to consumers based on differences in regions, including climatic differences;

“(ii) effects of imposition of the energy conservation standard on employment; and

“(iii) lifecycle costs for the covered product, including costs associated with the pur-

chase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

“(B) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL COSTS TO THE CONSUMER.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary, based on an economic analysis under subparagraph (A), determines that—

“(i) imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product; and

“(ii) the monetary value of the energy savings and, as applicable, water savings, that the consumer will receive as a result of such energy conservation standard during the first 3 years after purchasing and installing a covered product complying with such energy conservation standard, as calculated under the applicable test procedure, will be greater than any increased costs to the consumer of the covered product due to imposition of such energy conservation standard, including increased costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

“(C) REQUIRED ENERGY OR WATER SAVINGS.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that compliance with such energy conservation standard will result in—

“(i) a reduction of at least 0.3 quads of site energy over 30 years; or

“(ii) at least a 10 percent reduction in energy or water use of the covered product.

“(D) CRITERIA RELATED TO PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in any lessening of the utility or the performance of the applicable covered product, taking into consideration the effects of such energy conservation standard on—

“(i) the compatibility of the covered product with existing systems;

“(ii) the life span of the covered product;

“(iii) the operating conditions of the covered product;

“(iv) the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product, as applicable;

“(v) the maintenance requirements of the covered product; and

“(vi) the replacement and disposal requirements for the covered product.

“(E) CRITERIA RELATED TO MARKET COMPETITION AND PRICE DISCRIMINATION.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of the energy conservation standard is not likely to result in—

“(i) any lessening of market competition; or

“(ii) price discrimination.

“(F) TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION.—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in the unavailability in the United States of a type (or class) of products based on what type of fuel the product consumes.

“(G) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified, the Secretary—

“(i) shall prioritize the interests of consumers;

“(ii) may not consider estimates of the social costs or social benefits associated with incremental greenhouse gas emissions; and

“(iii) shall consider—

“(I) the economic impact of the standard on the manufacturers and on the consumers of the products subject to such standard;

“(II) the savings in operating costs throughout the estimated average life of the covered product in the type (or class) compared to any increase in the price of, or in the initial charges for, or maintenance expenses of, the covered products which are likely to result from the imposition of the standard;

“(III) the total projected amount of energy, or as applicable, water, savings likely to result directly from the imposition of the standard;

“(IV) the need for national energy and water conservation; and

“(V) other factors the Secretary considers relevant.

“(H) REGULATORY REVIEW.—

“(i) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of any final rule prescribing a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for any type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary shall evaluate the rule to determine whether such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified and whether the regulatory impact analysis for such rule remains accurate.

“(ii) EFFECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, if the Secretary determines, based on an evaluation under clause (i), that an energy conservation standard is not technologically feasible or economically justified—

“(I) the Secretary shall publish such determination and such energy conservation standard shall have no force or effect (except that such energy conservation standard shall be considered to be in effect for purposes of section 327); and

“(II) the Secretary may publish a final rule amending the energy conservation standard for the type (or class) of covered product to be technologically feasible and economically justified in accordance with this subsection, which amendment shall apply to such a product that is manufactured after the date that is 2 years after publication of such final rule.”.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REGIONAL STANDARDS.—Section 325(o)(6)(D)(i)(II) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)(6)(D)(i)(II)) is amended by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “this subsection”.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS.—Section 325(p)(2)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(p)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “taking into account those factors which the Secretary must consider under subsection (o)(2)” and inserting “as determined in accordance with subsection (o)”.

(c) ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR HIGH-INTENSITY DISCHARGE LAMPS, DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS, AND SMALL ELECTRIC MOTORS.—Section 346 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6317) is amended by striking subsection (c).

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 118-487. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in

the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand of division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONY GONZALES OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-487.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 7, strike "climatic differences" and insert "rural populations, cost of living comparisons, and climatic differences".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment. I grew up in rural Texas. This amendment is simple. It ensures that whenever the Biden administration proposes or amends an energy conservation standard, the needs of rural communities are taken into consideration.

For too long, the needs of people in rural communities, including those I represent in south and west Texas, have been ignored in order to support the left's rush-to-green agenda.

In my district, many people rely on gas-powered appliances to cook their meals, maintain their lawn care, and power and heat their homes in times of electric failures.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, first, as I have already said, the Department of Energy must already ensure that energy conservation standards are economically justified, so this amendment is totally unnecessary.

Instead of being helpful, this amendment adds duplicative processes to a bill that already adds burdensome steps to the energy conservation program. It is all just messaging and designed to slow down rulemaking.

Also, it is interesting to me that we are even considering this amendment. The gentleman seems very confident that there will be any new or amended energy conservations; however, under this bill, I am not even sure that we will ever see any new standards.

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

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. STEUBE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-487.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 13, insert the following:

"(E) DISCLOSURE.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary, not later than the date on which the standard is prescribed, publicly discloses each meeting held by the Secretary, during the 5-year period preceding such date, with any entity that—

"(i) has ties to the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party;

"(ii) has produced studies regarding, or advocated for, regulations or policy to limit, restrict, or ban the use of any type of energy; and

"(iii) has applied for or received Federal funds.".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment originally sponsored by Congressman HUIZENGA that requires the Secretary of Energy to disclose certain stakeholder meetings with any entity that meets the following criteria:

First, the entity must have ties to the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party.

Second, it must have produced studies regarding or has advocated for policies to limit, restrict, or ban the use of any type of energy.

Third, the entity must have applied for or received Federal funds.

In June of last year, nearly the same amendment was offered to Save Our Gas Stove Act, and it passed by a voice vote—because this is a solid policy prescription for a serious problem. The problem is that China-connected groups seem to have fast-pass access to the White House and our Federal agencies.

The entities I am concerned with are not only tied to the Chinese Communist Party, but they are peddling anti-energy policies that raise costs on American families and businesses—like gas stove bans. In addition to access, they often receive your tax dollars as well, in the form of grant funding.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has not been transparent about who it is meeting with, let alone their plans to ban gas-powered appliances.

Last year, a government watchdog group revealed a private meeting between the Secretary of Energy and one of these types of groups. We have since found this has not been an uncommon practice.

Over the past few years, we have faced a litany of burdensome regulations from the Biden administration targeting appliances.

As the underlying bill reflects, it is not just gas stoves—it is your washer, your dryer, your dishwasher, and much more.

We have a major problem if groups with known connections to China are able to successfully influence the executive branch in ways that undermine cost-effective appliance options that meet Americans' daily needs.

This amendment would inject critical transparency, curb the influence of the CCP-connected groups, and responsibly expose to America who has the ear of our regulators.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, the amendment amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with vague language that would likely be impossible to implement.

Additionally, this amendment is clearly designed to target environmental and clean energy groups. If this amendment is adopted, and if H.R. 6192 becomes law, it would slow down the Department of Energy rulemaking process and create additional hurdles to adopting energy conservation standards. It would overburden the Department of Energy staff, who would be tasked with identifying covered parties to ensure compliance. It creates loads of needless paperwork and is an unfunded mandate.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to recognize that this amendment is pure Republican messaging and would hinder climate action.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, this bill would provide transparency to who the Department is meeting with and who is influencing their decisions.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-487.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS.

The final rule titled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for

Distribution Transformers” (signed on April 3, 2024; Docket No. EERE-2019-BT-STD-0018) shall not take effect.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I offered this amendment with Representative HUDSON and Representative BALDERSON to stop the wrong-headed rule that the Department of Energy finalized which threatens the use of grain-oriented electrical steel in our distribution transformers.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What Biden administration bureaucrats fail to realize is that poorly designed rules made here in Washington can have devastating consequences for Pennsylvania communities. From south central to southwestern Pennsylvania, Gettysburg to Johnstown, Altoona to Bedford, Chambersburg to Lewistown, this impact will be felt.

This rule from the Department of Energy would only serve to worsen the crippling shortages of transformers already faced by American manufacturers.

Just recently, I spoke to a business in Pennsylvania that had been forced to wait 18 months for transformers to open their new business. These shortages are leading to costly delays that ultimately cost jobs, cost livelihoods, and cost the American public.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, apparently, Republicans don't realize that sometimes things can be a win-win.

Back in April, the Department of Energy finalized efficiency standards for distribution transformers, critical components for the electric grid. Because they are so ubiquitous, any improvements in efficiency from these transformers can translate to massive energy and cost savings.

Before the Department of Energy finalized the standard, it spent 15 months listening to everyone from steel and transformer manufacturers to utilities to homebuilders to everyday Americans and everyone in between. The Department of Energy took that feedback very seriously and produced a standard that met the criteria under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act: technologically feasible and economically justified. The final product they put out worked for everyone.

Don't take my word for it. Take the word of UAW Local 3303, which says

that this final rule “ensures a viable pathway for UAW-made steel to supply the transformer market long into the future.” Talk to the United Auto Workers Region 9 director, who thanked the Department of Energy “for listening to the voices of our members in Butler, Pennsylvania, and having a willingness to learn from our subject matter experts who actually make these products.”

You don't have to just listen to labor leaders on this, either. Listen to Cleveland-Cliffs, the manufacturer of the electrical steel that goes into transformers. They praised the rule and said they expect it to actually increase demand for their product, opening the possibility of future investments and plant expansion. Listen to the president of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, who thanked the Department of Energy for the flexibility that the final rule provided. Listen to the utilities that say this final rule provides stability and certainty while moving us toward vital efficiency goals.

The sponsors of this amendment should just turn around and listen to the Republican chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, my esteemed colleague from Washington State, who called the final rule encouraging.

Mr. Chair, you can go to one of the sponsors, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), who just two weeks ago appeared at an event with the Secretary of Energy at Cleveland-Cliffs—again, a manufacturer of grain-oriented electrical steel—and celebrated the final rule and the jobs at Cleveland-Cliffs that the final rule will save. The press release from my colleague's office called the final rule on distribution transformers efficiency “the right thing.”

I couldn't agree more, Mr. Chair. I am just not sure what made my colleagues change their minds in the last 2 weeks.

My point is, there is broad support behind this rule from all corners. If Republicans really cared about the transformer shortages utilities across the Nation are still suffering from, they would work with us to provide the necessary funding for the President's invocation of the Defense Production Act for transformers because that is something, unlike this amendment, that would really make a positive difference.

I really don't understand why this amendment is being offered. It makes no sense.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am not sure where he gathered that information, but it is totally false, which is normal here.

The sole remaining domestic producer of grain-oriented electrical steel is in my hometown of Butler, Pennsyl-

vania, and it is represented by 1,300 union workers from UAW 3303, which my colleague has referenced. He should have been in Butler with me when almost 500 of them showed up to protest what was happening with the elimination of grain-oriented electrical steel.

This rule threatens the long-term viability of the mill. The mill in Butler produces grain-oriented electrical steel for distribution transformers, and I brought a picture of it because most people don't know what we are talking about. Mr. Chair, if you are driving down the road and see a telephone pole with this gray canister on it, that is a distribution transformer. Inside it is a product called grain-oriented electrical steel.

That product, by the way, works at 98-percent efficiency. The other side would like to replace it with something called amorphous steel, which if you compare the two, only one is actually steel. Grain-oriented electrical steel is actually steel. Amorphous looks like tin foil.

Our product is 98-percent efficient. If you transfer over to amorphous steel, you are looking at a load capacity of 80 percent, which is dangerous, while a traditional GOES transformer can run with a 120 percent load capacity.

The market for these transformers is at an all-time high. Why in the world would we go away from something that is domestically produced in Butler, Pennsylvania, for a product that is not produced in America, cannot serve the needs that are there, and cannot meet the market demands for some type of a wrongheaded idea that we must go with this new product.

Listen to fact versus fiction. This transformer with grain-oriented electrical steel, domestic steel, is produced in Butler, Pennsylvania, by 1,300 union workers, with each union job supporting an estimated seven local jobs in my hometown. The elimination of this product would eliminate that town.

Have we not learned enough over the years that when we turn away from a domestic-produced product and rely on a foreign source for it, that somehow in the end we don't have the product and capacity that we need.

We have dumb-headed rule after dumb-headed rule in some type of a made-up, fantasy world where somehow this is better. It is not better.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Let me say, Mr. Chair, again, the standards that have been established by the Department of Energy have broad support. The rule has broad support from all corners. I just don't understand how my Republican colleagues can say all of a sudden now that they are opposed to it.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, here we are again in a situation where it is "he said, she said," or "you said, I said." I challenge anybody who has not been to a mill and actually watched the production of steel to sit on this floor and say they have a better product because they say it is a better product.

The distribution of electricity is critical in our homes, businesses, and towns across the Nation. The last remaining domestic producer of grain-oriented electrical steel, which is the product inside all of these transformers, is made in one mill in one town in America, not in some strange place across the oceans that says we will provide you with this if we can.

Why do we keep turning away from domestic production and thinking that somehow, someplace, somewhere, somebody else is going to provide it for us? That is wrongheaded and just makes absolutely no sense.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to please go in these mills, look at these canisters that are on the telephone poles, and understand that is how we push electricity from one point to the next. This isn't fantasy. This is the truth of what is going on.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to take down the rule that is there now and vote for this amendment. It is the only way we can save electrical transformers in America. Please vote for American products.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 199, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

AYES—208

Aderholt	Calvert	Duarte
Alford	Cammack	Duncan
Allen	Carey	Dunn (FL)
Amodei	Carl	Edwards
Armstrong	Carter (GA)	Ellzey
Arrington	Chavez-DeRemer	Emmer
Babin	Ciscomani	Estes
Bacon	Cline	Ezell
Balderson	Clough	Fallon
Barr	Clyde	Feenstra
Bean (FL)	Cole	Finstad
Bentz	Collins	Fischbach
Bergman	Comer	Fitzgerald
Bice	Crane	Fitzpatrick
Biggs	Crawford	Fleischmann
Billirakis	Crenshaw	Flood
Bishop (NC)	Cuellar	Foxx
Boebert	Curtis	Franklin, Scott
Bost	D'Esposito	Fry
Brecheen	Davidson	Fulcher
Buchanan	Davis (NC)	Gaetz
Bucshon	De La Cruz	Garbarino
Burchett	DesJarlais	Garcia, Mike
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Gimenez
Burlison	Donalds	Gonzales, Tony

Gonzalez,	Lesko	Rose
Vicente	Letlow	Rosendale
Good (VA)	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Gooden (TX)	Lucas	Roy
Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford
Granger	Luna	Salazar
Graves (LA)	Luttrell	Scalise
Graves (MO)	Mace	Schweikert
Green (TN)	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin
Greene (GA)	Maloy	Self
Griffith	Mann	Simpson
Grothman	Massie	Smith (MO)
Guest	Mast	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Harris	McClain	Smucker
Harshbarger	McClintock	Staubert
Hern	McCormick	Steel
Higgins (LA)	Miller (IL)	Stefanik
Hill	Miller (OH)	Steil
Hinson	Miller (WV)	Steube
Houchin	Miller-Meeks	Strong
Hudson	Mills	Tenney
Huizenga	Molinaro	Thompson (PA)
Hunt	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Issa	Moore (AL)	Tiffany
Jackson (TX)	Moore (UT)	Timmons
James	Moran	Turner
Johnson (SD)	Moylan	Valadao
Jordan	Murphy	Van Drew
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Van Dуйne
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Van Orden
Kean (NJ)	Norman	Wagner
Kelly (MS)	Nunn (IA)	Walberg
Kelly (PA)	Obermole	Waltz
Kiggans (VA)	Ogles	Weber (TX)
Kiley	Owens	Webster (FL)
Kim (CA)	Palmer	Wenstrup
Kustoff	Perez	Westerman
LaHood	Perry	Williams (NY)
LaLota	Pflugger	Williams (TX)
Lamborn	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Latta	Reschenthaler	Wittman
LaTurner	Rodgers (WA)	Womack
Lawler	Rogers (AL)	Yakym
Lee (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Zinke

NOES—199

Adams	Dingell	Lynch
Aguilar	Doggett	Manning
Alfred	Escobar	Matsui
Amo	Eshoo	McBath
Auchincloss	Espaiilat	McClellan
Balint	Evans	McCollum
Barragan	Fletcher	McGarvey
Beatty	Foster	McGovern
Bera	Frankel, Lois	Meeks
Beyer	Frost	Menendez
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Meng
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Mfume
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (IL)	Moore (WI)
Bonamici	Garcia (TX)	Morelle
Bowman	Garcia, Robert	Moskowitz
Boyle (PA)	Golden (ME)	Moulton
Brown	Goldman (NY)	Mrvan
Brownley	Gomez	Mullin
Budzinski	Gottheimer	Nadler
Bush	Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano
Caraveo	Harder (CA)	Neguse
Carbajal	Hayes	Nickel
Cardenas	Himes	Norcross
Carter (LA)	Horsford	Norton
Cartwright	Houlahan	Ocasio-Cortez
Casar	Hoyer	Omar
Case	Hoyle (OR)	Pallone
Casten	Ivey	Panetta
Castor (FL)	Jackson (NC)	Pappas
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Pascrell
Cherfilus-	Jeffries	Pelosi
McCormick	Johnson (GA)	Peltola
Chu	Kamllager-Dove	Peters
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Pettersen
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Pingree
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Plaskett
Cohen	Kennedy	Pocan
Connolly	Khanna	Porter
Correa	Kildee	Pressley
Costa	Kilmer	Quigley
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Ramirez
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
Crockett	Kuster	Ross
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
David (KS)	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Dean (PA)	Lee (NV)	Sablan
DeGette	Lee (PA)	Salinas
DeLauro	Leger Fernandez	Sanchez
DeBene	Levin	Sarbanes
Deluzio	Lieu	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Schakowsky

Schiff	Stanton	Torres (NY)
Schneider	Stevens	Trahan
Scholten	Strickland	Underwood
Schrier	Suozi	Vargas
Scott (VA)	Swalwell	Vasquez
Scott, David	Sykes	Veasey
Sewell	Takano	Velazquez
Sherman	Thanedar	Wasserman
Sherrill	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Slotkin	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Smith (WA)	Titus	Watson Coleman
Sorensen	Tlaib	Wexton
Soto	Tokuda	Wild
Spanberger	Tonko	Williams (GA)
Stansbury	Torres (CA)	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Baird	Huffman	Mooney
Banks	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Carson	Jackson Lee	Pence
Carter (TX)	Jacobs	Phillips
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Radewagen
Ferguson	Landsman	Sessions
Ferguson	Langworthy	Spartz
González-Colón	Magaziner	Trone
Grijalva	McHenry	
Hagedorn	Meuser	

□ 1641

Messrs. TAKANO and FOSTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. BOEBERT changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROUZER). There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROUZER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6192) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Fletcher of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6192 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 6192, if ordered;

Passage of H.J. Res. 98, the objections to the President to the contrary notwithstanding; and,

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 7423.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 206, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—202

Adams Foster Morelle
Aguilar Frankel, Lois Moskowitz
Allred Frost Moulton
Amo Gallego Mrvan
Auchincloss Garamendi Mullin
Balint Garcia (IL) Nadler
Barragan Garcia (TX) Napolitano
Beatty Garcia, Robert Neal
Bera Golden (ME) Neguse
Beyer Goldman (NY) Nickel
Bishop (GA) Gomez Norcross
Blumenauer Gonzalez, Ocasio-Cortez
Blunt Rochester Vicente
Bonamici Gottheimer
Bowman Green, Al (TX) Panetta
Boyle (PA) Harder (CA) Pappas
Brown Hayes Pascrell
Brownley Himes Pelosi
Budzinski Horsford Peltola
Bush Houlihan Perez
Caraveo Hoyer Peters
Carbajal Hoyle (OR) Pettersen
Cardenas Ivey Pingree
Carter (LA) Jackson (IL) Pocan
Cartwright Jackson (NC) Porter
Casar Jayapal Pressley
Case Jeffries Quigley
Casten Johnson (GA) Ramirez
Castor (FL) Kamlager-Dove Raskin
Castro (TX) Kaptur Ross
Cherfilus-Keating Ruiz
McCormick Kelly (IL) Ruppersberger
Chu Kennedy Ryan
Clark (MA) Khanna Salinas
Clarke (NY) Kildee Sanchez
Clyburn Kilmer Sarbanes
Cohen Kim (NJ) Scanlon
Connolly Krishnamoorthi Schakowsky
Correa Kuster Schiff
Costa Larsen (WA) Schneider
Courtney Larson (CT) Scholten
Craig Lee (CA) Schrier
Crockett Lee (NV) Scott (VA)
Crow Lee (PA) Scott, David
Cuellar Leger Fernandez Sewell
Davids (KS) Levin Sherman
Davis (IL) Lieu Sherrill
Davis (NC) Lofgren Slotkin
Dean (PA) Lynch Smith (WA)
DeGette Manning Sorensen
DeLauro Matsui Soto
DelBene McBath Spanberger
Deluzio McClellan Stansbury
DeSaulnier McCollum Stanton
Dingell McGarvey Stevens
Doggett McGovern Strickland
Escobar Meeks Suozzi
Eshoo Menendez Swalwell
Espallat Meng Sykes
Evans Mfume Takano
Fletcher Moore (WI) Thanedar

Thompson (CA) Trahan Waters
Thompson (MS) Underwood Watson Coleman
Titus Vargas Wexton
Tiaib Vasquez Wild
Tokuda Veasey Williams (GA)
Tonko Velazquez Wilson (FL)
Torres (CA) Wasserman
Torres (NY) Schultz

NAYS—206

Aderholt Garbarino Miller (WV)
Alford Garcia, Mike Miller-Meeks
Allen Gimenez Mills
Amodei Gonzales, Tony Molinaro
Armstrong Good (VA) Moolenaar
Arrington Gooden (TX) Moore (AL)
Babin Gosar Moore (UT)
Bacon Granger Moran
Balderson Graves (LA) Murphy
Barr Graves (MO) Nehls
Bean (FL) Green (TN) Newhouse
Bentz Greene (GA) Norman
Bergman Griffith Nunn (IA)
Bice Grothman Obernolte
Biggs Guest Ogles
Bilirakis Guthrie Owens
Bishop (NC) Palmer Armstrong
Boebert Harshbarger Perry
Bost Hern Pfluger
Brecheen Higgins (LA) Posey
Buchanan Hill Reschenthaler
Buchson Hinson Rodgers (WA)
Burchett Houchin Rogers (AL)
Burgess Hudson Rogers (KY)
Burlison Huizenga
Calvert Hunt
Cammack Issa
Carey Jackson (TX) James
Carl James Rutherford
Carter (GA) Johnson (LA) Salazar
Chavez-DeRemer Johnson (SD) Scalise
Ciscomani Jordan Schweikert
Cline Joyce (OH) Scott, Austin
Cloud Joyce (PA) Self
Clyde Kean (NJ) Simpson
Cole Kelly (MS) Smith (MO)
Collins Kelly (PA) Smith (NE)
Comer Kiggans (VA) Smith (NJ)
Crane Kiley Smucker
Crawford Kim (CA) Stauber
Crenshaw Kustoff Steel
Curtis LaHood Stefanik
D'Esposito LaLota Steil
Davidson Lamborn Steube
De La Cruz Langworthy Strong
DesJarlais Latta Tenney
Diaz-Balart LaTurner Thompson (PA)
Donalds Lawler Tiffany
Duarte Lee (FL) Timmons
Duncan Lesko Turner
Dunn (FL) Letlow Valadao
Edwards Loudermilk Van Drew
Ellzey Lucas Van Dwyne
Cartwright Jackson (NC) Porter
Casar Jayapal Pressley
Case Jeffries Quigley
Casten Johnson (GA) Ramirez
Castor (FL) Kamlager-Dove Raskin
Castro (TX) Kaptur Ross
Cherfilus-Keating Ruiz
McCormick Kelly (IL) Ruppersberger
Chu Kennedy Ryan
Clark (MA) Khanna Salinas
Clarke (NY) Kildee Sanchez
Clyburn Kilmer Sarbanes
Cohen Kim (NJ) Scanlon
Connolly Krishnamoorthi Schakowsky
Correa Kuster Schiff
Costa Larsen (WA) Schneider
Courtney Larson (CT) Scholten
Craig Lee (CA) Schrier
Crockett Lee (NV) Scott (VA)
Crow Lee (PA) Scott, David
Cuellar Leger Fernandez Sewell
Davids (KS) Levin Sherman
Davis (IL) Lieu Sherrill
Davis (NC) Lofgren Slotkin
Dean (PA) Lynch Smith (WA)
DeGette Manning Sorensen
DeLauro Matsui Soto
DelBene McBath Spanberger
Deluzio McClellan Stansbury
DeSaulnier McCollum Stanton
Dingell McGarvey Stevens
Doggett McGovern Strickland
Escobar Meeks Suozzi
Eshoo Menendez Swalwell
Espallat Meng Sykes
Evans Mfume Takano
Fletcher Moore (WI) Thanedar

NOT VOTING—22

Baird Hageman Mooney
Banks Huffman Pence
Carson Jackson Lee Phillips
Carter (TX) Jacobs Sessions
Cleaver LaMalfa Spartz
Ferguson Landsman Trone
Foushee Magaziner
Grijalva McHenry

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1650

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 195, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—212

Aderholt Gallego Miller (IL)
Alford Garbarino Miller (OH)
Allen Garcia, Mike Miller (WV)
Amodei Gimenez Miller-Meeks
Armstrong Golden (ME) Mills
Arrington Gonzales, Tony Molinaro
Babin Gonzalez, Moolenaar
Bacon Vicente Moore (AL)
Balderson Good (VA) Moore (UT)
Barr Gooden (TX) Moran
Bean (FL) Gosar Murphy
Bentz Granger Nehls
Bergman Graves (LA) Newhouse
Bice Graves (MO) Norman
Biggs Green (TN) Nunn (IA)
Bilirakis Greene (GA) Obernolte
Bishop (NC) Griffith Ogles
Boebert Grothman Owens
Bost Guest Palmer
Brecheen Guthrie Peltola
Buchanan Harris Perez
Buchson Harshbarger Perry
Burchett Hern Pfluger
Burgess Higgins (LA) Posey
Burlison Hill Reschenthaler
Calvert Hinson Rodgers (WA)
Cammack Houchin Rogers (AL)
Carey Hudson Rogers (KY)
Carl Huizenga Rose
Carter (GA) Hunt Rosendale
Chavez-DeRemer Issa Rouzer
Ciscomani Jackson (TX) Roy
Cline James Rutherford
Cloud Johnson (LA) Salazar
Clyde Johnson (SD) Scalise
Cole Jordan Scott, Austin
Collins Joyce (OH) Self
Comer Joyce (PA) Simpson
Crane Kean (NJ) Smith (MO)
Crawford Kelly (MS) Smith (NE)
Crenshaw Kelly (PA) Smith (NJ)
Cuellar Kiggans (VA) Smucker
Curtis Kiley Stauber
D'Esposito Kim (CA) Steel
Davidson Kustoff Stefanik
Davis (NC) LaHood Steil
De La Cruz LaLota Steube
DesJarlais Lamborn Strong
Diaz-Balart Langworthy Tenney
Donalds Latta Thompson (PA)
Duarte Lawler Tiffany
Duncan Lee (FL) Timmons
Dunn (FL) Letlow Valadao
Edwards Lesko Van Drew
Ellzey Letlow Van Dwyne
Emmer Loudermilk Van Orden
Estes Lucas Wagner
Ezell Luetkemeyer
Fallon Luna Walberg
Feenstra Luttrell Waltz
Finstad Mace Weber (TX)
Fischbach Malliotakis Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald Maloy Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick Mann Westernman
Fleischmann Massie Williams (NY)
Flood Mast Williams (TX)
Foxy McCaul Wilson (SC)
Franklin, Scott McClean Wittman
Fry McClintock Womack
Fulcher McCormick Yakym
Gaetz Meuser Zinke

NAYS—195

Adams Auchincloss Bera
Aguilar Balint Beyer
Allred Barragan Bishop (GA)
Amo Beatty Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester	Houlahan	Pingree
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pocan
Bowman	Hoyle (OR)	Porter
Boyle (PA)	Ivey	Pressley
Brown	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Brownley	Jackson (NC)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Jayapal	Raskin
Bush	Jeffries	Ross
Caraveo	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Kamlager-Dove	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Keating	Salinas
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Casas	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Case	Khanna	Scanlon
Casten	Kildee	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Scholten
McCormick	Kuster	Schrier
Chu	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Sherrill
Connolly	Leger Fernandez	Slotkin
Correa	Levin	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lieu	Sorensen
Courtney	Lofgren	Soto
Craig	Lynch	Spanberger
Crockett	Manning	Stansbury
Crow	Matsui	Stanton
Davids (KS)	McBath	Stevens
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Strickland
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Suozi
DeGette	McGarvey	Swalwell
DeLauro	McGovern	Sykes
DelBene	Meeks	Takano
Deluzio	Menendez	Thanedar
DeSaulnier	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Mfume	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Moore (WI)	Titus
Escobar	Morelle	Tlaib
Eshoo	Moskowitz	Tokuda
Espallat	Moulton	Tonko
Evans	Mrvan	Torres (CA)
Fletcher	Mullin	Torres (NY)
Foster	Nadler	Trahan
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Underwood
Frost	Neal	Vargas
Garamendi	Neguse	Vasquez
Garcia (IL)	Nickel	Veasey
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Velázquez
Garcia, Robert	Ocasio-Cortez	Wasserman
Goldman (NY)	Omar	Schultz
Gomez	Pallone	Waters
Gottheimer	Panetta	Watson Coleman
Green, Al (TX)	Pappas	Wexton
Harder (CA)	Pascrell	Wild
Hayes	Pelosi	Williams (GA)
Himes	Peters	Wilson (FL)
Horsford	Pettersen	

NOT VOTING—23

Baird	Hageman	Mooney
Banks	Huffman	Pence
Carson	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Carter (TX)	Jacobs	Schweikert
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Sessions
Ferguson	Landsman	Spartz
Foushee	Magaziner	Trone
Grijalva	McHenry	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1657

Ms. CARAVEO changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RELATING TO “STANDARD FOR DETERMINING JOINT EMPLOYER STATUS”—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question of whether the House, on reconsideration, will pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 98) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to “Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status”, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

In accord with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 191, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Ellzey	LaHood
Alford	Emmer	LaLota
Allen	Eshoo	Lamborn
Amodei	Estes	Langworthy
Armstrong	Ezell	Latta
Arrington	Fallon	LaTurner
Babin	Feenstra	Lawler
Bacon	Finstad	Lee (FL)
Balderson	Fischbach	Lesko
Barr	Fitzgerald	Letlow
Bean (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk
Bentz	Fleischmann	Lucas
Bera	Flood	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Foxx	Luna
Bice	Franklin, Scott	Luttrell
Biggs	Fry	Mace
Bilirakis	Fulcher	Malliotakis
Bishop (NC)	Gaetz	Maloy
Boebert	Garbarino	Mann
Bost	Garcia, Mike	Massie
Brecheen	Gimenez	Mast
Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	McCaul
Buchson	Good (VA)	McClain
Burchett	Gooden (TX)	McClintock
Burgess	Gosar	McCormick
Burlison	Granger	Meuser
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Miller (IL)
Cammack	Graves (MO)	Miller (OH)
Carey	Green (TN)	Miller (WV)
Carl	Greene (GA)	Miller-Meeks
Carter (GA)	Griffith	Mills
Case	Grothman	Molinaro
Chavez-DeRemer	Guest	Moolenaar
Ciscomani	Guthrie	Moore (AL)
Cline	Harris	Moore (UT)
Cloud	Harshbarger	Moran
Clyde	Hern	Murphy
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Nehls
Collins	Hill	Newhouse
Comer	Hinson	Norman
Correa	Houchin	Nunn (IA)
Costa	Hudson	Oberholte
Crane	Huizenga	Ogles
Crawford	Hunt	Owens
Crenshaw	Issa	Palmer
Cuellar	Jackson (TX)	Perry
Curtis	James	Peters
D’Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Pfleger
Davidson	Jordan	Posey
Davis (NC)	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
De La Cruz	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
DesJarlais	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Donalds	Kelly (PA)	Rose
Duarte	Kiggans (VA)	Rosendale
Duncan	Kiley	Rouzer
Dunn (FL)	Kim (CA)	Roy
Edwards	Kustoff	Rutherford

Salazar	Steil	Waltz
Scalise	Steube	Weber (TX)
Scholten	Strong	Webster (FL)
Schweikert	Tenney	Wenstrup
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Self	Tiffany	Williams (NY)
Simpson	Timmons	Williams (TX)
Smith (MO)	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Wittman
Smith (NJ)	Van Drew	Womack
Smucker	Van Duyne	Yakym
Stauber	Van Orden	Zinke
Steel	Wagner	
Stefanik	Walberg	

NAYS—191

Adams	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Aguilar	Green, Al (TX)	Peltola
Allred	Harder (CA)	Perez
Amo	Hayes	Pettersen
Auchincloss	Himes	Pingree
Balint	Horsford	Pocan
Barragán	Houlahan	Porter
Beatty	Hoyer	Pressley
Beyer	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Ivey	Ramirez
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Raskin
Blunt Rochester	Jackson (NC)	Ross
Bonamici	Jayapal	Ruiz
Bowman	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Boyle (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Brown	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Brownley	Kaptur	Sánchez
Budzinski	Keating	Sarbanes
Bush	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Caraveo	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Carbajal	Khanna	Schiff
Carter (LA)	Kildee	Schneider
Cartwright	Kilmer	Schrier
Casas	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)
Casten	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Castor (FL)	Kuster	Sewell
Castro (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cherfilus-	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
McCormick	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Chu	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Clyburn	Levin	Spanberger
Cohen	Lieu	Stansbury
Connolly	Lofgren	Stanton
Courtney	Lynch	Stevens
Craig	Manning	Strickland
Crockett	Matsui	Suozi
Crow	McBath	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	McClellan	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Takano
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Thanedar
DeGette	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Menendez	Titus
Deluzio	Meng	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Tokuda
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Escobar	Morelle	Torres (CA)
Espallat	Moskowitz	Torres (NY)
Evans	Moulton	Trahan
Fletcher	Mrvan	Underwood
Foster	Mullin	Vargas
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Vasquez
Frost	Napolitano	Veasey
Garamendi	Neal	Velázquez
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Wasserman
Garcia (TX)	Nickel	Schultz
Garcia, Robert	Norcross	Waters
Golden (ME)	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Goldman (NY)	Omar	Wexton
Gomez	Pallone	Wild
Gonzalez,	Panetta	Williams (GA)
Vicente	Pappas	Wilson (FL)
	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—24

Baird	Foushee	Magaziner
Banks	Grijalva	McHenry
Cárdenas	Hageman	Mooney
Carson	Huffman	Pence
Carter (TX)	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Cleaver	Jacobs	Sessions
Doggett	LaMalfa	Spartz
Ferguson	Landsman	Trone

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1704

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the joint resolution are referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

LUKE LETLOW POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7423) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Benedette Street in Rayville, Louisiana, as the "Luke Letlow Post Office Building", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, answered "present" 2, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 186] YEAS—401

Adams Caraveo Dean (PA)
Aderholt Carbajal DeGette
Aguilar Cardenas DeLauro
Alford Carey DelBene
Allen Carl Deluzio
Allred Carter (GA) DeSaulnier
Amo Carter (LA) DesJarlais
Amodoi Cartwright Diaz-Balart
Armstrong Casar Dingell
Arrington Case Doggett
Auchincloss Casten Donalds
Babin Castor (FL) Duarte
Bacon Castro (TX) Duncan
Balderson Chavez-DeRemer Dunn (FL)
Balint Cherfilus-Edwards
Barr McCormick Ellzey
Barragan Chu Emmer
Bean (FL) Ciscomani Escobar
Beatty Clark (MA) Espaillat
Bentz Clarke (NY) Estes
Bera Cline Evans
Bergman Cloud Ezell
Beyer Clyburn Fallon
Bice Clyde Feenstra
Biggs Cohen Finstad
Bilirakis Cole Fischbach
Bishop (GA) Collins Fitzgerald
Bishop (NC) Comer Fitzpatrick
Blumenauer Connolly Fleischmann
Blunt Rochester Correa Fletcher
Boebert Costa Flood
Bonamici Courtney Foster
Bost Craig Foxx
Bowman Crane Frankel, Lois
Boyle (PA) Crawford Franklin, Scott
Brecheen Crenshaw Frost
Brown Crockett Fry
Brownley Crow Fulcher
Buchanan Cuellar Gaetz
Bucshon Curtis Gallego
Budzinski D'Esposito Garamendi
Burchett Davids (KS) Garbarino
Burgess Davidson Garcia (IL)
Burlison Davis (IL) Garcia (TX)
Bush Davis (NC) Garcia, Mike
Cammack De La Cruz Garcia, Robert

Jimenez Lucas
Golden (ME) Luetkemeyer
Goldman (NY) Luna
Gomez Luttrell
Gonzales, Tony Lynch
Gonzalez, Mace
Vicente Malliotakis
Good (VA) Maloy
Gooden (TX) Mann
Gosar Manning
Gottheimer Mast
Granger Matsui
Graves (LA) McBath
Graves (MO) McCaul
Green (TN) McClain
Green, Al (TX) McClellan
Greene (GA) McClintock
Griffith McCollum
Grothman McCormick
Guest McGarvey
Guthrie McGovern
Harder (CA) Meeks
Harshbarger Menendez
Hayes Meng
Hern Meuser
Higgins (LA) Mfume
Hill Miller (IL)
Himes Miller (OH)
Hinson Miller (WV)
Horsford Miller-Meeks
Houchin Mills
Houlahan Molinaro
Hoyer Moolenaar
Hoyle (OR) Moore (AL)
Hudson Moore (UT)
Huizenga Moore (WI)
Hunt Moran
Issa Morelle
Ivey Moskowicz
Jackson (IL) Moulton
Jackson (NC) Mrvan
Jackson (TX) Mullin
James Murphy
Jayapal Nadler
Jeffries Napolitano
Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA) Neguse
Johnson (SD) Nehls
Jordan Newhouse
Joyce (OH) Nickel
Joyce (PA) Norcross
Kamlager-Dove Norman
Kaptur Nunn (IA)
Kean (NJ) Obernolte
Keating Ocasio-Cortez
Kelly (IL) Ogles
Kelly (MS) Omar
Kelly (PA) Owens
Kennedy Pallone
Khanna Palmer
Kiggans (VA) Panetta
Kildee Pappas
Kiley Pascrell
Kilmer Pelosi
Kim (CA) Peltola
Kim (NJ) Perez
Krishnamoorthi Perry
Kuster Peters
Kustoff Pettersen
LaHood Pfluger
LaLota Pingree
Lamborn Pocan
Langworthy Porter
Larsen (WA) Posey
Larsen (CT) Pressley
Latta Quigley
LaTurner Ramirez
Lawler Raskin
Lee (CA) Reschenthaler
Lee (FL) Rodgers (WA)
Lee (NV) Rogers (AL)
Lee (PA) Rogers (KY)
Leger Fernandez Rose
Lesko Ross
Letlow Rouzer
Levin Ruiz
Lieu Ruppertsberger
Lofgren Rutherford
Loudermilk Ryan

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rosendale Roy

NOT VOTING—27

Baird Cleaver Hageman
Banks Eshoo Harris
Calvert Ferguson Huffman
Carson Foushee Jackson Lee
Carter (TX) Grijalva Jacobs

LaMalfa McHenry Sessions
Landsman Mooney Spartz
Magaziner Pence Tenney
Massie Phillips Trone

□ 1711

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 179, NAY on Roll Call No. 180, NO on Roll Call No. 181, NO on Roll Call No. 182, YEA on Roll Call No. 183, NAY on Roll Call No. 184, NAY on Roll Call No. 185, and YEA on Roll Call No. 186,

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, due to a district commitment, I was unable to cast five votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted:

YEA on Roll Call No. 182, Kelly, PA Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 6192;

NAY on Roll Call No. 183, the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 6192;

YEA on Roll Call No. 184, Passage of H.R. 6192, Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act;

YEA on Roll Call No. 185, Consideration of the Veto Message on H.J. Res. 98, Providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to "Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status"; and

YEA on Roll Call No. 186, Suspend the rules and pass H.R. 7423, Luke Letlow Post Office Building.

REMOVAL OF MR. BOST AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 8182

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) as cosponsor of H.R. 8182.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MR. ROSE TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 4128

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 4128, the Payment Choice Act of 2023, a bill originally introduced by Representative PAYNE of New Jersey, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2023

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 870) to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 870

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DIVISION A—FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Fire Grants and Safety Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION.

Section 17(g)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (L), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (M)—

(A) by striking “for for” and inserting “for”; and

(B) by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(N) \$95,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028, of which \$3,420,000 for each such fiscal year shall be used to carry out section 8(f).”.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE TO FIREFIGHTERS GRANTS PROGRAM AND THE FIRE PREVENTION AND SAFETY GRANTS PROGRAM.

(a) SUNSET.—Section 33(r) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229(r)) is amended by striking “2024” and inserting “2030”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 33(q)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229(q)(1)) is amended by striking “to carry out this section—” and all that follows through “the fiscal year described in clause (i)” and inserting “to carry out this section \$750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028”.

SEC. 4. REAUTHORIZATION OF STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE FIRE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) SUNSET.—Section 34(k) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a(k)) is amended by striking “2024” and inserting “2030”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 34(j)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a(j)(1)(I)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking “fiscal year 2013; and” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028.”; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (I).

SEC. 5. GAO AUDIT AND REPORT.

Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller

General of the United States shall conduct an audit of and issue a publicly available report on—

(1) barriers that prevent fire departments from accessing Federal funds; and

(2) the United States Fire Administration.

DIVISION B—ACCELERATING DEPLOYMENT OF VERSATILE, ADVANCED NUCLEAR FOR CLEAN ENERGY

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “Accelerating Deployment of Versatile, Advanced Nuclear for Clean Energy Act of 2024” or the “ADVANCE Act of 2024”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—AMERICAN NUCLEAR LEADERSHIP

Sec. 101. International nuclear export and innovation activities.

Sec. 102. Denial of certain domestic licenses for national security purposes.

Sec. 103. Export license notification.

Sec. 104. Global nuclear energy assessment.

Sec. 105. Process for review and amendment of part 810 generally authorized destinations.

TITLE II—DEVELOPING AND DEPLOYING NEW NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGIES

Sec. 201. Fees for advanced nuclear reactor application review.

Sec. 202. Advanced nuclear reactor prizes.

Sec. 203. Licensing considerations relating to use of nuclear energy for nonelectric applications.

Sec. 204. Enabling preparations for the demonstration of advanced nuclear reactors on Department of Energy sites or critical national security infrastructure sites.

Sec. 205. Fusion energy regulation.

Sec. 206. Regulatory issues for nuclear facilities at brownfield sites.

Sec. 207. Combined license review procedure.

Sec. 208. Regulatory requirements for micro-reactors.

TITLE III—PRESERVING EXISTING NUCLEAR ENERGY GENERATION

Sec. 301. Foreign ownership.

TITLE IV—NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE, SUPPLY CHAIN, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND WORKFORCE

Sec. 401. Report on advanced methods of manufacturing and construction for nuclear energy projects.

Sec. 402. Nuclear energy traineeship.

Sec. 403. Biennial report on the spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste inventory in the United States.

Sec. 404. Development, qualification, and licensing of advanced nuclear fuel concepts.

TITLE V—IMPROVING COMMISSION EFFICIENCY

Sec. 501. Mission alignment.

Sec. 502. Strengthening the NRC workforce.

Sec. 503. Commission corporate support funding.

Sec. 504. Performance metrics and milestones.

Sec. 505. Nuclear licensing efficiency.

Sec. 506. Modernization of nuclear reactor environmental reviews.

Sec. 507. Improving oversight and inspection programs.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Technical correction.

Sec. 602. Report on engagement with the Government of Canada with respect to nuclear waste issues in the Great Lakes Basin.

Sec. 603. Savings clause.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) ACCIDENT TOLERANT FUEL.—The term “accident tolerant fuel” has the meaning given the term in section 107(a) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (Public Law 115-439; 132 Stat. 5577).

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) ADVANCED NUCLEAR FUEL.—The term “advanced nuclear fuel” means—

(A) advanced nuclear reactor fuel; and

(B) accident tolerant fuel.

(4) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR.—The term “advanced nuclear reactor” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note; Public Law 115-439).

(5) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR FUEL.—The term “advanced nuclear reactor fuel” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note; Public Law 115-439).

(6) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(7) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(8) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(9) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term “National Laboratory” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

TITLE I—AMERICAN NUCLEAR LEADERSHIP

SEC. 101. INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR EXPORT AND INNOVATION ACTIVITIES.

(a) COMMISSION COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(A) coordinate all work of the Commission relating to—

(i) import and export licensing for nuclear reactors and radioactive materials; and

(ii) international regulatory cooperation and assistance relating to nuclear reactors and radioactive materials, including with countries that are members of—

(I) the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; or

(II) the Nuclear Energy Agency; and

(B) support interagency and international coordination with respect to—

(i) the consideration of international technical standards to establish the licensing and regulatory basis to assist the design, construction, and operation of nuclear reactors and use of radioactive materials;

(ii) efforts to help build competent nuclear regulatory organizations and legal frameworks in foreign countries that are seeking to develop civil nuclear industries; and

(iii) exchange programs and training provided, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to foreign countries relating to civil nuclear licensing and oversight to improve the regulation of nuclear reactors and radioactive materials, in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) EXCHANGE PROGRAMS AND TRAINING.—With respect to the exchange programs and training described in paragraph (1)(B)(iii), the Commission shall coordinate, as applicable, with—

(A) the Secretary of Energy;

(B) the Secretary of State;

(C) the National Laboratories;

(D) the private sector; and

(E) institutions of higher education.

(b) **AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH BRANCH.**—The Commission may establish within the Office of International Programs a branch, to be known as the “International Nuclear Export and Innovation Branch”, to carry out the international nuclear export and innovation activities described in subsection (a) as the Commission determines to be appropriate and within the mission of the Commission.

(c) **EXCLUSION OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES FROM THE FEE BASE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 102 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR EXPORT AND INNOVATION ACTIVITIES.**—The Commission shall identify in the annual budget justification international nuclear export and innovation activities described in section 101(a) of the **ADVANCE Act of 2024**.”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) Costs for international nuclear export and innovation activities described in section 101(a) of the **ADVANCE Act of 2024**.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2025.

(d) **INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.**—The Commission shall coordinate all international activities under this section with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and other applicable agencies, as appropriate.

(e) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section alters the authority of the Commission to license and regulate the civilian use of radioactive materials.

SEC. 102. DENIAL OF CERTAIN DOMESTIC LICENSES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSES.

(a) **DEFINITION OF COVERED FUEL.**—In this section, the term “covered fuel” means enriched uranium that is fabricated outside the United States into fuel assemblies for commercial nuclear power reactors by an entity that—

(1) is owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or the Government of the People’s Republic of China; or

(2) is organized under the laws of, or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of, the Russian Federation or the People’s Republic of China.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON UNLICENSED POSSESSION OR OWNERSHIP OF COVERED FUEL.**—Unless specifically authorized by the Commission in a license issued under section 53 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2073) and part 70 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), no person subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission may possess or own covered fuel.

(c) **LICENSE TO POSSESS OR OWN COVERED FUEL.**—

(1) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE.**—The Commission shall not issue a license to possess or own covered fuel under section 53 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2073) and part 70 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), unless the Commission has first consulted with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State before issuing the license.

(2) **PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF LICENSE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (C), a license to possess or own covered fuel shall not be issued if the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State make the determination described in subparagraph (B)(i)(I).

(B) **DETERMINATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The determination referred to in subparagraph (A) is a determination that possession or ownership, as applicable, of covered fuel—

(I) poses a threat to the national security of the United States, including because of an adverse impact on the physical and economic security of the United States; or

(II) does not pose a threat to the national security of the United States.

(ii) **JOINT DETERMINATION.**—A determination described in clause (i) shall be jointly made by the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State.

(iii) **TIMELINE.**—

(I) **NOTICE OF APPLICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives an application for a license to possess or own covered fuel, the Commission shall notify the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State of the application.

(II) **DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State shall have a period of 180 days, beginning on the date on which the Commission notifies the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State under subclause (I) of an application for a license to possess or own covered fuel, in which to make the determination described in clause (i).

(III) **COMMISSION NOTIFICATION.**—On making the determination described in clause (i), the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State shall immediately notify the Commission.

(IV) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State notify the Commission under subclause (III), the Commission shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the determination.

(V) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the Commission notifies Congress under subclause (IV) of a determination made under clause (i), the Commission shall make that determination publicly available.

(C) **EFFECT OF NO DETERMINATION.**—The Commission shall not issue a license if the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State have not made a determination described in subparagraph (B).

(d) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section alters any treaty or international agreement in effect on the date of enactment of this Act or that enters into force after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. EXPORT LICENSE NOTIFICATION.

(a) **DEFINITION OF LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM.**—In this section, the term “low-enriched uranium” means uranium enriched to less than 20 percent of the uranium-235 isotope.

(b) **NOTIFICATION.**—If the Commission, after consultation with the Secretary of State and any other relevant agencies, issues an export license for the transfer of any item described in subsection (d) to a country described in subsection (c), the Commission shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(c) **COUNTRIES DESCRIBED.**—A country referred to in subsection (b) is a country that—

(1) has not concluded and ratified an Additional Protocol to its safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency; or

(2) has not ratified or acceded to the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna October 26, 1979, and opened for signature at New York March 3, 1980 (TIAS

11080), described in the information circular of the International Atomic Energy Agency numbered **INF/CIRC/274/Rev.1/Mod.1** and dated May 9, 2016 (TIAS 16-508).

(d) **ITEMS DESCRIBED.**—An item referred to in subsection (b) includes—

(1) unirradiated nuclear fuel containing special nuclear material (as defined in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014)), excluding low-enriched uranium;

(2) a nuclear reactor that uses nuclear fuel described in paragraph (1); and

(3) any plant or component listed in Appendix I to part 110 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), that is involved in—

(A) the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear reactor fuel elements;

(B) the separation of plutonium; or

(C) the separation of the uranium-233 isotope.

SEC. 104. GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY ASSESSMENT.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Commission, shall conduct a study on the global status of—

(1) the civilian nuclear energy industry; and

(2) the supply chains of the civilian nuclear energy industry.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) information on the status of the civilian nuclear energy industry, the long-term risks to that industry, and the bases for those risks;

(2) information on how the use of the civilian nuclear energy industry, relative to other types of energy industries, can reduce the emission of criteria pollutants and carbon dioxide;

(3) information on the role the United States civilian nuclear energy industry plays in United States foreign policy;

(4) information on the importance of the United States civilian nuclear energy industry to countries that are allied to the United States;

(5) information on how the United States may collaborate with those countries in developing, deploying, and investing in nuclear technology;

(6) information on how foreign countries use nuclear energy when crafting and implementing their own foreign policy, including such use by foreign countries that are strategic competitors;

(7) an evaluation of how nuclear non-proliferation and security efforts and nuclear energy safety are affected by the involvement of the United States in—

(A) international markets; and

(B) setting civilian nuclear energy industry standards;

(8) an evaluation of how industries in the United States, other than the civilian nuclear energy industry, benefit from the generation of electricity by nuclear power plants;

(9) information on utilities and companies in the United States that are involved in the civilian nuclear energy supply chain, including, with respect to those utilities and companies—

(A) financial challenges;

(B) nuclear liability issues;

(C) foreign strategic competition; and

(D) risks to continued operation; and

(10) recommendations for how the United States may—

(A) develop a national strategy to increase the role that nuclear energy plays in diplomacy and strategic energy policy;

(B) develop a strategy to mitigate foreign competitor's utilization of their civilian nuclear energy industries in diplomacy;

(C) align the nuclear energy policy of the United States with national security objectives; and

(D) modernize regulatory requirements to strengthen the United States civilian nuclear energy supply chain.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the study under subsection (a) is completed, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the study, including a classified annex, if necessary.

SEC. 105. PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND AMENDMENT OF PART 810 GENERALLY AUTHORIZED DESTINATIONS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF FACTORS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall identify and evaluate factors, other than agreements for cooperation entered into in accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), that may be used to determine a country's generally authorized destination status under part 810 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, and to list such country as a generally authorized destination in Appendix A to part 810 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) PROCESS UPDATE.—The Secretary of Energy shall review and, as appropriate, update the Department of Energy's process for determining a country's generally authorized destination status under part 810 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, and for listing such country as a generally authorized destination in Appendix A to part 810 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, taking into consideration and, as appropriate, incorporating factors identified and evaluated under subsection (a).

(c) REVISIONS TO LIST.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall, in accordance with any process updated pursuant to this section, review the list in Appendix A to part 810 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, and amend such list as appropriate.

TITLE II—DEVELOPING AND DEPLOYING NEW NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGIES

SEC. 201. FEES FOR ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR APPLICATION REVIEW.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note; Public Law 115-439) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (15) as paragraphs (3), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (12), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), and (21), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR APPLICANT.—The term ‘advanced nuclear reactor applicant’ means an entity that has submitted to the Commission an application for a license for an advanced nuclear reactor under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(4) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR PRE-APPLICANT.—The term ‘advanced nuclear reactor pre-applicant’ means an entity that has submitted to the Commission a licensing project plan for the purposes of submitting a future application for a license for an advanced nuclear reactor under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).”

“(5) AGENCY SUPPORT.—The term ‘agency support’ has the meaning given the term ‘agency support (corporate support and the IG)’ in section 170.3 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).”;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (10) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(11) HOURLY RATE FOR MISSION-DIRECT PROGRAM SALARIES AND BENEFITS.—The term ‘hourly rate for mission-direct program salaries and benefits’ means the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the full-time equivalent rate (within the meaning of the document of the Commission entitled ‘FY 2023 Final Fee Rule Work Papers’ (or a successor document)) for mission-direct program salaries and benefits for a fiscal year; by

“(B) the productive hours assumption for that fiscal year, determined in accordance with the formula established in the document referred to in subparagraph (A) (or a successor document).”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (12) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(13) MISSION-DIRECT PROGRAM SALARIES AND BENEFITS.—The term ‘mission-direct program salaries and benefits’ means the resources of the Commission that are allocated to the Nuclear Reactor Safety Program (as determined by the Commission) to perform core work activities committed to fulfilling the mission of the Commission, as described in the document of the Commission entitled ‘FY 2023 Final Fee Rule Work Papers’ (or a successor document).

“(14) MISSION-INDIRECT PROGRAM SUPPORT.—The term ‘mission-indirect program support’ has the meaning given the term in section 170.3 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).”

(b) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—Section 102(b)(1)(B) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215(b)(1)(B)) (as amended by section 101(c)(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) The total costs of mission-indirect program support and agency support that, under paragraph (2)(B), may not be included in the hourly rate charged for fees assessed and collected from advanced nuclear reactor applicants.

“(vi) The total costs of mission-indirect program support and agency support that, under paragraph (2)(C), may not be included in the hourly rate charged for fees assessed and collected from advanced nuclear reactor pre-applicants.”

(c) FEES FOR SERVICE OR THING OF VALUE.—Section 102(b) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) FEES FOR SERVICE OR THING OF VALUE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission shall assess and collect fees from any person who receives a service or thing of value from the Commission to cover the costs to the Commission of providing the service or thing of value.

“(B) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR APPLICANTS.—The hourly rate charged for fees assessed and collected from an advanced nuclear reactor applicant under this paragraph relating to the review of a submitted application described in section 3(1) may not exceed the hourly rate for mission-direct program salaries and benefits.

“(C) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR PRE-APPLICANTS.—The hourly rate charged for fees assessed and collected from an advanced nuclear reactor pre-applicant under this paragraph relating to the review of submitted materials as described in the licensing project plan of an advanced nuclear reactor

pre-applicant may not exceed the hourly rate for mission-direct program salaries and benefits.”

(d) SUNSET.—Section 102 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) CESSATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Paragraphs (1)(B)(vi) and (2)(C) of subsection (b) shall cease to be effective on September 30, 2030.”

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2025.

SEC. 202. ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR PRIZES.

Section 103 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (Public Law 115-439; 132 Stat. 5571) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) PRIZES FOR ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR LICENSING.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a non-Federal entity; and

“(B) the Tennessee Valley Authority.

“(2) PRIZE FOR ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR LICENSING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 169 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2209) and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary is authorized to make, with respect to each award category described in subparagraph (C), an award in an amount described in subparagraph (B) to the first eligible entity—

“(i) to which the Commission issues an operating license for an advanced nuclear reactor under part 50 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), for which an application has not been approved by the Commission as of the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(ii) for which the Commission makes a finding described in section 52.103(g) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), with respect to a combined license for an advanced nuclear reactor—

“(I) that is issued under subpart C of part 52 of that title (or successor regulations); and

“(II) for which an application has not been approved by the Commission as of the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(B) AMOUNT OF AWARD.—Subject to paragraph (3), an award under subparagraph (A) shall be in an amount equal to the total amount assessed by the Commission and collected under section 102(b)(2) from the eligible entity receiving the award for costs relating to the issuance of the license described in that subparagraph, including, as applicable, costs relating to the issuance of an associated construction permit described in section 50.23 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), or early site permit (as defined in section 52.1 of that title (or successor regulations)).

“(C) AWARD CATEGORIES.—An award under subparagraph (A) may be made for—

“(i) the first advanced nuclear reactor for which the Commission—

“(I) issues a license in accordance with clause (i) of subparagraph (A); or

“(II) makes a finding in accordance with clause (ii) of that subparagraph;

“(ii) an advanced nuclear reactor that—

“(I) uses isotopes derived from spent nuclear fuel (as defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101)) or depleted uranium as fuel for the advanced nuclear reactor; and

“(II) is the first advanced nuclear reactor described in subclause (I) for which the Commission—

“(aa) issues a license in accordance with clause (i) of subparagraph (A); or

“(bb) makes a finding in accordance with clause (ii) of that subparagraph;

“(iii) an advanced nuclear reactor that—
“(I) is a nuclear integrated energy system—

“(aa) that is composed of 2 or more collocated or jointly operated subsystems of energy generation, energy storage, or other technologies;

“(bb) in which not fewer than 1 subsystem described in item (aa) is a nuclear energy system; and

“(cc) the purpose of which is—

“(AA) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in both the power and nonpower sectors; and
“(BB) to maximize energy production and efficiency; and

“(II) is the first advanced nuclear reactor described in subclause (I) for which the Commission—

“(aa) issues a license in accordance with clause (i) of subparagraph (A); or

“(bb) makes a finding in accordance with clause (ii) of that subparagraph;

“(iv) an advanced reactor that—

“(I) operates flexibly to generate electricity or high temperature process heat for nonelectric applications; and

“(II) is the first advanced nuclear reactor described in subclause (I) for which the Commission—

“(aa) issues a license in accordance with clause (i) of subparagraph (A); or

“(bb) makes a finding in accordance with clause (ii) of that subparagraph; and

“(v) the first advanced nuclear reactor for which the Commission grants approval to load nuclear fuel pursuant to the technology-inclusive regulatory framework established under subsection (a)(4).

“(3) FEDERAL FUNDING LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) EXCLUSION OF TVA FUNDS.—In this paragraph, the term ‘Federal funds’ does not include funds received under the power program of the Tennessee Valley Authority established pursuant to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831 et seq.).

“(B) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS EXPENDED.—An award under this subsection shall not exceed the total amount expended (excluding any expenditures made with Federal funds received for the applicable project and an amount equal to the minimum cost-share required under section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352)) by the eligible entity receiving the award for licensing costs relating to the project for which the award is made.

“(C) REPAYMENT AND DIVIDENDS NOT REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding section 9104(a)(4) of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an eligible entity that receives an award under this subsection shall not be required—

“(i) to repay that award or any part of that award; or

“(ii) to pay a dividend, interest, or other similar payment based on the sum of that award.”.

SEC. 203. LICENSING CONSIDERATIONS RELATING TO USE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR NONELECTRIC APPLICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report addressing any unique licensing issues or requirements relating to—

(1) the flexible operation of advanced nuclear reactors, such as ramping power output and switching between electricity generation and nonelectric applications;

(2) the use of advanced nuclear reactors exclusively for nonelectric applications; and

(3) the collocation of nuclear reactors with industrial plants or other facilities.

(b) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Commission shall seek input from—

- (1) the Secretary of Energy;
- (2) the nuclear energy industry;
- (3) technology developers;
- (4) the industrial, chemical, and medical sectors;
- (5) nongovernmental organizations; and
- (6) other public stakeholders.

(c) CONTENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The report under subsection (a) shall describe—

(A) any unique licensing issues or requirements relating to the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a), including, with respect to the nonelectric applications referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection, any licensing issues or requirements relating to the use of nuclear energy—

(i) for hydrogen or other liquid and gaseous fuel or chemical production;

(ii) for water desalination and wastewater treatment;

(iii) for heat used for industrial processes;

(iv) for district heating;

(v) in relation to energy storage;

(vi) for industrial or medical isotope production; and

(vii) for other applications, as identified by the Commission;

(B) options for addressing those issues or requirements—

(i) within the existing regulatory framework;

(ii) as part of the technology-inclusive regulatory framework required under subsection (a)(4) of section 103 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2133 note; Public Law 115-439); or

(iii) through a new rulemaking; and

(C) the extent to which Commission action is needed to implement any matter described in the report.

(2) COST ESTIMATES, BUDGETS, AND TIME-FRAMES.—The report shall include cost estimates, proposed budgets, and proposed timeframes for implementing risk-informed and performance-based regulatory guidance in the licensing of nuclear reactors for nonelectric applications.

SEC. 204. ENABLING PREPARATIONS FOR THE DEMONSTRATION OF ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTORS ON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITES OR CRITICAL NATIONAL SECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(b)(1)(B) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215(b)(1)(B)) (as amended by section 201(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) Costs for—

“(I) activities to review and approve or disapprove an application for an early site permit (as defined in section 52.1 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) to demonstrate an advanced nuclear reactor on a Department of Energy site or critical national security infrastructure (as defined in section 327(d) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 132 Stat. 1722)) site; and

“(II) pre-application activities relating to an early site permit (as defined in section 52.1 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) to demonstrate an advanced nuclear reactor on a Department of Energy site or critical national security infrastructure (as defined in section 327(d) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 132 Stat. 1722)) site.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2025.

SEC. 205. FUSION ENERGY REGULATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection e.—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “, including by use of a fusion machine” after “particle accelerator”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting “if made radioactive by use of a particle accelerator that is not a fusion machine,” before “is produced”;

(2) in each of subsections ee. through hh., by inserting a subsection heading, the text of which comprises the term defined in the subsection;

(3) by redesignating subsections ee., ff., gg., hh., and jj. as subsections jj., gg., hh., ii., and ff., respectively, and moving the subsections so as to appear in alphabetical order;

(4) in subsection dd., by striking “dd. The” and inserting the following:

“ee. HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE; SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL.—The”; and

(5) by inserting after subsection cc. the following:

“dd. FUSION MACHINE.—The term ‘fusion machine’ means a machine that is capable of—

“(1) transforming atomic nuclei, through fusion processes, into different elements, isotopes, or other particles; and

“(2) directly capturing and using the resultant products, including particles, heat, or other electromagnetic radiation.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2133 note; Public Law 115-439) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking “inclusive,” and inserting “inclusive”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(B)(ii), by inserting “(including fusion machine license applications)” after “commercial advanced nuclear reactor license applications”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note; Public Law 115-439) (as amended by section 201(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “or fusion reactor” and inserting “reactor or fusion machine”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (21) as paragraphs (12) through (22), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) FUSION MACHINE.—The term ‘fusion machine’ has the meaning given the term in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014).”.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGREEMENT STATE.—The term “Agreement State” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note; Public Law 115-439).

(B) FUSION MACHINE.—The term “fusion machine” has the meaning given the term in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014).

(2) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on—

(A) the results of a study, conducted in consultation with Agreement States and the private fusion sector, on risk- and performance-based, design-specific licensing frameworks for mass-manufactured fusion machines, including an evaluation of the design, manufacturing, and operations certification process used by the Federal Aviation Administration for aircraft as a potential model for

mass-manufactured fusion machine regulations; and

(B) the estimated timeline for the Commission to issue consolidated guidance or regulations for licensing mass-manufactured fusion machines, taking into account—

- (i) the results of that study; and
- (ii) the anticipated need for such guidance or regulations.

SEC. 206. REGULATORY ISSUES FOR NUCLEAR FACILITIES AT BROWNFIELD SITES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BROWNFIELD SITE.—The term “brownfield site” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(2) COVERED SITE.—The term “covered site” means a brownfield site, a retired fossil fuel site, or a site that is both a retired fossil fuel site and a brownfield site.

(3) PRODUCTION FACILITY.—The term “production facility” has the meaning given the term in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014).

(4) RETIRED FOSSIL FUEL SITE.—The term “retired fossil fuel site” means the site of 1 or more fossil fuel electric generation facilities that are retired or scheduled to retire, including multi-unit facilities that are partially shut down.

(5) UTILIZATION FACILITY.—The term “utilization facility” has the meaning given the term in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014).

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF REGULATORY ISSUES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall evaluate the extent to which modification of regulations, guidance, or policy is needed to enable efficient, timely, and predictable licensing reviews for, and to support the oversight of, production facilities or utilization facilities at covered sites.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider how licensing reviews for production facilities or utilization facilities at covered sites may be expedited by considering matters relating to siting and operating a production facility or a utilization facility at or near a covered site to support—

(A) the reuse of existing site infrastructure, including—

- (i) electric switchyard components and transmission infrastructure;
- (ii) heat-sink components;
- (iii) steam cycle components;
- (iv) roads;
- (v) railroad access; and
- (vi) water availability;

(B) the use of early site permits;

(C) the utilization of plant parameter envelopes or similar standardized site parameters on a portion of a larger site; and

(D) the use of a standardized application for similar sites.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing any regulations, guidance, and policies identified under paragraph (1).

(c) LICENSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall—

(A) develop and implement strategies to enable efficient, timely, and predictable licensing reviews for, and to support the oversight of, production facilities or utilization facilities at covered sites; or

(B) initiate a rulemaking to enable efficient, timely, and predictable licensing reviews for, and to support the oversight of, production facilities or utilization facilities at covered sites.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), consistent with the mission of the Commission, the Commission shall consider matters relating to—

(A) the use of existing site infrastructure;

(B) existing emergency preparedness organizations and planning;

(C) the availability of historical site-specific environmental data;

(D) previously completed environmental reviews required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(E) activities associated with the potential decommissioning of facilities or decontamination and remediation at covered sites; and

(F) community engagement and historical experience with energy production.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the actions taken by the Commission under subsection (c)(1).

SEC. 207. COMBINED LICENSE REVIEW PROCEDURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with this section, the Commission shall establish and carry out an expedited procedure for issuing a combined license pursuant to section 185 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2235(b)).

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—To qualify for the expedited procedure under subsection (a), an applicant—

(1) shall submit a combined license application for a new nuclear reactor that—

(A) references a design for which the Commission has issued a design certification (as defined in section 52.1 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)); or

(B) has a design that is substantially similar to a design of a nuclear reactor for which the Commission has issued a combined license, an operating license, or a manufacturing license under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.);

(2) shall propose to construct the new nuclear reactor on a site—

(A) on which a licensed commercial nuclear reactor operates or previously operated; or

(B) that is directly adjacent to a site on which a licensed commercial nuclear reactor operates or previously operated and has site characteristics that are substantially similar to that site; and

(3) may not be subject to an order of the Commission to suspend or revoke a license under section 2.202 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE.—With respect to a combined license for which the applicant has satisfied the requirements described in subsection (b), the Commission shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) not later than 18 months after the date on which the application is accepted for docketing—

(A) complete the technical review process and issue a safety evaluation report; and

(B) issue a final environmental impact statement or environmental assessment, unless the Commission finds that the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to a categorical exclusion in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(2) not later than 2 years after the date on which the application is accepted for docketing, complete any necessary public licensing hearings and related processes; and

(3) not later than 25 months after the date on which the application is accepted for

docketing, make a final decision on whether to issue the combined license.

(d) PERFORMANCE AND REPORTING.—

(1) DELAYS IN ISSUANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the applicable deadline, the Executive Director for Operations of the Commission shall inform the Commission of any failure to meet a deadline under subsection (c).

(2) DELAYS IN ISSUANCE EXCEEDING 90 DAYS.—If any deadline under subsection (c) is not met by the date that is 90 days after the applicable date required under that subsection, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the delay, including—

(A) a detailed explanation accounting for the delay; and

(B) a plan for completion of the applicable action.

SEC. 208. REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR MICRO-REACTORS.

(a) MICRO-REACTOR LICENSING.—The Commission shall—

(1) not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, develop risk-informed and performance-based strategies and guidance to license and regulate micro-reactors pursuant to section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133), including strategies and guidance for—

- (A) staffing and operations;
- (B) oversight and inspections;
- (C) safeguards and security;
- (D) emergency preparedness;

(E) risk analysis methods, including alternatives to probabilistic risk assessments;

(F) decommissioning funding assurance methods that permit the use of design- and site-specific cost estimates;

(G) the transportation of fueled micro-reactors; and

(H) siting, including in relation to—

(i) the population density criterion limit described in the policy issue paper on population-related siting considerations for advanced reactors dated May 8, 2020, and numbered SECY-20-0045;

(ii) licensing mobile deployment; and

(iii) environmental reviews; and

(2) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, implement, as appropriate, the strategies and guidance developed under paragraph (1)—

(A) within the existing regulatory framework;

(B) through the technology-inclusive regulatory framework to be established under section 103(a)(4) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2133 note; Public Law 115-439); or

(C) through a pending or new rulemaking.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing and implementing strategies and guidance under subsection (a), the Commission shall consider—

(1) the unique characteristics of micro-reactors, including characteristics relating to—

- (A) physical size;
- (B) design simplicity; and
- (C) source term;

(2) opportunities to address redundancies and inefficiencies;

(3) opportunities to consolidate review phases and reduce transitions between review teams;

(4) opportunities to establish integrated review teams to ensure continuity throughout the review process; and

(5) other relevant considerations discussed in the policy issue paper on policy and licensing considerations related to micro-reactors dated October 6, 2020, and numbered SECY-20-0093.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with—

- (1) the Secretary of Energy;

(2) the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate;

(3) micro-reactor technology developers; and

(4) other stakeholders.

TITLE III—PRESERVING EXISTING NUCLEAR ENERGY GENERATION

SEC. 301. FOREIGN OWNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The prohibitions against issuing certain licenses for utilization facilities to certain aliens, corporations, and other entities described in the second sentence of section 103 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133(d)) and the second sentence of section 104 d. of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2134(d)) shall not apply to an entity described in subsection (b) if the Commission determines that issuance of the applicable license to that entity is not inimical to—

- (1) the common defense and security; or
- (2) the health and safety of the public.

(b) ENTITIES DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An entity referred to in subsection (a) is an alien, corporation, or other entity that is owned, controlled, or dominated by—

(A) the government of—

(i) a country, other than a country described in paragraph (2), that is a member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) the Republic of India;

(B) a corporation that is incorporated in a country described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A); or

(C) an alien who is a citizen or national of a country described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A).

(2) EXCLUSION.—A country described in this paragraph is a country—

(A) any department, agency, or instrumentality of the government of which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to sanctions under section 231 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9525); or

(B) any citizen, national, or entity of which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is included on the List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury pursuant to sanctions imposed under section 231 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9525).

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 103 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133(d)) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “any any” and inserting “any”.

(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section affects the requirements of section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565).

TITLE IV—NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE, SUPPLY CHAIN, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND WORKFORCE

SEC. 401. REPORT ON ADVANCED METHODS OF MANUFACTURING AND CONSTRUCTION FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report (referred to in this section as the “report”) on manufacturing and construction for nuclear energy projects.

(b) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In developing the report, the Commission shall seek input from—

- (1) the Secretary of Energy;
- (2) the nuclear energy industry;
- (3) National Laboratories;
- (4) institutions of higher education;
- (5) nuclear and manufacturing technology developers;

(6) the manufacturing and construction industries, including manufacturing and construction companies with operating facilities in the United States;

- (7) standards development organizations;
- (8) labor unions;
- (9) nongovernmental organizations; and
- (10) other public stakeholders.

(c) CONTENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The report shall—

(A) examine any unique licensing issues or requirements relating to the use, for nuclear energy projects, of—

- (i) advanced manufacturing processes;
- (ii) advanced construction techniques; and
- (iii) rapid improvement or iterative innovation processes;

(B) examine—

(i) the requirements for nuclear-grade components in manufacturing and construction for nuclear energy projects;

(ii) opportunities to use standard materials, parts, or components in manufacturing and construction for nuclear energy projects;

(iii) opportunities to use standard materials that are in compliance with existing codes and standards to provide acceptable approaches to support or encapsulate new materials that do not yet have applicable codes and standards; and

(iv) requirements relating to the transport of a fueled advanced nuclear reactor core from a manufacturing licensee to a licensee that holds a license to construct and operate a facility at a particular site;

(C) identify safety aspects of advanced manufacturing processes and advanced construction techniques that are not addressed by existing codes and standards, so that generic guidance may be updated or created, as necessary;

(D) identify options for addressing the issues, requirements, and opportunities examined under subparagraphs (A) and (B)—

(i) within the existing regulatory framework; or

(ii) through a new rulemaking;

(E) identify how addressing the issues, requirements, and opportunities examined under subparagraphs (A) and (B) will impact opportunities for domestic nuclear manufacturing and construction developers; and

(F) describe the extent to which Commission action is needed to implement any matter described in the report.

(2) COST ESTIMATES, BUDGETS, AND TIMEFRAMES.—The report shall include cost estimates, proposed budgets, and proposed timeframes for implementing risk-informed and performance-based regulatory guidance for advanced manufacturing and construction for nuclear energy projects.

SEC. 402. NUCLEAR ENERGY TRAINEESHIP.

Section 313 of division C of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (42 U.S.C. 16274a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Nuclear Regulatory”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and subsection (c)” after “paragraph (2)”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (5); and

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR.—The term ‘advanced nuclear reactor’ has the meaning given the term in section 951(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271(b)).”

“(2) COMMISSION.—The term ‘Commission’ means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.”

“(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).”

“(4) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term ‘National Laboratory’ has the meaning given the term in section 951(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271(b)).”;

(4) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “Nuclear Regulatory”;

(5) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) NUCLEAR ENERGY TRAINEESHIP SUBPROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish, as a subprogram of the Program, a nuclear energy traineeship subprogram under which the Commission, in coordination with institutions of higher education and trade schools, shall competitively award traineeships that provide focused training to meet critical mission needs of the Commission and nuclear workforce needs, including needs relating to the nuclear tradecraft workforce.”

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the nuclear energy traineeship subprogram described in paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

“(A) coordinate with the Secretary of Energy to prioritize the funding of traineeships that focus on—

“(i) nuclear workforce needs; and

“(ii) critical mission needs of the Commission;

“(B) encourage appropriate partnerships among—

“(i) National Laboratories;

“(ii) institutions of higher education;

“(iii) trade schools;

“(iv) the nuclear energy industry; and

“(v) other entities, as the Commission determines to be appropriate; and

“(C) on an annual basis, evaluate nuclear workforce needs for the purpose of implementing traineeships in focused topical areas that—

“(i) address the workforce needs of the nuclear energy community; and

“(ii) support critical mission needs of the Commission.”.

SEC. 403. BIENNIAL REPORT ON THE SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL AND HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE INVENTORY IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE.—The term “high-level radioactive waste” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

(2) SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL.—The term “spent nuclear fuel” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

(3) STANDARD CONTRACT.—The term “standard contract” has the meaning given the term “contract” in section 961.3 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2026, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

(1) the annual and cumulative amount of payments made by the United States to the holder of a standard contract due to a partial breach of contract under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) resulting in financial damages to the holder;

(2) the cumulative amount spent by the Department of Energy since fiscal year 2008 to reduce future payments projected to be made by the United States to any holder of a standard contract due to a partial breach of contract under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.);

(3) the cumulative amount spent by the Department of Energy to store, manage, and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level

radioactive waste in the United States as of the date of the report;

(4) the projected lifecycle costs to store, manage, transport, and dispose of the projected inventory of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the United States, including spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste expected to be generated from existing reactors through 2050;

(5) any mechanisms for better accounting of liabilities for the lifecycle costs of the spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste inventory in the United States;

(6) any recommendations for improving the methods used by the Department of Energy for the accounting of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste costs and liabilities;

(7) any actions taken in the previous fiscal year by the Department of Energy with respect to interim storage; and

(8) any activities taken in the previous fiscal year by the Department of Energy to develop and deploy nuclear technologies and fuels that enhance the safe transportation or storage of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste, including technologies to protect against seismic, flooding, and other extreme weather events.

SEC. 404. DEVELOPMENT, QUALIFICATION, AND LICENSING OF ADVANCED NUCLEAR FUEL CONCEPTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall establish an initiative to enhance preparedness and coordination with respect to the qualification and licensing of advanced nuclear fuel.

(b) **AGENCY COORDINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission and the Secretary of Energy shall enter into a memorandum of understanding—

(1) to share technical expertise and knowledge through—

(A) enabling the testing and demonstration of accident tolerant fuels for existing commercial nuclear reactors and advanced nuclear reactor fuel concepts to be proposed and funded, in whole or in part, by the private sector;

(B) operating a database to store and share data and knowledge relevant to nuclear science and engineering between Federal agencies and the private sector;

(C) leveraging expertise with respect to safety analysis and research relating to advanced nuclear fuel; and

(D) enabling technical staff to actively observe and learn about technologies, with an emphasis on identification of additional information needed with respect to advanced nuclear fuel; and

(2) to ensure that—

(A) the Department of Energy has sufficient technical expertise to support the timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of advanced nuclear fuel;

(B) the Commission has sufficient technical expertise to support the evaluation of applications for licenses, permits, and design certifications and other requests for regulatory approval for advanced nuclear fuel;

(C)(i) the Department of Energy maintains and develops the facilities necessary to enable the timely research, development, demonstration, and commercial application by the civilian nuclear industry of advanced nuclear fuel; and

(ii) the Commission has access to the facilities described in clause (i), as needed; and

(D) the Commission consults, as appropriate, with the modeling and simulation experts at the Office of Nuclear Energy of the Department of Energy, at the National Laboratories, and within industry fuel vendor teams in cooperative agreements with the

Department of Energy to leverage physics-based computer modeling and simulation capabilities.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the efforts of the Commission under subsection (a), including—

(A) an assessment of the preparedness of the Commission to review and qualify for use—

(i) accident tolerant fuel;

(ii) ceramic cladding materials;

(iii) fuels containing silicon carbide;

(iv) high-assay, low-enriched uranium fuels;

(v) molten-salt based liquid fuels;

(vi) fuels derived from spent nuclear fuel or depleted uranium; and

(vii) other related fuel concepts, as determined by the Commission;

(B) activities planned or undertaken under the memorandum of understanding described in subsection (b);

(C) an accounting of the areas of research needed with respect to advanced nuclear fuel; and

(D) any other challenges or considerations identified by the Commission.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Commission shall seek input from—

(A) the Secretary of Energy;

(B) National Laboratories;

(C) the nuclear energy industry;

(D) technology developers;

(E) nongovernmental organizations; and

(F) other public stakeholders.

TITLE V—IMPROVING COMMISSION EFFICIENCY

SEC. 501. MISSION ALIGNMENT.

(a) **UPDATE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall, while remaining consistent with the policies of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.) (including to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection of the public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment), update the mission statement of the Commission to include that licensing and regulation of the civilian use of radioactive materials and nuclear energy be conducted in a manner that is efficient and does not unnecessarily limit—

(1) the civilian use of radioactive materials and deployment of nuclear energy; or

(2) the benefits of civilian use of radioactive materials and nuclear energy technology to society.

(b) **REPORT.**—On completion of the update to the mission statement required under subsection (a), the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes—

(1) the updated mission statement; and

(2) the guidance that the Commission will provide to staff of the Commission to ensure effective performance of the mission of the Commission.

SEC. 502. STRENGTHENING THE NRC WORKFORCE.

(a) **COMMISSION WORKFORCE.**—

(1) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 161A the following:

“SEC. 161B. COMMISSION WORKFORCE.

“(a) **DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 161 d. of this Act and any provision of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1980 (94 Stat. 3585; 5 U.S.C. app.), and without regard to any pro-

vision of title 5 (except section 3328), United States Code, governing appointments in the civil service, the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (in this section referred to as the ‘Chairman’) may, in order to carry out the Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s (in this section referred to as the ‘Commission’) responsibilities and activities in a timely, efficient, and effective manner and subject to the limitations described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)—

“(A) recruit and directly appoint exceptionally well-qualified individuals into the excepted service for covered positions; and

“(B) establish in the excepted service term-limited covered positions and recruit and directly appoint exceptionally well-qualified individuals into such term-limited covered positions, which may not exceed a term of 4 years.

“(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—

“(A) **NUMBER.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The number of exceptionally well-qualified individuals serving in covered positions pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) may not exceed 210 at any one time.

“(ii) **TERM-LIMITED COVERED POSITIONS.**—The Chairman may not appoint more than 20 exceptionally well-qualified individuals into term-limited covered positions pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) during any fiscal year.

“(B) **COMPENSATION.**—

“(i) **ANNUAL RATE.**—The annual basic rate of pay for any individual appointed under paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (1)(B) may not exceed the annual basic rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

“(ii) **EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS.**—Any individual recruited and directly appointed into a covered position or a term-limited covered position shall be compensated at a rate of pay that is commensurate with such individual’s experience and qualifications.

“(C) **SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITION.**—The Chairman may not, under paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (1)(B), appoint exceptionally well-qualified individuals to any Senior Executive Service position, as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code.

“(3) **LEVEL OF POSITIONS.**—To the extent practicable, in carrying out paragraph (1) the Chairman shall recruit and directly appoint exceptionally well-qualified individuals into the excepted service to entry, mid, and senior level covered positions, including term-limited covered positions.

“(4) **CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE WORKFORCE NEEDS.**—When recruiting and directly appointing exceptionally well-qualified individuals to covered positions pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), to maintain sufficient flexibility under the limitations of paragraph (2)(A)(i), the Chairman shall consider the future workforce needs of the Commission to carry out its responsibilities and activities in a timely, efficient, and effective manner.

“(b) **ADDRESSING INSUFFICIENT COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES AND OTHER PERSONNEL OF THE COMMISSION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chairman may fix the compensation for employees or other personnel serving in a covered position without regard to any provision of title 5, United States Code, governing General Schedule classification and pay rates.

“(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The authority under this subsection to fix the compensation of employees or other personnel shall apply with respect to an employee or other personnel serving in a covered position regardless of when the employee or other personnel was hired.

“(3) **LIMITATIONS ON COMPENSATION.**—

“(A) **ANNUAL RATE.**—The Chairman may not use the authority under paragraph (1) to

fix the compensation of employees or other personnel—

“(i) at an annual rate of basic pay higher than the annual basic rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code; or

“(ii) at an annual rate of basic pay that is not commensurate with such an employee or other personnel’s experience and qualifications.

“(B) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.—The Chairman may not use the authority under paragraph (1) to fix the compensation of an employee serving in a Senior Executive Service position, as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code.

“(C) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) FOR NEW EMPLOYEES.—The Chairman may pay an individual recruited and directly appointed under subsection (a) a 1-time hiring bonus in an amount not to exceed \$25,000.

“(2) FOR EXISTING EMPLOYEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), an employee or other personnel who the Chairman determines exhibited exceptional performance in a fiscal year may be paid a performance bonus in an amount not to exceed the least of—

“(i) \$25,000; and

“(ii) the amount of the limitation that is applicable for a calendar year under section 5307(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

“(B) EXCEPTIONAL PERFORMANCE.—Exceptional performance under subparagraph (A) includes—

“(i) leading a project team in a timely and efficient licensing review to enable the safe use of nuclear technology;

“(ii) making significant contributions to a timely and efficient licensing review to enable the safe use of nuclear technology;

“(iii) the resolution of novel or first-of-a-kind regulatory issues;

“(iv) developing or implementing licensing or regulatory oversight processes to improve the effectiveness of the Commission; and

“(v) other performance, as determined by the Chairman.

“(C) LIMITATIONS.—

“(i) SUBSEQUENT BONUS.—Any person who receives a performance bonus under subparagraph (A) may not receive another performance bonus under that subparagraph for a period of 5 years thereafter.

“(ii) HIRING BONUS.—Any person who receives a 1-time hiring bonus under paragraph (1) may not receive a performance bonus under subparagraph (A) unless more than one year has elapsed since the payment of such 1-time hiring bonus.

“(iii) NO BONUS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.—No person serving in a Senior Executive Service position, as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code, may receive a performance bonus under subparagraph (A).

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Chairman shall develop and implement a plan to carry out this section. Before implementing such plan, the Chairman shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Office of Personnel Management a report on the details of the plan.

“(2) REPORT CONTENT.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) evidence and supporting documentation justifying the plan; and

“(B) budgeting projections on costs and benefits resulting from the plan.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Chairman may consult with the Office of Personnel Management, the Office of Management and Budget,

and the Comptroller General of the United States in developing the plan under paragraph (1).

“(e) DELEGATION.—The Chairman shall delegate, subject to the direction and supervision of the Chairman, the authority provided by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to the Executive Director for Operations of the Commission.

“(f) INFORMATION ON HIRING, VACANCIES, AND COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall include in its budget materials submitted in support of the budget of the President (submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code), for fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, information relating to hiring, vacancies, and compensation at the Commission.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—The information described in paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) an analysis of any trends with respect to hiring, vacancies, and compensation at the Commission;

“(B) a description of the efforts to retain and attract employees or other personnel to serve in covered positions at the Commission;

“(C) information that describes—

“(i) how the authority provided by subsection (a) is being used to address the hiring needs of the Commission;

“(ii) the total number of exceptionally well-qualified individuals serving in—

“(I) covered positions described in subsection (g)(1) pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A);

“(II) covered positions described in subsection (g)(2) pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A);

“(III) term-limited covered positions described in subsection (g)(1) pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B); and

“(IV) term-limited covered positions described in subsection (g)(2) pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B);

“(iii) how the authority provided by subsection (b) is being used to address the hiring or retention needs of the Commission;

“(iv) the total number of employees or other personnel serving in a covered position that have their compensation fixed pursuant to subsection (b); and

“(v) the attrition levels with respect to term-limited covered positions appointed under subsection (a)(1)(B), including the number of individuals leaving a term-limited covered position before completion of the applicable term of service and the average length of service for such individuals as a percentage of the applicable term of service; and

“(D) an assessment of—

“(i) the current critical workforce needs of the Commission and any critical workforce needs that the Commission anticipates in the next five years; and

“(ii) additional skillsets that are or likely will be needed for the Commission to fulfill the licensing and oversight responsibilities of the Commission.

“(g) COVERED POSITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered position’ means—

“(1) a position in which an employee or other personnel is responsible for conducting work of a highly-specialized scientific, technical, engineering, mathematical, or otherwise skilled nature to address a critical licensing or regulatory oversight need for the Commission; or

“(2) a position that the Executive Director for Operations of the Commission determines is necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of the Commission in a timely, efficient, and effective manner.

“(h) SUNSET.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the authorities provided by

subsections (a) and (b) shall terminate on September 30, 2034.

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—If, no later than the date referenced in paragraph (1), the Commission issues a certification that the authorities provided by subsection (a), subsection (b), or both subsections are necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities and activities in a timely, efficient, and effective manner, the authorities provided by the applicable subsection shall terminate on September 30, 2039.

“(3) COMPENSATION.—The termination of the authorities provided by subsections (a) and (b) shall not affect the compensation of an employee or other personnel serving in a covered position whose compensation was fixed by the Chairman in accordance with subsection (a) or (b).”

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 161 the following:

“Sec. 161A. Use of firearms by security personnel.

“Sec. 161B. Commission workforce.”

(b) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2033, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that—

(1) evaluates the extent to which the authorities provided under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 161B of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as added by this Act) have been utilized;

(2) describes the role in which the exceptionally well-qualified individuals recruited and directly appointed pursuant to section 161B(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as added by this Act) have been utilized to support the licensing of advanced nuclear reactors;

(3) assesses the effectiveness of the authorities provided under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 161B of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as added by this Act) in helping the Commission fulfill its mission;

(4) makes recommendations to improve the Commission’s strategic workforce management; and

(5) makes recommendations with respect to whether Congress should extend, enhance, modify, or discontinue the authorities provided under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 161B of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as added by this Act).

(c) ANNUAL SOLICITATION FOR NUCLEAR REGULATOR APPRENTICESHIP NETWORK APPLICATIONS.—The Commission, on an annual basis, shall solicit applications for the Nuclear Regulator Apprenticeship Network.

SEC. 503. COMMISSION CORPORATE SUPPORT FUNDING.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and make publicly available a report that describes—

(1) the progress on the implementation of section 102(a)(3) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215(a)(3)); and

(2) whether the Commission is meeting and is expected to meet the total budget authority caps required for corporate support under that section.

(b) LIMITATION ON CORPORATE SUPPORT COSTS.—Section 102(a)(3) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215(a)(3)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

“(B) 30 percent for fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter.”

(c) **CORPORATE SUPPORT COSTS CLARIFICATION.**—Paragraph (10) of section 3 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note; Public Law 115-439) (as redesignated by section 201(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The term” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘corporate support costs’ does not include—

“(i) costs for rent and utilities relating to any and all space in the Three White Flint North building that is not occupied by the Commission; or

“(ii) costs for salaries, travel, and other support for the Office of the Commission.”

SEC. 504. PERFORMANCE METRICS AND MILESTONES.

Section 102(c) of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “180” and inserting “90”; and

(B) by striking “180” and inserting “90”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **PERIODIC UPDATES TO METRICS AND SCHEDULES.**—

“(A) **REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT.**—Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Commission shall review and assess, based on the licensing and regulatory activities of the Commission, the performance metrics and milestone schedules established under paragraph (1).

“(B) **REVISIONS.**—After each review and assessment under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall revise and improve, as appropriate, the performance metrics and milestone schedules described in that subparagraph to provide the most efficient metrics and schedules reasonably achievable.”

SEC. 505. NUCLEAR LICENSING EFFICIENCY.

(a) **OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION.**—Section 203 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5843) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) There” and inserting the following:

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT; APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR.**—There”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “(b) Subject” and inserting the following:

“(b) **FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR.**—Subject”;

(ii) by striking “delegate including:” and inserting “delegate, including the following:”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “for the discharge of the” and inserting “to fulfill the licensing and regulatory oversight”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “(c) Nothing” and inserting the following:

“(d) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR SAFE OPERATION OF FACILITIES.**—Nothing”; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **LICENSING PROCESS.**—In carrying out the principal licensing and regulation functions under subsection (b)(1), the Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation shall—

“(1) establish techniques and guidance for evaluating applications for licenses for nuclear reactors to support efficient, timely, and predictable reviews of applications for those licenses to enable the safe and secure use of nuclear reactors;

“(2) maintain the techniques and guidance established under paragraph (1) by periodically assessing and, if necessary, modifying those techniques and guidance; and

“(3) obtain approval from the Commission if establishment or modification of the techniques and guidance under paragraph (1) or (2) involves policy formulation.”

(b) **EFFICIENT LICENSING REVIEWS.**—

(1) **GENERAL.**—Section 181 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2231) is amended—

(A) by striking “The provisions of” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The provisions of”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **EFFICIENT LICENSING REVIEWS.**—The Commission shall provide for efficient and timely reviews and proceedings for the granting, suspending, revoking, or amending of any—

“(1) license or construction permit; or

“(2) application to transfer control.”

(c) **CONSTRUCTION PERMITS AND OPERATING LICENSES.**—Section 185 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2235) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“c. **APPLICATION REVIEWS FOR PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION FACILITIES OF AN EXISTING SITE.**—In reviewing an application for an early site permit, construction permit, operating license, or combined construction permit and operating license for a production facility or utilization facility located at the site of a production facility or utilization facility licensed by the Commission, the Commission shall, to the extent practicable, use information that was part of the licensing basis of the licensed production facility or utilization facility.”

SEC. 506. MODERNIZATION OF NUCLEAR REACTOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the efforts of the Commission to facilitate efficient, timely, and predictable environmental reviews of nuclear reactor applications for a license under section 103 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133), including through expanded use of categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and generic environmental impact statements.

(b) **REPORT.**—In completing the report under subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) describe the actions the Commission will take to implement the amendments to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) made by section 321 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (Public Law 118-5; 137 Stat. 38);

(2) consider—

(A) using, through adoption, incorporation by reference, or other appropriate means, categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and environmental impact statements prepared by other Federal agencies to streamline environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission;

(B) using categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and environmental impact statements prepared by the Commission to streamline environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission;

(C) using mitigated findings of no significant impact in environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission to reduce the impact of a proposed action to a level that is not significant;

(D) the extent to which the Commission may rely on prior studies or analyses prepared by Federal, State, and local governmental permitting agencies to streamline environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission;

(E) opportunities to coordinate the development of environmental assessments and environmental impact statements with other

Federal agencies to avoid duplicative environmental reviews and to streamline environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission;

(F) opportunities to streamline formal and informal consultations and coordination with other Federal, State, and local governmental permitting agencies during environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission;

(G) opportunities to streamline the Commission’s analyses of alternatives, including the Commission’s analysis of alternative sites, in environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a) by the Commission;

(H) establishing new categorical exclusions that could be applied to actions relating to new applications described in subsection (a);

(I) amending section 51.20(b) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, to allow the Commission to determine, on a case-specific basis, whether an environmental assessment (rather than an environmental impact statement or supplemental environmental impact statement) is appropriate for a particular application described in subsection (a), including in proceedings in which the Commission relies on a generic environmental impact statement for advanced nuclear reactors;

(J) authorizing the use of an applicant’s environmental impact statement as the Commission’s draft environmental impact statement, consistent with section 107(f) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336a(f));

(K) opportunities to adopt online and digital technologies, including technologies that would allow applicants and cooperating agencies to upload documents and coordinate with the Commission to edit documents in real time, that would streamline communications between—

(i) the Commission and applicants; and

(ii) the Commission and other relevant cooperating agencies; and

(L) in addition to implementing measures under paragraph (3), potential revisions to part 51 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, and relevant Commission guidance documents—

(i) to facilitate efficient, timely, and predictable environmental reviews of applications described in subsection (a);

(ii) to assist decision making about relevant environmental issues;

(iii) to maintain openness with the public;

(iv) to meet obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(v) to reduce burdens on licensees, applicants, and the Commission; and

(3) include a schedule for promulgating a rule for any measures considered by the Commission under subparagraphs (A) through (K) of paragraph (2) that require a rulemaking.

SEC. 507. IMPROVING OVERSIGHT AND INSPECTION PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF LICENSEE.**—In this section, the term “licensee” means a person that holds a license issued under section 103 or 104 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2133, 2134).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that identifies specific improvements to the nuclear reactor and materials oversight and inspection programs carried out pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) that the Commission may implement to maximize the efficiency of such programs through, where appropriate, the use of risk-informed, performance-based procedures, expanded incorporation of information technologies, and staff training.

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In developing the report under subsection (b), the Commission shall, as appropriate, seek input from—

(1) other Federal regulatory agencies that conduct oversight and inspections;

(2) the nuclear energy industry;

(3) nongovernmental organizations; and

(4) other public stakeholders.

(d) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (b) shall—

(1) assess specific elements of oversight and inspections that may be modified by the use of technology, improved planning, and continually updated risk-informed, performance-based assessment, including—

(A) use of travel resources;

(B) planning and preparation for inspections, including entrance and exit meetings with licensees;

(C) document collection and preparation, including consideration of whether nuclear reactor data are accessible prior to onsite visits or requests to the licensee and that document requests are timely and within the scope of inspections; and

(D) the cross-cutting issues program;

(2) identify and assess measures to improve oversight and inspections, including—

(A) elimination of areas of duplicative or otherwise unnecessary activities;

(B) increased use of templates in documenting inspection results; and

(C) periodic training of Commission staff and leadership on the application of risk-informed criteria for—

(i) inspection planning and assessments;

(ii) agency decision-making processes on the application of regulations and guidance; and

(iii) the application of the Commission's standard of reasonable assurance of adequate protection;

(3) assess measures to advance risk-informed procedures, including—

(A) increased use of inspection approaches that balance the level of resources commensurate with safety significance;

(B) increased review of the use of inspection program resources based on licensee performance;

(C) expansion of modern information technology, including artificial intelligence and machine learning, to risk-inform oversight and inspection decisions; and

(D) updating the Differing Professional Views or Opinions process to ensure any impacts on agency decisions and schedules are commensurate with the safety significance of the differing opinion;

(4) assess the ability of the Commission, consistent with the mission of the Commission, to enable licensee innovations that may advance nuclear reactor operational efficiency and safety, including the criteria of the Commission for timely acceptance of licensee adoption of advanced technologies, including digital technologies;

(5) identify recommendations resulting from the assessments described in paragraphs (1) through (4);

(6) identify specific actions that the Commission may take to incorporate into the training, inspection, oversight, and licensing activities, and regulations, of the Commission, without compromising the mission of the Commission, the recommendations identified under paragraph (5); and

(7) describe when the actions identified under paragraph (6) may be implemented.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 104 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2134(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following:

“(3) LIMITATION ON UTILIZATION FACILITIES.—The Commission may issue a license

under this section for a utilization facility useful in the conduct of research and development activities of the types specified in section 31 if—

“(A) not more than 75 percent of the annual costs to the licensee of owning and operating the facility are devoted to the sale, other than for research and development or education and training, of—

“(i) nonenergy services;

“(ii) energy; or

“(iii) a combination of nonenergy services and energy; and

“(B) not more than 50 percent of the annual costs to the licensee of owning and operating the facility are devoted to the sale of energy.”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “The Commission” and inserting the following:

“(2) REGULATION.—The Commission”; and

(3) by striking “c. The Commission” and inserting the following:

“c. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Commission”.

SEC. 602. REPORT ON ENGAGEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR WASTE ISSUES IN THE GREAT LAKES BASIN.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report describing any engagement between the Commission and the Government of Canada with respect to nuclear waste issues in the Great Lakes Basin.

SEC. 603. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act affects authorities of the Department of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) and the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 870, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 870, the Fire Grants and Safety Act. I thank my Senate Democratic colleague Chairman PETERS for his leadership in advancing this legislation through the Senate.

This bill incorporates language from H.R. 4090, the Fire Grants and Safety Act, a bill that I championed through the House Science Committee. It also includes the ADVANCE Act, legislation from the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I thank all of my colleagues for their work in making this a strong and com-

prehensive bill. Through bipartisan and bicameral collaboration, we have paved the way for advancing this bill in the House, and I anticipate its smooth passage in the Senate.

I was proud to lead the Fire Grants and Safety Act with my colleagues and original cosponsors, the Congressional Fire Services Caucus co-chairs, Representatives PASCRELL, BOST, FITZPATRICK, and HOYER, Chairman LUCAS, Ranking Member LOFGREN, Subcommittee Chairman COLLINS, Subcommittee Ranking Member STEVENS, and Representative GOLDEN.

I also thank the many external stakeholders, including the local firefighters from the Seventh Congressional District in New Jersey, for their critically important feedback as we developed this legislation.

Firefighters and EMTs are frequently first responders to danger. They are essential for keeping our communities safe. All across the country, firefighters and EMS personnel work through danger and uncertainty every day to protect their neighbors.

As a former volunteer firefighter, I know the hardship and sacrifices that firefighters make daily to quickly respond to emergencies, so I am proud to lead the Fire Grants and Safety Act to ensure that our firefighters have the proper training and equipment to continue to protect our communities.

The Fire Grants and Safety Act increases funding for the U.S. Fire Administration and reauthorizes two critical programs: the Assistance to Firefighters Grants (AFG) and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grant program (SAFER).

AFG directly supports local firefighters by providing training, equipment, and even vehicles. The SAFER program provides training for local fire departments so that they are better able to respond to emergencies. Together, these programs ensure that we have capable, well-equipped fire departments to protect our communities.

We must pass this legislation before the programs sunset at the end of this year.

By advancing this multiyear reauthorization, we ensure the continuity and the stability of these programs, enabling the Fire Administration, AFG, and SAFER to continue equipping, training, and staffing our departments effectively.

This bipartisan and bicameral piece of legislation demonstrates our firm commitment to the safety and well-being of our firefighters, empowering them to overcome challenges and fulfill their mission of safeguarding our communities.

I support the inclusion in this bill of the ADVANCE Act to ensure that America maintains its leadership in nuclear energy. To quote the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy: “Nuclear Power is the Most Reliable Energy Source, and It's Not Even Close.” By harnessing its unparalleled reliability, low carbon emissions, and

capacity for large-scale power generation, nuclear energy fosters energy security, technological innovation, and a cleaner environment for future generations.

By empowering the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to lead in international forums for the development of regulations for advanced nuclear reactors, this bill strengthens America's position as a global leader in nuclear technology.

By requiring the NRC to develop a streamlined licensing process and allowing the hiring of specialized staff, the bill facilitates innovation and the adoption of advanced nuclear technologies.

This reform not only accelerates the pace of technological advancement but also fosters a more adaptive regulatory environment, encouraging investment and fostering economic growth in the nuclear sector.

Once again, I thank House and Senate leadership, my Science Committee colleagues, Congressional Fire Services Caucus co-chairs, and numerous external stakeholders for their critical feedback as we worked to draft this reauthorization. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

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

I rise in support of the Fire Grants and Safety Act of 2023. This amended version inserts into the Senate bill the text we passed out of the Science Committee unanimously. This bill also includes the text of the ADVANCE Act. I thank Representatives PASCRELL and KEAN and our Senate colleagues Mr. PETERS and Ms. COLLINS for their leadership and cooperation on this important bill.

In our changing climate, we are experiencing more frequent and severe wildfires, not just in the Western United States, but across the United States. From Maui in Hawaii to Smokehouse Creek, Texas, we have witnessed the ferocity and destruction of wildfires. With more than a third of the population living within the wildland-urban interface, our communities are more at risk from fire than ever before.

In addition to wildfires, there were more than half a million structure fires in 2022, including 360,000 home fires. Tragically, this resulted in 2,790 civilian and 18 firefighter deaths. We will always honor our firefighters' commitment and sacrifice. We trust our firefighters to fulfill their role professionally, including those occasions when it may mean risking their own lives. However, that trust goes both ways, and they must have from Congress the support and resources they need to keep themselves and their communities safe.

S. 860 reauthorizes the U.S. Fire Administration and two very special programs: The Assistance to Firefighters

Grants (AFG) and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response, SAFER grants.

The U.S. Fire Administration helps fire and emergency medical services prepare for, prevent, mitigate, and respond to all hazards. The USFA also leads Federal work on public safety, education, fire research, and fire service training. This legislation will authorize the agency and modernize the National Emergency Response Information System, which will mean much-needed improvements to data collection, usage, and analytics for decision-makers at all levels of fire response.

AFG and SAFER have been supporting local firefighters for two decades. AFG helps fire departments obtain crucial safety gear, including breathing apparatus, equips firefighters with new technologies, and also supports research to improve protective gear.

The SAFER program helps recruit and retain firefighters. Seventy percent of U.S. firefighters are volunteers, and rural communities in particular rely primarily on volunteer firefighters. Studies have shown that increasing firefighter crew sizes drastically improves the likelihood of safe outcomes. This program is an effective and meaningful investment into the emergency preparedness of our communities.

Recipients of AFG and SAFER awards are in all 50 States, Washington, D.C., the territories, and some Tribes. We must ensure these funds are getting into the hands of those who need them most, so this bill also calls on the GAO to identify any barriers that may prevent fire departments from accessing these crucial Federal funds. This bill is vital to keeping our communities protected and to support our firefighters and EMS first responders.

As for the ADVANCE Act provisions, this legislation is a continuation of the strong, bipartisan support that Congress has shown toward the development and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactors. This bill would enhance the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ability to safely and efficiently license next-generation nuclear technologies, all while lowering the financial barriers for first-of-a-kind movers.

The ADVANCE Act also includes a bill sponsored by our colleague Congresswoman TRAHAN that would support our emerging fusion industry—this is so important—by codifying the NRC's current fusion device guidelines into law. It is important that these guidelines that are not overly restrictive be placed into law. This will provide much-needed clarity and consistency for these emerging companies as they design and build the fusion reactors of the future, which we so desperately need to succeed.

I urge support for this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) to speak on the bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I rise in support of S. 870, which includes a bipartisan and bicameral nuclear energy package.

I first thank my colleague, friend, and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security for leading this effort in the House along with me, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE.

I thank the chair and ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Chairman CARPER and Ranking Member CAPITO, for leading this effort in the Senate.

Finally, I thank the chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, for making nuclear energy a policy priority in this Congress.

Now, this package of nuclear bills is comprised of the work of many Members of both the House and the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and I thank them for their work in advancing the peaceful use of nuclear energy here in the United States.

The ADVANCE Act, which is a Senate bill, and the Atomic Energy Advancement Act, which is a House bill, will expand nuclear energy by modernizing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and programs at the Department of Energy.

The bill updates our regulatory framework to restore America's nuclear dominance and encourage innovation while also maintaining the NRC's global gold standard of safety. Now, more than ever, it is essential that America leads in the nuclear energy space.

As we approach a nuclear renaissance here in the United States, a future which will see small module reactors, microreactors, advance fuel reactors, and reprocessing of commercial spent fuels, it is exciting times.

When Congress first passed the Atomic Energy Act over 70 years ago, we ushered in the age for the peaceful use of the atom and cemented American nuclear leadership globally.

Our adversaries, like Russia and China, are working to undercut our strength and seeking to dominate the nuclear markets and supply chains.

A robust and growing nuclear industry is critical for reducing carbon emissions and providing reliable, affordable, and clean energy to the American people.

This nuclear package will help bring America's nuclear promise back and secure, once again, the United States' position as a global nuclear leader.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), someone who has worked on these issues for so many years.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants, the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grants, and the United States Fire Administration.

It is hard to imagine now, but 25 years ago, Federal support for our fire services was nearly nonexistent, very little equity, but then funding for firefighting was primarily the responsibility of the State and local governments.

During budget shortfalls, fire departments were often the very first to get cut. When a department needed equipment or personnel, they resorted to bake sales and pancake breakfasts, although there is nothing wrong with those. That is a heck of a way to bring responsibility of protecting the citizens.

Working with local fire departments, national advocates, retirees, partners in Congress, and the White House, we passed the FIRE Act into law after getting volunteers and career firefighters here to Washington, D.C., to follow every Congressman and get on their case. That is what we did.

While we will take credit for this legislation, it is really the firefighters that did this. They came to Washington. It seems like a lifetime away.

Career firefighters, fire chiefs, volunteers, everyone came together to make sure our fire groups were no longer the forgotten piece of the public safety equation.

Our law delivered Federal dollars to local departments for the very first time. In 2003, we created the SAFER program so departments could meet their staffing needs.

The success of these programs speaks for itself. Since its inception, AFG has delivered more than \$9 billion to equip and train firefighters.

When we were looking at this legislation out in the West, there were some departments that had to push the equipment to the fire. That is the case, and that existed over 25 years ago.

I am proud to say that SAFER has awarded more than \$5 billion. This has been called one of the most efficient programs.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that SAFER awarded more than \$5 billion to departments to hire, recruit, and retain firefighters.

These grants are amongst the most effective in the entire Federal budget. Fire departments rely on the Fire Administration for fire data collection, public safety education, and service training. Without reauthorization, these programs would all go kaput September 30.

Thank you to my fire service co-chairs, Representatives HOYER, BOST,

and FITZPATRICK, as well as the House cosponsor, Congressman KEAN from New Jersey, for joining us in our bipartisan quest.

This is truly, Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan piece of legislation that worked.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) to speak on the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 870, the Fire Grants and Safety Act. Included in this legislation is a bipartisan nuclear energy package, which I was very proud to work on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

As I have said many times before, an all-of-the-above strategy is critical to reclaim American energy dominance, and nuclear—our Nation's largest source of clean energy—has a pivotal role to play.

In Georgia's 12th District, we are leading our Nation's nuclear future at Plant Vogtle with the first two new nuclear reactors built and in commercial operation in the United States in three decades.

Just last week, I welcomed Members of Congress and industry leaders to my district for a panel discussion on the benefits of nuclear energy expansion, followed by a visit to Plant Vogtle to see units 3 and 4 officially up and running on the grid.

This historic accomplishment is nothing short of remarkable, but make no mistake about it, it was a challenging process.

Nuclear projects in the U.S. are often bogged down by burdensome licensing and permitting that result in unnecessary delays and increased costs.

My bill, the Nuclear Licensing Efficiency Act, is included in the bipartisan nuclear package and provides efficient, timely, and predictable reviews of applications and proceedings for licenses of nuclear reactors.

It allows information that was used in the licensing process for an existing nuclear reactor site to be used in further licensing and permitting at the site, and it establishes a timeframe of once every 3 years to update performance metrics and milestone schedules to be as efficient as possible.

By modernizing these processes, America can fully embrace the reliability of clean 24/7 nuclear energy as we have in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on S. 870.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, thanks to all of the Members here today who have worked on this legislation.

I rise in strong support of S. 870, legislation that includes the ADVANCE Act, which I co-lead with Energy Subcommittee Chairman JEFF DUNCAN, to

modernize our nuclear energy policy and to maintain important safety provisions and environmental protections.

Transitioning to clean energy needs to be an all-of-the-above approach that leverages every aspect of our energy production in the United States, including nuclear.

Nuclear energy provides nearly 20 percent of the electricity in the United States. It is also our largest source of carbon-free energy, making up more than half our emissions-free electricity.

We know that nuclear energy is not a silver bullet, but if we are going to get to zero percent carbon emissions by 2050, it must be part of the equation.

This bill helps ensure that our approach to nuclear energy is modernized, focusing on safety and environmental protections.

I am glad that my provisions to improve safety measures at nuclear energy facilities, recruit a highly trained and skilled workforce, and keep our nuclear regulations up to date were included in the bill.

These steps will help enhance our nuclear energy supply chain while protecting against failures that could negatively impact communities in the workforce.

One of the provisions included in this legislation will strengthen the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ability to attract and retain highly qualified and competent employees, ensuring the commission is up to the challenge of licensing the advanced reactors that we anticipate will come in increasing numbers over the next decade.

In 2022, the NRC reported it was 23 percent smaller than it was 6 years earlier, and a third of the commission is currently eligible for retirement.

We need to incentivize a strong nuclear energy workforce so we can ensure nuclear energy is safe and effective. This will be an important part of taking on the climate crisis.

This bill is overwhelmingly bipartisan, it is supported by a variety of advocacy groups, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, who did so much work on this.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member LOFGREN for yielding time.

I am standing before you here today in support of this incredible bicameral, bipartisan bill, the Fire Grant and Safety Act, which I am so pleased to be an original cosponsor of.

I certainly want to recognize the incredible work of our junior Senator from Michigan, Senator GARY PETERS, for moving this bill forward for our consideration.

I certainly recognize Mr. KEAN, who is the lead sponsor on the Republican

side of this critical bill, and, frankly, senior Members of this body who joined in the debate, as well.

This piece of legislation, as has been shared, just reauthorizes very critical elements of the U.S. Fire Administration and its programs to support firefighters and lifesaving EMS workers to make them better protected. It is just really one of the best things that we can do in this Chamber.

Just last week, I was visited by Fire Chief Robert Jennison. He lives in my district in West Bloomfield, and he is a fire chief in Livonia, a community I used to represent. He mentioned this bill and how important it is for his fire stations and for his activities.

We should be really proud to be coming together in a bipartisan way to reauthorize our fire safety efforts here in the United States of America.

We also have to be real with ourselves because over a 10-year period, fire-related deaths in this country rose by 33 percent.

That has been unnecessary, and it has been an unnerving loss of life. With the National Fire Protection Association estimating that once every 23 seconds, a fire department somewhere in our country responds to a fire emergency, we must do more to support our local heroes.

□ 1745

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I celebrate the Science Committee, which always operates on a bipartisan basis. Once again, we have worked together on the provisions in this bill.

I will highlight something I mentioned in passing, which is the fusion energy program. For years and years, people have said that fusion energy is always 50 years away. That was before ignition was achieved at Lawrence Livermore National Lab, the National Ignition Facility, not once, not twice, but many times. We now have a private-sector fusion industry that is charging ahead and making tremendous progress.

I have heard, when I have visited with them, their praise for the NRC's guidelines. This is not fission. It doesn't have the challenge of nuclear energy, so it doesn't need the same kind of regulatory scheme. It needs to be sensible, streamlined, solid, and certain.

That is what those standards are. Putting them into law is going to help private industry rush forward. I think all of us hope that they will be as successful as they plan to be within the next 5 years. This act will help that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of the House to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I again thank my House and Senate colleagues and Chairman PETERS for co-leading this important reauthorization.

As I previously mentioned, this legislation is a strong commitment to the safety and well-being of our first responders, empowering them to overcome challenges and fulfill their mission of safeguarding our communities. That will help make all Americans safer.

The ADVANCE Act, as we have heard in this Chamber, is also critically important to pass today.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan and bicameral legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 870, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. 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 motion will be postponed.

NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION SAFETY TEAM ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2024

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4143) to amend the National Construction Safety Team Act to enable the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate structures other than buildings to inform the development of engineering standards, best practices, and building codes related to such structures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4143

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 "National Construction Safety Team Enhancement Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION SAFETY TEAM ENHANCEMENT.

The National Construction Safety Team Act is amended—

(1) in section 2 (15 U.S.C. 7301)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking "buildings" and inserting "structure"; and

(ii) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "In instances in which the failure of the building or structure is the proper subject for investigation by another Federal agency, the Director shall defer to the authority of such agency.";

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking "buildings" and inserting "the built environment"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "or structure" after "building";

(II) in subparagraph (C), by striking "building standards, codes, and practices" and inserting "engineering standards, practices, and building codes"; and

(III) in subparagraph (D), by striking "buildings" and inserting "the built environment"; and

(C) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (G), by inserting "or structure" after "building"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (J)—

(I) by inserting "or structure" after "building"; and

(II) by inserting "or the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004" after "1977";

(2) in section 4 (15 U.S.C. 7303)—

(A) by striking the term "building" each place it appears; and

(B) by inserting "building or structure" before "failure" each place it appears;

(3) in section 7 (15 U.S.C. 7306), by inserting "or structure" after "building";

(4) in section 8 (15 U.S.C. 7307)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or structure" after "building";

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking "standards, codes, and practices" and inserting "engineering standards, practices, and building codes"; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting "and structure" after "building";

(5) in section 9(2) (15 U.S.C. 7308(2)), by striking "building standards, codes, and practices" each place it appears and inserting "engineering standards, practices, and building codes"; and

(6) in section 14 (15 U.S.C. 7312), by striking "building standards, codes, or practices" and inserting "engineering standards, practices, and building codes".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) and the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4143, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4143, the National Construction Safety Team Enhancement Act of 2024, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The National Construction Safety Team, or NCST, is a program run by the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate major building disasters and failures so that we can develop better construction standards in the future.

Following NIST's investigation of the Twin Towers collapse after 9/11, they issued recommendations that have significantly impacted how we design and construct buildings, making them safer and more durable.

Currently, NIST is investigating the 2021 collapse of the Surfside condominiums in south Florida, which killed nearly 100 people.

While NIST does exceptional work in these investigations, their scope is limited to building failures. This bill will

expand that authority to general infrastructure failures, which currently are not investigated in this way.

This is a smart bill that will ensure that we can utilize NIST's unique expertise to better understand any failures in roads, bridges, dams, and other infrastructure and, most importantly, develop best practices and guidances so that we can avert future tragedies.

This legislation builds off the authorities NIST received after 9/11 to conduct technical investigations of building failures and ensures these efforts do not impede on criminal or other law enforcement investigations.

I thank Ranking Member LOFGREN for introducing this bill along with Chairman LUCAS.

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

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

I rise today in support of my bill, the National Construction Safety Team Enhancement Act of 2024.

Last year, there was massive flooding along California's central coast, which left communities really across the State vulnerable. In my district, the Pajaro River's levee failed, forcing over 1,500 people to evacuate and putting thousands of homes at risk. Many of them were flooded.

In May 2023, I joined Representative PANETTA, Senator PADILLA, and the late Senator Feinstein in asking the Army Corps of Engineers to provide emergency assistance to help with the levee.

Last August, the Biden-Harris administration heeded our call to action and committed \$20 million to repair the levee and address erosion on the left bank of the Pajaro River. That has now been concluded, and these communities have been protected, at least with the emergency repairs.

As with this small rural community in my own district, the climate crisis continues to put massive strains on aging infrastructure across the United States.

While recovery and reconstruction efforts continue, we have to do more to understand the causes of destructive and life-threatening events, like the Pajaro River levee failure, to make sure it doesn't happen again. Unfortunately, there's no agency currently authorized to conduct thorough technical investigations of failure of general infrastructure, like levees, dikes, bridges, or dams.

When it comes to buildings, the National Institute of Standards and Technology has been charged by Congress with conducting investigations in order to improve the building codes and standards used to design and maintain them. The National Construction Safety Team, or NCST, dispatches experts to work alongside other agencies to investigate major building disasters, to improve the scientific understanding around these failures, and to prevent future catastrophes.

This bill expands NCST's existing authority to include investigations of general infrastructure failures. These teams will investigate incidents involving other structures that we also rely on every day in order to improve the safety and resilience of American communities.

The tragic destruction of the Francis Scott Key Bridge into the mouth of the Patapsco River in Baltimore underscores the immediate need for this legislation. The impact of that catastrophe is being felt all across the United States.

NIST needs the authority to investigate major infrastructure failures so that they may improve future engineering standards and building codes to guard against such failures in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LUCAS for his partnership on this bill and so many other things.

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

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), my colleague on the Science Committee.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank again Ranking Member LOFGREN, particularly in light of her remarkable leadership in crafting and introducing this bill. I join both of my colleagues to shine a light on the deep and critical importance of H.R. 4143, the National Construction Safety Team Enhancement Act.

We all know that NIST is the little engine that could within our Federal Government, doing so much with little resources and showing the true benefit of where and how we invest taxpayer dollars for the greater implications of society and safety. We know that the National Construction Safety Team within NIST is modeled after the National Transportation Safety Team, both expert operations that get dispatched to the site of major building disasters to investigate the cause and identify preventive solutions.

However, the existing authority only extends to buildings, and it leaves out major swaths of our built environment, as the ranking member mentioned, like bridges and levees, which, just frankly, leaves our Nation vulnerable.

This legislation will expand the safety team's existing authority to better investigate those failures of infrastructure in structures other than buildings.

This really couldn't come at a more important time. I know this is deeply critical to residents in Michigan. We want to be in a place where we are creating resilient structures and recognizing some of the damaging impacts of climate change and rising sea levels. That is the extreme weather environment we are in.

I thank the ranking member and all on the Science Committee. I am proud

to be a cosponsor of this bill and eager to see it passed in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I am proud of this bill. If we make this the law, America will be safer, full stop. I am happy that we were able to do it on a bipartisan basis, and I am looking forward to quick action in the Senate.

I thank again the chairman of the committee, Mr. LUCAS, for his collaboration on this and so many other things.

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

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a commonsense, practical policy that supports science and innovation to improve people's lives. I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation to ensure that NIST can utilize its unique expertise to conduct these technical investigations on major failures to our infrastructure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4143, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. 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 motion will be postponed.

□ 1800

PAYING TRIBUTE TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPUTY ALFREDO "FREDDY" FLORES

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

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to a peacemaker of California's 27th Congressional District who was taken from us too soon.

On April 20 of this year, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputy Alfredo "Freddy" Flores tragically passed away at the age of 51 after suffering injuries during a training exercise last October.

He is survived by his wife Maggie and his children, Nathaniel, Kayla, Victoria, and Adrian.

While our community is grieving this tragic loss, we were also blessed by his extraordinary life and the security

blanket that he provided us on a daily basis.

Deputy Flores lived a life of service to his family, community, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office.

Deputy Flores dedicated 22 years of his life to the safety, security, and prosperity of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater form of love than being willing to sacrifice your own life in the defense of others.

While he is with the Lord now, Deputy Flores' legacy lives on with everyone who knew him and his family. He looks down upon us with great pride today.

RECOGNIZING TYLER MASTIN

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone whose service has been instrumental in the lives of constituents in Arizona's Eighth Congressional District, Tyler Mastin.

Tyler's service to the Eighth District began in August of 2022 as a constituent services representative in my Surprise, Arizona, District Office.

During his tenure, Tyler has expertly navigated casework for over 300 constituents who had encountered difficulties with various Federal agencies. As a result of his efforts, he directly saved constituents over \$547,000. This is an incredible achievement that made a huge difference in the lives of constituents and their families.

Tyler also displayed leadership abilities by managing both the Congressional App Challenge and the Congressional Art Competition and has been an invaluable member of my district team.

I would like to thank Tyler for his leadership and service to our district. His dedication and determination were critical to the success of our constituent service programs and improved the lives of those in the Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tyler.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SOCK OUT CANCER DAY

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

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Sock Out Cancer Day, which will take place on June 2.

Cancer affects millions of families from all walks of life, and Sock Out Cancer Day reminds us that we are all alike in facing this formidable foe.

The Sock Out Cancer organization has captured this message by selling pairs of multicolored socks which symbolize over 25 different forms of cancer.

With the proceeds, the organization has helped survivors and families pay for food, transportation, and housing

so they can focus their energy on healing and recovery.

Mr. Speaker, Sock Out Cancer has become a beacon of hope for those facing the fight of their lives. I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in recognizing this June 2 as National Sock Out Cancer Day.

IT IS THE MATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSENDALE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to do something this evening. Unless you want to sort of geek out a bit, I am not sure you want to hang out watching this, so maybe there is something good on Netflix.

I am going to walk through a couple of financial debt concepts I tried sharing last week just to help people sort of get their heads around something. Then we are going to actually just go through a couple of top lines on the Social Security actuary report. Now, I have to admit, I haven't finished it. We have only just gone through some of the very top line. It is going to take me a week or two to work out all the math. We want to make sure—because some of the headlines, I believe, were misleading on just, still, how difficult these numbers are.

Then we are going to go through sort of understanding the scale of the problem. Then we are going to do a little bit of talking about optimism, and we are going to do some discussion about AI, artificial intelligence, in government, and some of the bills we have actually already introduced to disrupt the cost of this government.

We keep hearing sort of the nasty and horrible noise that the world is coming to an end. I am going to argue that if we get artificial intelligence right, we can make a difference in government.

So let's first walk through the first concept.

Mr. Speaker, how many of you remember a little while back—I think it was S&P or was it Moody's—it may have been Moody's, downgraded U.S. debt?

We have had two downgrades. Of the three largest rating agencies, we have been downgraded twice.

Now, I know every Member of Congress and all of our staff read every word of it, but if you actually read it, Mr. Speaker, there is an entire report about why they would downgrade U.S. debt. It was more of a downgrade of future horizons. One of the number one reasons on that downgrade was governance.

Now, the fact of the matter is the debt picture is off the charts. I am going to show one chart here where I think we have now had our fourth day in the last couple of weeks where we

went over \$100,000 per second of borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, do you screw with your bankers?

Because this is my passion, I try to convince my brothers and sisters here in Congress: You have to act like an adult. Have fights here. Actually know your math. Bend the cost of government, but don't do stupid things and then turn around.

That is because this week, understand, Mr. Speaker, this week, I believe, the Treasury is going to market for about \$125 billion. Our interest rates are actually slightly down this week compared to last week, but the fact that those interest rates bounce up and down this much lets you know sort of how nervous the debt markets are.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago a lot of the fancy financial markets were writing stories about how U.S. debt is getting harder to sell. This week it looks like it is easier to sell.

That is fragility. I know that is a big word, but it is the only one I have for this. Don't play a game here. We will pay \$1.2 trillion in interest this year. Interest for the United States in this fiscal year will be the second biggest expense in government. Social Security will be \$1.450 trillion. Interest will be \$1.2 trillion. Medicare is almost \$1 trillion. Defense is \$960 or \$980 billion. Think of that, Mr. Speaker. Defense is now the fourth biggest expense in government. It is no longer the first or second.

Part of that concept is—this one is a little more for those folks who like to think of themselves as sort of monetary policy folks, think about what the Federal Reserve has been trying to do. They have been raising interest rates, they have been pulling liquidity, they have been holding back on buying bonds and doing just the opposite, letting their portfolio roll off. They are trying to pull liquidity out of society to squeeze inflation out.

However, this place has actually made it that much harder to do. It is craziness how much we spent in the Inflation Reduction Act, which is singularly the most Orwellian-named piece of legislation in modern history. You do realize, Mr. Speaker, in the Cloakroom a moment ago, I was trying to do this math off the top of my head. I think it is like \$2.8 billion a day that we pay in interest. We pay that in interest. The U.S. Government pays that to bondholders every day.

So here is what you have, Mr. Speaker. We are borrowing about \$8 to \$8.5 billion a day. We are paying out \$2.8 billion a day in interest.

The question is: Is government borrowing really good for productivity in this society?

Does government borrowing actually make us a wealthier society, a more prosperous society?

Now, some borrowing is historic. You are going to do that.

However, at the scale we are consuming, we are consuming much of the

world's liquidity, not just of the United States. The United States and China are the two big economies right now bingeing on debt. Europe actually has dialed back its debt.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, I did the presentation last week, and I think there were 13 countries that had better credit ratings than the United States.

Greece today has a better credit rating than the United States. Their 10-year bond is cheaper, lower in interest costs, than the U.S.

Much of that risk premium is governance. It is the belief saying: Oh, the United States is going to use its tools to bend inflation. The United States is going to do the things necessary to actually lower debt and borrowing.

Are we?

You see the conversations we have around here. Most of the time these microphones are full of people coming up with new programs and new ways to spend money.

So understand, Mr. Speaker, I had two concepts I just walked you through. They are a little highbrow. The first is you need to actually have a government that convinces the bond markets that we are serious, and we respect our creditors.

Let's be honest, Mr. Speaker, if you borrow a bunch of money, you don't go into your creditor and make a clown of yourself. We need to do the same.

The second half is understanding the economic mess we are making. It is more than just the borrowing. It is the fact you pulled capital out of the markets that would have gone to more productive uses, and at the same time we are paying interest. Now we are paying interest that in some ways is higher than people who said: Why would I take a risk premium and invest in something, a new plant, a new widget maker, those sorts of things, when I can get 5 percent on a 2-year? I am going to do that.

The scale of our debt is creating economic distortion. It is just a concept we need to understand, that also in some ways Congress—and this always drives people crazy who believe it is Fed and liquidity, but in many ways, Congress, because of our borrowing, has actually created this liquidity cycle where we borrow and then we are pumping out interest. We borrow it, and then we give you almost a premium on the interest rate, and we are paying you out. It is a real problem.

In many ways, we have made the Federal Reserve's job even more difficult for squeezing inflation out. Almost no one has actually spent time on it. There are a couple of good academic articles if you want to geek out, Mr. Speaker.

All right. We have used this chart over and over and over because we are trying to help people understand.

Do you see the blue, Mr. Speaker?

The blue is what we get to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, you do understand every dime a Member of Congress votes on is borrowed.

So interest, this number is wrong now. Interest, if you do gross interest, is 1.2. Publicly borrowed interest is probably—it may be somewhere near that, \$890 or \$900 billion.

This is interest.

This is Social Security.

This is Medicare.

This is Medicaid.

These are other mandatory programs.

These are earned benefits. You worked your 40 quarters; you get your maximum Social Security.

You worked so much, you get Medicare.

However, I need you also to be willing to hear some very difficult math of how Medicare is actually financed to understand its impact on the debt and deficit.

There are other benefits out there that are in the formula you get because we have a treaty obligation with some of our Native American population, where if you fall below a certain income, you get certain subsidies, those sorts of things. Those are also considered mandatory programs.

The point here is the vast majority of U.S. spending your Member of Congress never ever gets to vote on, and we need to change that. We need to start telling the truth that we are hemorrhaging cash. At these interest rates you have got to understand, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to your retirement and your kids' futures.

So let's actually walk through. I will just do this board. You can actually go to my website and sign up. There is a little thing there you sign up for. Give us your phone number, we will send you a text message every single day called the daily debt. We have been doing this for several months now. You get a little text that says: Here is what we borrowed today. Here is what the gross borrowing is. We do the last 365 days. This year it is 366 days because of leap year. Over here we do the fiscal year.

□ 1815

When you look here at the total gross—now, remember, that is borrowing from the trust funds as well as publicly issued—we have now gone 4 days in the last couple of weeks where we went over \$100,000 a second—a second. For anyone there that has a relative who doesn't believe the debt is a big deal, sign them up. Send us their phone number. We will send them a text message every day, and they can start to understand the scale of how much of this U.S. economy now is in debt.

Remember, think about that. If the U.S. economy is about \$28 trillion, \$29 trillion, and we are going to borrow this year—publicly borrow, not total borrowing—publicly borrow maybe \$2.7 trillion, \$2.8 trillion, you are functionally borrowing, what, 9 percent of the entire economy? That is remarkable.

I am hoping I am wrong. CBO thought we would only be at about 5.4

percent, but if you look at our current burn rate, the concept—and why that is important. Remember, I have come here and done the presentation of the left's version of let's tax people over 400,000. You do it, and then you say, okay, you max—there is this concept of tax maximization where I can tax your income to a certain point, but the next percent of tax on you, it rolls over. You will actually say: Screw it, I am not going to work as much.

It is basically a concept based off sort of the Laffer curve concept, but you can get the same thing in capital gains. How much of capital gains today is just inflation? It is not actually appreciation of your asset. It is inflation changes of your asset, estate taxes, your passthroughs, all those things.

The math came out to about 1.5 percent, 1.6 percent of GDP you could get by tax maximizing everything for those over \$400,000. Play this math with me. If it is 1.5 percent of the economy and, so far this year, we are borrowing over 9 percent of the economy, does that give you an idea?

Those of us who want to cut spending, if you are not allowed to touch defense and if you are not allowed to touch any of that mandatory I just showed you, you have the nondefense discretionary spending—what was it? Let's call it \$900 billion—can you get 1 percent of GDP, 1.5 percent? Yeah, you could cut all sorts of programs.

Remember the Bloomberg economist, a year ago, put out a report saying, if you took \$100 billion out of nondefense discretionary, you actually lowered GDP about one-half of a percent, so everyone who says: We are going to cut and we are going to pretend the economy is going to grow at this rate, that is not how the math works. Now, in the long run, you have more capital stock, those things, but in the short run, you actually lowered GDP with these cuts. You have just got to deal with it. It is the reality of economics and math.

One of the things I wanted to go through is that very few people here have ever paid much attention to Medicare and how we finance it, and where does the money come from? You had the President behind that podium that made it sound like you are not allowed to talk about Social Security and we are going to actually raise these taxes for Medicare.

Okay. You have to understand. You see this red area there? Think of that as Medicare part A. That is the trust fund. That is, when you pay your payroll tax, a little slice of that goes to this right here. That is the trust fund that bounces up and down. One day it is 6 years away from running out. Now, it is 2035 because of some changes and good employment and the economy, but it is really sensitive.

This blue here, most folks don't understand. The majority here, the biggest single slice of the pie, of Medicare, comes right out of the general fund. When we talk about healthcare costs going up, they are already up over 10

percent this year. Tax receipts are up 7 percent, but Medicare costs are up 10 percent. That is a huge hit on the general fund.

Over here, you see this. That is actually premiums. Then here are some actual State transfers and those things, some of the dual eligibles and some of those things. You have a lot of folks who run around here somehow thinking Medicare is financed off of the FICA tax, the payroll tax, and it is not. It is about a third of the spending.

And why that is important is the actuary report that came out yesterday actually was okay on Medicare. We gained a few years. The reason, if you really dig into it, it is these minute changes and, I believe, unrealistically optimistic numbers that healthcare costs are going to stabilize—even though, this year, Medicare costs are up 10 percent, so I don't know how they justified those two numbers.

Guess what I am going to do the next week or two. We are going to read every line and try to figure out what they were saying in here. Welcome to my life.

But when you see this, see this part A here—now we are doing it in blue—that is actually part of your payroll tax. The part B and part D, those are substantially coming out of the general fund. It turns out Medicare, other than interest, is the biggest spend out of the general fund because Social Security, until the trust fund is gone, does not have a general fund aspect.

Social Security is self-financed right now. It is payroll tax and trust fund, but that is why so many of us are freaked out that—is it 8 years? 9 years? Is it now 2035, or 2034? We are going to get to that. I need you to understand they played a little game where they combined the disability trust fund number and the old age survivor fund number. The old age survivor was still at 2033, but then you roll in disability, actually—because so many people are able to work in the new economy—its number was better. They combined the two, and that is where you really got some of the added time on the trust fund. Yay.

All right. Now, let's go to the place that gets a lot of people really cranky. We are going to tell you the truth. You need to process this because you have had people in the political class, the media class, the fraud information class that comes through these things and tell you stories about Social Security and Medicare that just mathematically aren't true.

Let's get ready for the truth. This is based on an average couple—not an individual—average couple. This number is updated. Look, the average couple in a lifetime—this is an average in America. I think we are actually basing this on a 2023 number—average couple will pay in \$783,000 in their lifetime in Social Security taxes. It is amazing.

How many people will you hear: But they stole my money. No, actually, it turns out that the average couple gets

every dime of that back. The benefits they will receive will be about 831,000, so a \$70,000-some spiff. Okay. Crap rate of return.

You have got to understand. George Bush, what, 20-some years ago when they talked about taking just a tiny slice of your money and allowing you to control it and put it into other types of accounts, you would have had a stunning amount of money. The left beat the crap out of Republicans over that. They are trying to privatize. That wasn't the deal. We can look back now. You got lied to. You got played for fools.

But we got what we wanted. The average American actually gets every dime back of their Social Security, plus a little spiff. Horrible rate of return, but you get it all back. That isn't where the crisis is. What crushes the future Federal debt and deficit is the Medicare portion.

That same average couple in that lifetime will pay \$214,000 into that Medicare part A trust fund. Remember, I already showed you the majority of Medicare doesn't actually come from the trust fund. It covers about 35 percent of spending. The rest comes in from your premiums, from the general fund, from some State transfers, other things.

That average couple is going to pay \$214,000 in taxes into Medicare. They are going to get \$635,000 in benefits. That difference there is the number one driver of U.S. debt. Political class, it is so dangerous to tell you the truth because it makes our core voters cranky.

It is not your fault. We as a society, we made a deal with all of us. These are earned benefits. We made a deal. You worked your 40 quarters for Social Security. You worked your time. You paid your taxes. You got to 65. That was the societal deal. But what this place didn't do is think about the cost of healthcare. We were so terrified to incentivize, to require, to encourage, to prod innovation, disruptions in cost. We committed a fraud here, and this fraud has gone on here for decades.

We tell you: ObamaCare, we are doing something on healthcare. ObamaCare was a finance bill. It is who had to pay taxes and who got subsidized. Our Republican bill, it was better. It fixed part of the actuarial curve problem, but it was still a finance bill. It is who had to pay and who got subsidized. Do you see the difference?

Medicare For All is a financing bill because we don't talk about what healthcare actually costs, and that is what we are going to end on, is I am going to give you some of the basic ideas of what we could do, the morality of disrupting the cost of healthcare. This is uncomfortable because I have done this at public meetings, and I get booted by my friends because a lot of people don't want to be told every dime of U.S. borrowing from today through the next 30 years—every dime—this is according to CBO and a bunch of the

outside groups—every dime, interest, Medicare—and let's use the actuary, 2035—it is actually just the very beginning of 2035, and if there is one economic bump, it comes back down to 2033.

Instead of the 25 percent cut you were heading toward getting in Social Security, the fed gets paid out of the general fund, those three things are calculated to be 100 percent of the borrowing.

Here is the 2024 CBO long-term debt report that I know every Member of Congress here read, every line. When I started doing this presentation a few years ago, the long-term debt was \$116 trillion. Remember, I just told you, it is interest and healthcare. And then, if we backfill Social Security, now it is \$141 trillion.

As of March, when CBO did their long-term numbers, it is no longer \$116 trillion. It is \$141 trillion. And, if these interest rates stick around, which our economists say they are going to because we are still not at the historic norm—how many Members of Congress have gotten in front of you and told you the truth that 100 percent of borrowing from today through the next 30 years, the growth of it—the growth—interest, healthcare, if we backfill Social Security in 10 years, and now it is \$141 trillion?

There is a way to make this work. Are you willing to adopt technology? Some of it is incredibly simple stuff.

I am going to do a slight non sequitur here, but I have done it over time because it is so easy to understand. We calculate—and there are multiple studies saying this—16 percent of all of U.S. healthcare is people that get sick or have a stroke or a heart attack, these things, because they didn't stay on—someone like me, can you imagine, who drinks 7 or 8 cups of coffee a day? I have hypertension. As long as I take my calcium inhibitor, I am not likely to have a stroke. If you are diabetic, if you follow your regimen, you should be fine, but 16 percent of people in U.S. healthcare are people that don't take or don't follow their regimen. That is \$600 billion this year in healthcare costs.

Do you care about U.S. debt? Think about something crazy. You could actually just get a pill bottle for 99 cents that the cap beeps at you: Hey, did you take your statin? Did you take your hypertension medicine? It would cost 99 cents. You would be amazed. I have had that piece of legislation for years around here.

I could no more get a hearing here because, well, that is creative. Maybe the outside world likes having sick people because they make money off of them. That is incredibly cynical for me to say. How many revolutionary pieces of legislation do you see coming through here that are simple, easy to understand, and make huge differences in the cost of healthcare?

No, David, a pill bottle cap that beeps at me that might save us \$100 billion, we can't do that. Why the hell not? It is almost immoral.

Look, I have done this before trying to show you that, over the next couple decades, it is actually Medicare that starts to consume approaching 7 percent of the entire economy, just that. You start to add in Social Security, that is going 5.9 percent. You start to understand, when you are starting to look at numbers of 13 percent, 14 percent of the entire economy is just those two programs. You are probably not going to change Social Security. That is an earned benefit.

You could change the cost of healthcare by introducing technology disruptions, other business models, if this place was willing to be just somewhat creative, maybe read some of the journals out there. We are going to talk about some of those disruptions to our economy.

□ 1830

Should I make you actually understand that in 2034, the deficits—the reason I have this chart is, I am trying to help folks understand how far we missed.

If you and I go back a year ago, at that point we were saying, we will have about a \$1.3 trillion borrowing. Then it went up. It might be 1.6.

How do we get expected deficits where we are missing numbers this much? Understanding the economic effects of what it actually does to economic growth when the smart people we keep turning to over in the administration, even our own CBO, are missing these numbers by 100 percent, when a year or two later the debt numbers double.

Does that let you understand something? If the economy is decent—also what happened a week ago Friday, we went from running at a 2.8, 2.9 percent GDP to, oh, sorry, we were wrong. The first quarter was only 1.7.

There is something wrong in our data collection, and I don't know if it is the continued impacts of inflation making your life feel much heavier, much more stressed, but this stuff doesn't have to be terrifying. There are ways to attack it if you are willing to read, willing to be part of the action.

This chart has been around forever, and it just keeps getting uglier every time it gets updated. I am trying to help you understand current baseline debt with some of the policy changes and the higher interest rates. Remember, we are running substantially higher than this this year, but long-term baseline is going to start being just the borrowing. It will be 5, 6, 7 percent of the entire economy.

Long-run debt, if you go the 30-year window, debt starts to approach 32 percent of entire GDP. Do you think the bond markets are ever going to let us get anywhere near that? You tell me where on this line here we blow up.

It is not a crash. What it is is, you have got to turn on the printing press-

es. You start to inflate your way out. All your savings get devalued. Remember, I have done two or three presentations on this here. What is the biggest tax hike in modern history? You are living it. Understand, you are living it.

The last 3 years of the Biden administration because of the higher inflation, in my district, unless you right now make about 24 percent more today than you did the day the President took office, you are poorer if you live in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area.

If you are not making the 24 percent, you have the right to be cranky because that was a transfer of your wealth to the U.S. debt because we lowered the value of your purchasing power, but we now pay it back. We pay back the U.S. debt because the United States is the largest debtor in the world. We now pay it back with inflated dollars. It is a tax. Whether you understand it or not, inflation is a tax. Welcome to the biggest tax in modern history, and you just lived it.

Have you ever wondered why so many of our brothers and sisters on the left despise it when we talk about inflation? The answer: Because it worked for them.

It turns out when you have that inflation, the size of the debt as a percentage of GDP sort of flatlines a bit until the new higher interest rates come slamming into you, and that is where we are at now.

Let's do some optimistic stuff or semi-optimistic. I want us to think about how disruptive we can be if we actually read and if we think. I think my staff who made this one got a little carried away, but you do realize I think we just had the eighth OMB report that is saying the Pentagon is unauditible. They cannot audit it.

Do you really know your inventory? Do we know how many assets we have? It turns out we can't audit them. So why not do something crazy. How about this idea: We have multiple companies now that have designed artificial intelligence, AI audit crawlers that crawl through every asset list, every inventory list, every book-keeping entry, everything. You could actually audit the Pentagon; you just have to use technology not a building full of people.

We have this as a piece of legislation. If it works, you could then unleash this type of technology on the fraudsters of Medicare, the durable medical equipment fraudsters, the billing fraudsters. How about all up and down government to find the waste and fraud?

The technology can do it. We and our army of auditors can't seem to do it. Can you believe I can't get a hearing on this? AI will audit the Pentagon. You would think this would be a no-brainer, but this place is terrified of the very technology that can save us.

Let's actually walk through a couple other ideas. How about if I came to you and said we could fast-track a drug, a vaccine—and for anyone that is actu-

ally watching and is curious, I want you right now to grab your favorite search engine on your phone and look up a fentanyl vaccine.

There is also one for cocaine, a cocaine vaccine. It turns out it is in trials right now where they figured out how to block the receptor. The cocaine one, because it is not a synthetic, the vaccine actually attaches to the protein. What is the morality in a society when you are approaching 100,000 of our brothers and sisters who die every year of synthetic opioid? What happens when law enforcement pulls over someone coming out of southern Arizona, and they have fentanyl tablets or powder shoved in their glove box and that law enforcement officer is exposed to it and has to slam Narcan into his system?

I am told in the Phoenix area we have one dead homeless person a day, almost always from fentanyl. Why isn't this moral? Why isn't the morality of this is if they are really heading toward this technology, let's fast-track it. Let's do an XPRIZE. Let's find some way to get it into our community and try it. Maybe it doesn't work.

There are all sorts of other ethical or moral applications. Does someone have to be in their right mind? Do they have to have sobered up to be able to make the decision to take something that keeps them from being able to have the receptors for the synthetic opioid. But let us embrace these things.

How many more people have to die? You think I am ever going to get a hearing on this? These are moral, but they are also great for the economy. How many people could come back into society, into the labor force, or actually mitigate their addiction? These are moral, and they are also great economics.

Let's actually walk through some of the other things going on that are wonderful, but we have to figure out here if we are going to do things to help finance it because it doesn't work right now.

Today, the very first patient here in D.C. began the process of having their sickle cell cured. Now, it is a rigorous process, but it is a cure for one of the most expensive diseases in this country. Once again, I argue and my team argues, the morality is in the cure, and it is also great economics. When you have a population that suffers a painful disease and there is a path to cure them now, because this has been FDA approved, and it is going into the first patient right now outside of the trials.

Let's actually walk through this. Right now there is a revolution happening in really smart labs all over America, where they are using AI to design the next generation of drugs. There is a great story from last week. I think it was WIRED magazine—if you want to geek out—saying that AI produced a small molecule drug that no one had ever thought of, and at least on the computer simulator, it has amazing efficacy.

Why wouldn't we promote or why wouldn't we work with the FDA, that is saying we have the ability to do the datasets much faster, bring these things to market faster, cure people faster? Or is the 1930s, 1940s FDA model what we are still going to stand behind?

A cancer vaccine, particularly one—we have already had the conversation about the one for melanoma. This one is more brain cancer. It is actually going into trials. How do we help these things come to market faster? It is moral and it also saves boatloads of cash.

I showed you healthcare costs which are our primary driver. Do we do what the troglodytes around here say, well, we will just cut reimbursements, or you can stand in the waiting line longer? Or do we do this: cure people?

We have about a half a dozen AI bills just for healthcare. The concept of bringing technology faster, using AI to find fraudsters, using AI for the back office, for example, you are a doctor's office or medical clinic using AI to say—it is called AI clean claims.

Instead of going through the rigmarole—boom—you just match up the insurance companies or the Medicare or the rules, and if they match—boom—it is paid. You just cut the staff. Yes, it does remove some people, but it also removes a hell of a lot of cost.

I talked to you about using AI to audit the Pentagon. The fact of the matter is, this is the MedPAC report from 3 weeks ago—and I know every Member of Congress read it, but there is one thing in here, when you go through it, that explodes at you and that basically says—it is falling apart because we have been using it so much—at the end of this decade, Medicare will be about 23 percent of every corporate tax dollar and personal tax dollar we collect. That is from 13 percent to 23 percent, and that is coming in just a few more years.

There is this term called a "black swan." That is when something sneaks up on you, blows you up, and you weren't expecting it.

This is called a "white swan." You know it is coming for you and you choose to do nothing about it.

I know I come behind this microphone every week, and I am almost mentally exhausted. Is anyone listening? There are solutions. Our problem is the clock is ticking. The on-ramp to bring those solutions to market, to actually have an effect on our debt and borrowing and economic growth, I think we only have 3, 4, 5 more years, but you have got to deal with the real numbers.

When this place borrows \$8.5 billion a day and we will lose our minds over things that mathematically are rounding errors, when we have done things in this body that have made the bond markets nervous, when a single basis point—so 1 percent of interest has 100 basis points—a single basis point just this year cost us about \$800 million.

I have watched us—sorry. I am not supposed to curse on the floor. I have watched us have debates where we say absolutely insane things and you can almost watch parts of the market saying: Nope. I think U.S. debt just got riskier because these people aren't serious about economic growth and stability.

Mr. Speaker, there are ways to make this work. Is anyone listening?

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

MONEY DOESN'T GROW ON TREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, as usual, I appreciate my friend from Arizona, who is, if nothing else, dogged in his determination and consistent in making clear to the American people the problem that we face on our overall spending, including mandatory.

Specifically mandatory, as we refer to it, this broad basket of things that we have committed to do that is consuming our budget ever more every single year. It is an important point and one that we don't discuss enough as a body on what we should do about it.

The gentleman's point is precisely correct about the nature of the problem, the seriousness of the problem. When we are sitting here right now and we are roughly—I am going to use ballpark numbers—bringing in \$4 trillion of revenue, but we are spending about \$6 trillion, pushing \$7 trillion—he is right—it depends on what we are talking about in terms of the accounting.

Basically, what you are saying is, you are printing money to fund effectively all of our discretionary budget and then some.

□ 1845

What I mean by that is, you are printing money to fund defense, the operation of the government, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, all the things that you touch and feel and see because the \$4 trillion is going to fund Medicare, Social Security, food stamps, veterans benefits that are mandatory, plus interest. There you are. You have used up all of your revenue.

The problem is, nobody in this town wants to do anything about it. My Democratic colleagues will hide behind "you must increase taxes." My Republican colleagues will do nothing to actually limit spending in any meaningful way. They will just talk about ultimately needing to deal with mandatory spending one day and not do anything to deal with the spending issues now.

Where I depart from my friend from Arizona, respectfully, who is no longer on the floor—maybe not depart. Where I want to be more clear is the questions when we have debates on the floor of the House about spending items in

what we call discretionary. That is the stuff that we can touch, the accounts, the Department of Defense, some of these issues.

My issue with that is less about mounting debt, although it is a part of it. It is that you are funding the demise of our prosperity. You are funding the bureaucrats who are at war with us. You are funding that which is undermining our ability to create economic growth and live freely to get out from under that financial morass.

In other words, you are not really going to address the debt problem by saving \$5 billion on some small item, but what you are going to do is you are going to stop the interference with the American people.

Let me give you some examples. If you are a hardworking American out there and have a family of four, and you are a plumber in San Marcos, Texas, which I represent part of, you are just trying to go about doing your job. You need a pickup truck. You need to put all of your stuff in it. You need to be able to drive around. We are making that pickup truck impossible to afford.

We are making it literally impossible to afford. We are putting all of these requirements and demands on the vehicles. We are going to make it where you have to have electric vehicles, with the tailpipe rules and mandates. They are piling up on lots. They are getting more expensive.

If you want to go get your windshield replaced, it is like \$1,500 now. It used to be \$200 or \$300. Why? We have all sorts of mandates and requirements and gadgets in the windshield.

Now, they are going to mandate vehicles that have automatic braking.

Every time you do that, you make this stuff more expensive. The market should bear that out. The market should sort that out. If you want a vehicle that has automatic braking, great. Pay for it. The vast majority of Americans will say: No, I can't afford that. I just want a simple car.

We are killing the ability of the average family to afford life. It matters. This is the problem.

In the House of Representatives, what we have become is the house of perpetuating corporate cronyism and the enrichment of a handful of folks at the expense of hardworking American families.

Then, I will have some of my colleagues who will throw out these random statements like: We should read the philosophers and conservatives of the past who were the traditionalists and rational in what they believed about limited government, not the radical populists of today.

I think that misses the entire point. It is not populist to believe we should stop spending money we don't have, driving up inflation, driving down the value of the dollar, and putting a tax on the hardworking American family. It is not populist to say that we shouldn't regulate our entire lives out

of existence with expensive vehicles and all sorts of demands on what you can and can't do, which makes things more expensive, or all of the green climate agenda that is empowering China, undermining our ability to have affordable energy.

That is not populism. It is not populism to say that maybe, just maybe, if you are going to send \$95 billion overseas to fund war, maybe you should have to pay for that. That is not populist. It is rational. You can question the war. You could say that we should be focusing on America first, securing our borders first.

Maybe you could say that is populist. I think it is rational. It is sovereignty. The Founders, and importantly the conservative thought leaders of the 20th century, like Russell Kirk, believe that you actually do have to have institutions, but you believe in sovereignty and the rule of law. You believe that there are supposed to be limits, limits to what you do in feeding your appetite.

What are our limits? I am sitting here in an empty Chamber, but to my friend who is serving as the Speaker at the moment, what are our limits? What limits are we placing on this place?

To my friends who voted for continuing wars around the world, \$95 billion, who paid for it? Your grandkids, your kids, you. You paid for it by printing money. We did not pay for it. We printed money to give it away—the same thing with the first \$113 billion for Ukraine, the same thing for virtually everything we are doing.

I have had some supporters, particularly ones of financial means, who have called and said: CHIP, why did you abandon the people of Ukraine? We must stop Putin.

I said: Great. Are you interested in having a 70 percent marginal tax rate next year to pay for it?

There were crickets on the other end of the phone.

We have lost perspective on what we are supposed to do here responsibly in this Chamber. That is the truth.

While we sit here and move a few bills across the floor, and while we just passed a massive, unpaid-for foreign aid package that funds both sides of the war in Israel—it gives \$9 billion used by Hamas, used to have Palestinian refugees moving to the United States, funding both sides of that conflict, while we fund Ukraine, where we have no clear mission, no evidence that we can produce enough ammo fast enough to be able to help them when they are getting out-shelled no matter what and they are running out of men, even if you accept that all of that might result in some improvement, we are funding all of that.

We just voted on all of that. We just voted on an anti-Semitism resolution, which codifies thought-speech, so we can pat ourselves on the back and say: Look at what we did. Look what we did.

People feel good about it, but you didn't do a damn thing. In fact, you

made things worse because you just empowered the Federal Government to go after thought-speech.

We do all of that. Right after, what did we do? We passed a massive omnibus spending bill, \$1.7 trillion in two omnibus packages. We funded \$200 billion for a new FBI headquarters, an FBI that is out of control.

We do all of these things, and what is happening in the meantime? What is happening right now? What is happening right now is that our borders are wide open.

The people in Texas are still feeling it every single day. We are dealing with the reality of roughly 1,000 to 1,600 people a day being paroled into the United States.

Nobody out there in the real world knows what that means. It means that there is a provision in the law supposedly there for a case-by-case basis to help a few people. The Biden administration is blatantly, unlawfully, illegally using that provision to expand it and dump literally 1,000 to 1,600 people a day. We believe 400,000 over the last year, according to the reports that we have, were dumped into the United States under what is called parole.

Guess what? How did Laken Riley's killer get into the United States? Parole.

There have been dozens of examples of individuals who were paroled into the United States under the Biden administration's policies who have gone on to kill, assault, and harm and undermine the security of Americans.

Think about that. That is what is happening right now, allegedly, on our watch. The fact is, we could have done something about it. A year ago this Saturday, Republicans passed what we call H.R. 2, which is the bill number for border security. It was a strong bill that would have closed the ability of the Biden administration to abuse parole. It would have closed their ability to abuse asylum. It would have ended the abuse of the unaccompanied alien children, using them as essentially a hall pass to get into the United States.

It would have fundamentally ended the Biden administration's abuse of law to dump people into the United States to the tune of something like 4½ million people who have been released into the United States under the Biden administration.

We did that. Republicans did that, and we did that after conservatives worked hard and worked with the Speaker to force this body of Republicans to walk away from the amnesty-driven, Chamber of Commerce-driven failure of the last two decades and pass a strong border security measure.

That bill is sitting over in the Senate, where Senate Democrats refuse to move it while they hide behind a sham piece of legislation, which would not secure the border of the United States, so they can try to blame Republicans in an election year.

What Republicans have failed to do is use the leverage of the power of the

purse to force our Democratic colleagues in the Senate and the Biden administration to come to the table and deal with the border crisis, despite the rhetoric of our own leadership saying that we would do that.

We have fully funded the government at debt-increasing levels, busting the caps that were put into law. We are funding the government that is abusing our borders and dumping people into the United States unlawfully, paying off student loans unlawfully to the tune of \$700 billion to \$1.4 trillion. Meanwhile, we are racking up \$34½ trillion in debt, barreling toward \$35 trillion, with a trillion dollars every 3 months, with more interest than we pay for national defense, almost a trillion dollars in interest, barreling toward \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion of interest. Meanwhile, the number of retirees is growing, demands on Medicare are growing, and costs—the prices—of healthcare are going up.

That is all happening right now in real time. What are we doing about it?

This is a question that I want to ask my Republican colleagues: If the American people look at our Democratic colleagues and say: Man, that is insanity. We can't do that. That is crazy stuff. They want to have all sorts of woke policies and DEI. They want to let criminals out. They want wide-open borders. They want to keep spending gobs of money. They want to undermine our Western civilization, our way of life. Man, that is crazy. I don't want that.

They say: Well, we have to turn to Republicans. Let's vote for Republicans.

Let's say that happens. Let's say we are fortunate enough for that to happen with large enough numbers that we win the majority of the House, the majority of the Senate, and the White House, what are we going to do? I will bet you a significant amount that you will hear excuses out of this Chamber by Republicans in January, with a newly minted majority here, in the Senate, and in the White House, saying the following: CHIP, we don't have 60 votes in the Senate. What you want can't be done. CHIP, we have divisions in our own Conference, our own Republican majority. We can't pass everything you want to pass and then get it to the Senate and send it to the President. We are going to have to send over this compromise.

It has been happening for decades. The reason our borders are wide open—it didn't just materialize one day that Joe Biden just woke up and decided to open them up. It has been decades in the making with support from Republicans because they were too much in the pocket of the Chamber of Commerce. They were sitting down in the Rio Grande with a "No Trespassing" sign, and then over here with a sign saying: "Help Wanted." Wink, wink, come on in. We don't care about the border.

That was happening. I know because I saw it. I saw it as a Texan. I saw it as

an American. I saw it as a staffer on the Senate Judiciary Committee, as a chief of staff for TED CRUZ. I saw the amnesty bills. I saw the desire to have cheap labor at the expense of sovereignty.

□ 1900

Let's talk for a minute about that cheap labor. I keep hearing from all of my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle, frankly—how important it is for us to continue to have a flow of people across our border, legal or illegal, because, quote, we need the workers.

Have you looked at what is happening to jobs? The jobs for Americans, American-born workers, post-COVID is flat or down. The actual engagement in the workforce is flat or down. Yes, there is growth from migrants to try to catch up on the number, but what we are doing is we are paying people not to work. We are paying kids to sit in their room, basement, whatever, playing Fortnite, kids in their twenties. We have low workforce participation from American citizens and workers while we try to then bring people in who, by the way, then use the social welfare state, who then have massive demands on the education system. How do I know that? I live in Texas. I see the schools. I see the rolls.

Tomorrow in the Budget Committee we are going to have a hearing on the cost and the impact of illegal immigration. Kinney County, Texas, just a little bit southwest of San Antonio, which I represent, we will have a witness here tomorrow from Kinney County walking us through roughly these numbers: The crime that they were dealing with in 2021, pre-Biden, was about 140 something crimes a year that they had to deal with. They are now at 15,000. Now, that is a lot of criminal trespass that Operation Lone Star and the State Department of Public Safety are trying to work to manage, but that is what they are dealing with. That is what they are dealing with in their court systems.

I can sit here and walk you through—we will have a hearing tomorrow; I won't do it here—the impact on the schools, the hospitals, all of the social services. Anybody who does a legitimate analysis of all of those costs compared to the taxes, sales taxes, which so many of my colleagues hang their hat on and say this is causing economic activity and they are paying taxes.

Yes, there is some of that, but we have created the welfare state which Milton Friedman famously said: I am all for open borders if you get rid of the welfare state. Now, that was pre-9/11. Let's say you have security, you vet everybody, you know who is coming here, do they want to harm us, or they are just hardworking people, they want to achieve the American Dream?

If you have a zero welfare state, I would say: Come on. I don't care where you are from, I don't care what you look like, come on. If you are coming

to America and you are making your way and you are going to work hard, then you are going to follow our values and our principles, regardless of your background, regardless of your religion, because you are going to believe in the rule of law, you are going to believe in economic prosperity, you are going to believe in free enterprise and capitalism, you are most likely going to believe in God and everything that made this country great because you are coming here seeking the American Dream.

However, we are turning the American Dream upside-down. We are destroying that which migrants come to this country to achieve when they come here, they believe in this country, believe in the rule of law because that is what the American Dream is built around, and we are completely destroying it. That is the truth.

It is happening right now while we sit here and fiddle while America burns. I am going to say it over and over and over again until at least my Republican colleagues, who try to pretend to give a crap about the border, actually do something about it.

How many campaign ads, how many speeches are going to be given by my Republican colleagues between now and November about what they will do to secure the border? What are they doing right now? Shrugging. Sorry; can't do anything. It is Biden. What are we going to do?

How many more Americans are going to die while we shrug? Well, thank God the Founders didn't shrug. Thank God the men at Lexington and Concord didn't just shrug and say: Oh, well, I guess there is a tyrant. Thank God the boys at Normandy didn't shrug, and say: Why the hell are we across the ocean and we have to go take out this crazy guy Hitler? Thank God they didn't. Thank God the boys at the Alamo didn't shrug. We are shrugging it off, though. We are pretending it is not happening.

Is anybody paying attention to what is happening in London? Am I going to say it here on the floor of the House and get the scorn of people when I say: You have got a massive Muslim takeover of the United Kingdom going on right before our eyes? They would say: Well, CHIP, what is wrong with that? Well, I have got some pretty strong concerns about Sharia law and whether that will be forced upon the American people. In this case the people of the United Kingdom. I have got pretty strong concerns about people who want to see Israel's destruction, who were happy about October 7, who were elected in the United Kingdom. Some might say that we have seen that here in the United States.

What are we going to do about that? We have 51½ million people who are foreign born in the United States. They have about 20 to 25 million kids. That puts it at well over 20-some percent of our population. It is the highest such number in the history of our country.

People say: Well, isn't that great?

Is it? Are we teaching people about Western civilization? Are we teaching people about the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the rule of law? Are we teaching them Western values? Are we teaching them God exists? Are we teaching them the importance of freedom or are we teaching an entire generation—or two or three—to run around complaining about what is wrong and why the entire world is against them because of their skin color, their sex, their supposed gender identity, whatever the hell category we create to make people have an excuse for not just stepping up and achieving the American Dream?

That is what we are doing. Our borders are wide open. People go: Well, I know it is bad. It is bad, CHIP, but what do we do about it?

Stop it. Like actually stop it. We literally just gave away every ounce of leverage we had. Why? To fund Ukraine. Unpaid for, with no clear mission. We said: Who cares about America's borders? Sorry, CHIP, we couldn't get it done. I have got to go back to the people of Texas, and say: Well, sorry, we will get 'em next time.

Look, nobody I know—Conservative, moderate, Democrat—nobody comes here expecting to get everything they want. It is a body of Representatives. It is the worst form of government except for all the others. I get it, but I am sick and tired of watching this play play out the same way every single time. The American people get screwed and get left holding the bag. That is the truth.

Every single hardworking family across this country right now who can't afford groceries, can't afford electricity, can't afford to buy a car, can't send their kid to a school that they can believe will teach them the right thing, teach them God exists, teach them their country is great, even just teach them that there is man and woman. No, none of that.

We are funding this radical climate agenda that is destroying our ability to have energy right now. You are not going to have an internal combustion engine in 10 years because these radical nuts are killing your ability to do it. Republicans are sitting back and shrugging, patting ourselves on the back for increasing mining for rare earth minerals in Minnesota or around this country rather than fully opening up American oil and gas, building American nuclear power. It is absurd. It is ridiculous.

The average American right now is wondering whether or not they can actually achieve the American Dream. I want to know whether my colleagues in this Chamber, Democrat or Republican, would come to the microphone and give a rip-roaring speech right now about why every American should believe they are going to be able to achieve the American Dream, because I will tell you right now, unless we lead, unless we take this moment to reverse

the direction we are headed, change trajectory, massively shift the direction of our country, then our kids and our grandkids will not be able to achieve the American Dream. They won't.

Well, CHIP, how does that sell? What I am selling is a duty to fight. What I am selling is a duty to go fight to make sure those American kids and grandkids can achieve the American Dream. Fight for sovereignty, fight for citizenship, introduce legislation to demand that citizens only vote, to stand up and fight for the opportunity to go carry out your life because you can afford to do it because you have gotten rid of all the regulations that are constraining the hardworking American.

Go get rid of the corporate cronyism enriching the insurance companies, enriching all the big corporations across this country, hospitals and pharma, and strip it away. Get rid of the middlemen and empower doctors and patients and get all that crap out of the way so people can actually go get healthcare. Do that.

Cut the government bureaucracy. Get rid of the bureaucrats. Get rid of DEI. Get rid of critical race theory. Go to war with the bureaucrats, metaphorically, to stop destroying the American Dream. Don't just sit here and come here and give speeches about some basketball team that won the national championship, then go home and say: Look at me, I gave a speech about the basketball championship. Who cares? Their parents can't afford to live.

We have a duty in the people's House to do something. The iceberg is right in front us. My friend, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, just explained it. We are massively upside-down. We are bleeding out of every pore of our body in terms of money and debt. Our borders are wide open. We are increasingly unchurched. Our schools are indoctrinating our kids. Our universities are indoctrination camps. They are essentially daycares for elitists, and we just forgave their debts, their student loans.

Every hardworking American out there deserves a Representative who represents them. Democrat or Republican, Conservative, moderate, Liberal, why are you here? What is the point? Why get elected? Why get an election certificate?

The point is, stand up in defense of the rule of law and the Constitution. If you say you believe in limited government, limit it. If you say you believe in cutting spending, cut it. If you say you believe in securing the border, secure it. If you say you believe in peace through strength, then stop sending our military and our money into endless conflict and instead build a strong military here, sparingly used, make sure our men and women have the care they need when they get home, and send a message around the world that when we use force, it will be used quickly and massively.

This is what the people I represent want. They don't want any more of

these feel-good bills because some organization declares "a week." It happens all the time. Teacher week, got to do a teacher bill; cop week, got to do a cop bill. None of that is going to make this country freer or stronger or more secure.

We took an oath to the Constitution. I don't want any more excuses about well, CHIP, this only offends the Commerce Clause a little bit. This one is better than that other version. Stop doing it. Go the other direction.

Stop selling watered-down Democrat-light, and go inspire the American people with something better so that the kids of this generation can get their lives out of these phones and get their lives out of the despair of wondering whether they are going to be able to have the American Dream and give them hope that if they go out and they work and work hard and they save money, they are going to be able to buy a house, have a family, they are going to get healthcare because they worked hard and they were able to do it. That is why migrants come here.

Stop paying people not to work. Stop the endless nonsense and drivel that comes out of this body in the name of doing something and, instead, stand up and fight for the American people. Don't give lip service on June 6 because it is the 80th anniversary of what those boys did when they walked into a wall of bullets. Stand up and do a fraction of what they did by having the nerve to vote "no" on something, even though somebody might tweet something mean about it.

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

□ 1915

PROTESTS AT UNIVERSITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a resolution that I am introducing in this House and that I hope will receive prompt passage and bipartisan support.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, in recent weeks, tent encampments have spread at universities across the country. These encampments are illegal and in violation of university policies.

They have become rife with anti-Semitic threats and acts of violence, harassment, and other disruptive behavior.

Some universities have responded by evenhandedly enforcing the law and clearing the encampments. They have emphasized the rights of students to protest and express their opinions in innumerable ways while making it clear that acts in violation of the law or university rules will not be tolerated.

Other universities have decided to ignore the law and ignore their own poli-

cies, allowing encampments and other illegal activity associated with them to grow unchecked for weeks.

Encampments have made demands of universities such as divesting from companies tied to Israel, cutting ties with Hillel campus programs, and ending study abroad programs to Israel.

Some of these universities have even negotiated with those in the encampments and agreed to their demands around changes in university policy, including Northwestern University, UC Riverside, Brown, Rutgers, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Minnesota.

Still, others have canceled classes, moved to online meetings, or canceled graduation ceremonies, and that includes Columbia, UCLA, UC San Diego, and Emory University.

These encampments and the criminal behavior connected to them, such as threats or acts of violence, blocking or occupying buildings, genuine harassment, or other disruptive behavior, are not protected by the First Amendment.

To the contrary, they disrupt the operation of the university and the academic freedom and speech rights of other students.

Free speech on campus means universities should encourage free and open expression in speech, writing, listening, challenging, and learning while never shielding students from ideas the university disagrees with or limiting expression on the basis of content.

It does not mean universities should tolerate the promotion of violence, the destruction of property, the obstruction of students' freedom of movement, harassment, vandalism, or other unlawful acts.

Resolved, the House finds canceling classes and commencement in response to unlawful encampments is unacceptable and unfair to the majority of students.

The House condemns any negotiation where a university changes its policy in response to the demands of those engaged in unlawful activity on campus.

The House condemns any concessions made by universities based on demands from those participating in unlawful encampments, including ending study abroad programs to Israel, cutting ties with Hillel, and divesting from companies associated with Israel.

The House calls on universities across the country to work with local law enforcement to immediately clear tent encampments from university property and restore safe learning environments on their campuses, and further resolves that noncompliant students, faculty, or staff be subject to appropriate consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we can come together and pass this resolution, and it can set the right tone for universities across the country because by this point, it is clear as day that the wrong approach is to allow illegal encampments to exist on campus and then to keep growing, growing, and growing as we have seen at UCLA, at USC, and at Columbia. That only

makes the problem more unmanageable. It only causes things to spiral out of control.

The universities that have taken the right approach have said you, as a student, are fully protected under the First Amendment to express yourself on any topic with any opinion you would like in countless different ways.

You are free to do that on our campus, but what you are not free to do is to set up structures on campus, to impede other students, or to engage in threats or acts of violence and other unlawful disruptive conduct that we have been seeing on these campuses.

I am hoping that this resolution will point in the right direction those universities who have been approaching this problem in the wrong way to the detriment of their students.

Now, perhaps the only thing more disgraceful than these illegal pro-Hamas encampments is the way that these universities have catered to them.

Perhaps even more disgraceful than that is the way that some politicians have, the way that some political leaders have remained silent or have refused to condemn things that are so morally clear or have equivocated on the clearest of moral questions.

While President Biden did come out and make a strong statement today, up to this point, his response has been manifestly inadequate.

The Governor of my State, Governor Newsom, in California, has had next to nothing to say about it, even though some of the worst situations are on California campuses.

Just today, the Secretary of Education, Miguel Cardona, testified before our committee, the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Now, Mr. Cardona came into this hearing with a troubling record. For example, he recently refused to say whether chants of "From the River to the Sea" are anti-Semitic.

At today's hearing, I asked him some basic questions. I asked him if he would condemn the illegal tent encampments on university campuses. Secretary Cardona refused to do so.

I asked him if he would condemn faculty members who interfere with the attempts of law enforcement to clear out these encampments and enforce the law. Secretary Cardona refused to condemn them.

I asked him if he would condemn calls to divest from Israel. Secretary Cardona refused to do so. Perhaps most incredibly, I asked the Secretary several times, Secretary Cardona: Will you condemn calls for universities to cut ties with Hillel? As, for example, the organization Students for Justice in Palestine recently did at UC Santa Cruz.

I asked him again and again: Secretary Cardona, will you condemn calls to cut ties with Hillel? And Secretary Cardona refused to do so.

Why is this so hard? Hillel is a center for Jewish community and campus life on campuses all across the country.

Secretary Cardona is unwilling to condemn those who say universities

should cut ties with these organizations? Secretary Cardona is unwilling to condemn these overtly anti-Semitic statements?

Given what the President said today, if we are to take seriously his statements condemning what is happening on our university campuses, we need to ask the question whether we can take that commitment seriously so long as Miguel Cardona remains his Secretary of Education.

FUNDING CUTS FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this administration's proposal to cut funding for the charter school program.

This is an incredibly important program for many charter schools across the country in allowing them to start up and offer an option to students in communities across the United States.

Now, prior to this year, this administration's support for charter schools has been tepid at best. Funding for the charter school program has remained flat as funding for various other parts of the education budget has increased substantially.

Yet, this year, the administration went a step further. Its proposed budget for the Department of Education proposes a \$40 million cut to the charter school program from \$440 million to \$400 million.

Now, Secretary Cardona was asked about this at today's hearing, and he explained: Well, the Fiscal Responsibility Act requires us to make budget cuts—so he decided to go after charter schools.

Mr. Speaker, that makes no sense whatsoever. The Department is asking for a significant increase in its budget this year, a \$3.7 billion increase, so that its overall discretionary budget is \$82.5 billion.

They are asking for a \$3.7 billion funding increase while cutting funding for the charter school program by \$40 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to these cuts. I hope that this House will push back on them in a bipartisan manner because the reality is that charter schools across the country have made tremendous progress in closing achievement gaps and expanding the options that are available to parents.

In fact, a recent study out of Stanford validated the work that charter schools have done and the results that they have gotten in closing achievement gaps that have persisted in other parts of our public education system.

The reality is that there are far too many communities in this country, particularly in my State of California, where schools simply are not getting the job done. There are communities where the neighborhood school—that young people, that kids are assigned to—does not teach them to the read in the way that it should, does not teach them math in the way that it should, leaving them ill prepared for success in life.

In many of these communities you have charters like Kipp Academy and

many others that have started up and have done things differently. These are charters that have had high expectations, that have made significant gains, that have gotten kids reading above grade level and outperforming their peers at other schools in math. These charters are putting them on a path of future opportunity and success in life, but that is exactly what this proposal from this administration is going to cut funding for.

It should also be noted that even in communities that have good public schools—like in my district, we have a number of truly outstanding traditional public schools—charter schools are still of value.

We have a number of terrific charter schools as well, and they might be right for some families but not for others.

The entire point is that not every student is the same, not every family is the same. By allowing a variety of options, some of which might have different focuses or a different approach to pedagogy or options that might offer immersion education or a focus on career technical education, this empowers parents to make the choice that is right for their child and their family.

I find it completely unacceptable that this administration is withdrawing support for charter schools.

I also find it unacceptable that my State of California has taken a number of steps in recent years to make it more difficult to start up, to operate, and to renew charter schools.

What we need to do is look to the success that many charters have had and to draw lessons that we can then use to improve public education across this country so that every child in America has access to a quality education as they deserve.

OPPOSING THE INCREASE IN THE GAS TAX

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to a forthcoming increase in the gas tax in California. It almost defies belief, but California's gas tax is about to increase yet again, reaching \$0.60 per gallon.

Now, the State already has the highest gas tax in the country and by far the highest gas prices. As of today, Californians pay \$1.70 more per gallon for gas than the national average and \$0.53 more per gallon than the next closest State.

I will say that again: We pay \$0.53 more per gallon than the State with the second-highest gas prices. Even if you were actually to eliminate the entire gas tax in California, \$0.60 per gallon, we would still have the second-highest gas prices in the entire country.

I am calling on Governor Newsom and the legislature to act to make sure that this gas tax increase does not go into effect.

Californians are already suffering under inflation and the price of groceries and the price of electricity as

well, which is the second highest of any State in the country. The last thing they need is another increase to the gas tax.

I am calling on State lawmakers to stop this gas tax increase. As a matter of fact, what they should really do is suspend the gas tax entirely.

It wouldn't bring prices down to a reasonable level, but it would provide folks throughout our State with relief that they very much need.

□ 1930

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT MAJOR DOUGLAS POWER

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now recognize a few outstanding individuals and organizations within my district.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize retiring Sergeant Major Douglas Power for his distinguished service with the United States Marine Corps, most recently as the government and external affairs officer for the Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center in Bridgeport, California.

Doug entered the Marine Corps Reserve in August 1980 and went on to graduate from boot camp and transfer to Active Duty in 1985.

After first transferring overseas in 1987, his deployments to various locations, including Korea, Kuwait, and Iraq, underscored his commitment to defending our country.

Throughout his more than three decades of military service, Sergeant Major Power displayed an unwavering dedication to service and leadership.

Deservingly, he was awarded multiple decorations and medals, demonstrating the legacy of honor and sacrifice that he established.

He retired from military service in 2012, at which time he began his new career as the government and external affairs officer at the training center.

After 12 years of faithful dedication to civic service and community engagement, he retired from that role this year, on April 30, 2024.

I am proud to represent outstanding servicemembers like Sergeant Major Power in Congress. I thank him for his service to our district and our country.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize Sergeant Major Douglas Power for his heroic and valuable service to our country and community, and I wish him the best in his retirement.

RECOGNIZING STACEY SIMON

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize retiring County Counsel Stacey Simon for her 25 years of service to Mono County.

Stacey has served the people of Mono County for more than two decades, most recently as county counsel, and never wavered from her goal of making the county a better place.

Throughout Stacey's tenure, she not only skillfully handled the routine business of the county but also guided Mono through various complex prob-

lems and challenges, including the uncertainties of COVID-19.

Additionally, she played an instrumental role in many local projects, most notably the construction of the Lee Vining Community Center and preschool program, the county's solid waste franchise system, implementation of HIPAA, housing developments, and much more.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like we had an issue with our graphic, so I am going to start over.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize retiring County Counsel Stacey Simon for her 25 years of service to Mono County.

Stacey has served the people of Mono County for more than two decades, most recently as county counsel, and never wavered from her goal of making the county a better place.

Throughout Stacey's tenure, she not only skillfully handled the routine business of the county but also guided the county through various complex problems and challenges, including the uncertainties of COVID-19.

Additionally, she played an instrumental role in many local projects, most notably the construction of the Lee Vining Community Center and preschool program, the county's solid waste franchise system, implementation of HIPAA, housing developments, and much more.

No matter the obstacle, Stacey has been a model of positive leadership as she has helped the county weather every crisis, hardship, or transition it faced.

Stacey is known for her incredible depth of knowledge, curiosity, and tenacity, as well as for demonstrating the utmost care and concern for her clients and county staff.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize Stacey Simon for the dedicated leadership and years of service she provided to the people of Mono County, and I proudly join Mono County in wishing her the very best in her retirement.

RECOGNIZING ALPINE WATERSHED GROUP

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the Alpine Watershed Group for receiving the 2022 Forest Service Volunteers Program Citizen Stewardship and Partnerships Award.

The Alpine Watershed Group is a community-based nonprofit organization in my district that is dedicated to conducting essential water quality monitoring, habitat restoration, and education programs throughout Alpine County.

Over the span of more than two decades, the Alpine Watershed Group has been an instrumental partner to the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest and the United States Forest Service.

In 2022 alone, the Alpine Watershed Group planned and recruited for multiple volunteer events in the forest, including large watershed and forest restoration projects, trash and roadside

cleanups, tree planting, and watershed monitoring.

Due to the help of their volunteers at the annual Creek Day event, 72 bags of trash were removed, amounting to more than 500 pounds; 25 bags of invasive weeds were removed; 102 willow stakes were installed; 600 feet of fence in Hope Valley were removed; and a beaver dam analogue in Faith Valley was constructed.

In addition to these efforts, the group provides continual outreach and environmental education programs that support the United States Forest Service's mission to care for the land and serve the people. Their devoted efforts have made an indelible impact on our national forests, local watersheds, and the Alpine County community.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize the Alpine Watershed Group for this outstanding accomplishment and commend them for their significant contributions and dedication to promoting the sustainability of our Nation's natural resources.

CELEBRATING SOROPTIMIST INTERNATIONAL OF LOOMIS BASIN'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to mark and celebrate the 50-year anniversary of the Soroptimist International of Loomis Basin club.

Over the span of five decades, they have made a significant contribution in the Loomis community and Sacramento region by investing in the development of women of all ages and fostering a passion to make both our local and international communities a better place.

The Loomis chapter of Soroptimist International was founded 1974 with the mission to provide women and girls with the access to education and training they need to achieve economic empowerment.

In addition to hosting and participating in many local events, they provide scholarships and grants for women to improve their economic status while honing valuable skills to further their education and help with employment opportunities.

Their dedicated efforts have made a meaningful difference in the lives of women and girls, and it is an honor to represent exemplary organizations like the Soroptimist International of Loomis Basin here in Congress.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize the Loomis Basin Soroptimists and their 50 years of dedication to the women of our community.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT MAJOR DOUGLAS POWER

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, we are recognizing Sergeant Major Douglas Power again so we have the appropriate accompanying graphic.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize retiring Sergeant Major Douglas Power for his distinguished service with the United States Marine Corps, most recently as the government and external

affairs officer for the Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center in Bridgeport, California.

Doug entered the Marine Corps Reserve in August 1980 and went on to graduate from boot camp and transfer to Active Duty in 1985.

After first transferring overseas in 1987, his deployments to various locations, including Korea, Kuwait, and Iraq, underscored his commitment to defending our country.

Throughout his more than three decades of military service, Sergeant Major Power displayed an unwavering dedication to service and leadership.

Deservingly, he was awarded multiple decorations and medals, demonstrating the legacy of honor and sacrifice he established.

He retired from military service in 2012, at which time he began his new career as the government and external affairs officer at the training center.

After 12 years of faithful dedication to civic service and community engagement, he retired from that role this year, on April 30, 2024.

I am proud to represent outstanding servicemembers like Sergeant Major Power in Congress. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, it is my honor to recognize him for his distinguished service to our community and our country.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4063. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Community Reinvestment Act; Supplemental Rule (RIN: 3064-AG03) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4064. A letter from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export Control Measures Under the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) to Address Iranian Aggression Against Israel and Military Support for Russia [Docket No.: 240417-0112] (RIN: 0694-AJ61) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4065. A letter from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's interim final

rule — Revision of Firearms License Requirements [Docket No.: 240419-0113] (RIN: 0694-AJ46) received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4066. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's memorandum — Advancing Governance, Innovation, and Risk Management for Agency Use of Artificial Intelligence [M-24-10] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4067. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's notice of decision — Revisions to OMB's Statistical Policy Directive No. 15: Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity [2024-06469] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4068. A letter from the Director, Workforce Policy and Innovation, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Pathways Programs [Docket ID: OPM-2023-0020] (RIN: 3206-AO25) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-4069. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Alaska Region, Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Hook-and-Line Catcher/Processors in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XF893) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4070. A letter from the Manager, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of *Chrysopsis floridana* (Florida Golden Aster) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2019-0071; FF09E22000 FXES1113090FEDR 2223] (RIN: 1018-BE00) received April 23, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4071. A letter from the Manager, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing Island Bedstraw and Santa Cruz Island Dudleya From the List of Endangered and Threatened Plants [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2022-0066; FF09E22000 FXES1113090FEDR 223] (RIN: 1018-BF51) received April 23, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4072. A letter from the Manager, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassifying *Mitracarpus Polycladus* From Endangered to Threatened With a Section 4(d) Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2021-0058; FF09E22000 FXES1113090FEDR 234] (RIN: 1018-BE53) re-

ceived April 23, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4073. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fluid Mineral Leases and Leasing Process [BLM—HQ—FRN—MO4500176829] (RIN: 1004-AE80) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4074. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan [Docket No.: 180202117-8117-01] (RIN: 0648-BH58) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4075. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2020 and 2021 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 200227-0066] (RIN: 0648-XH080) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4076. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole Management in the Groundfish Fisheries of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 170630613-8749-02] (RIN: 0648-BH02) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4077. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pacific Halibut Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program; Community Development Quota Program; Modifications to Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements [Docket No.: 170626590-8785-02] (RIN: 0648-BG94) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4078. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XF636) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4079. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Prohibition of Commercial Fishing in the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument [Docket No.: 240212-0045] (RIN: 0648-BL70) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4080. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-West Coast, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Pacific Halibut Catch Limits for Area 2A Fisheries in 2018 [Docket No.: 180207136-8136-01] (RIN: 0648-BH71) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4081. A letter from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Regulations and Dissemination, DPLR, OPDR, ETA, DOL-ETA and DOL-WHD, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Improving Protections for Workers in Temporary Agricultural Employment in the United States [DOL Docket No.: ETA-2023-0003] (RIN: 1205-AC12) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4082. A letter from the General Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Enhancing Transparency of Airline Ancillary Service Fees [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2022-0109] (RIN: 2105-AF10) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4083. A letter from the Senior Trial Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Refunds and Other Consumer Protections [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2022-0089 and DOT-OST-2016-0208] (RIN: 2105-AF04) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4084. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's manual — VA Manual M26-3, Chapter 9: VA Purchase received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4085. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulatory Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's handbook — VA Servicer Handbook M26-4, Chapter 9: VA Purchase received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4086. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final regulations — Transfer of Certain Credits [TD: 9993] (RIN: 1545-BQ64) received May 3, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-4087. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final rule — Clean Vehicle Credits under Sections 25E and 30D; Transfer of Credits; Critical Minerals and Battery Components; Foreign Entities of Concern [TD: 9995] (RIN: 1545-BQ52; RIN: 1545-BQ86; RIN: 1545-BQ99), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-4088. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2024 Annual

Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, and a letter titled, "Recommendations by Board of Trustees to Remedy Inadequate Balances in the Social Security Trust Funds", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title II, Sec. 201 (as amended by Public Law 100-647, Sec. 8005(a)); (102 Stat. 3781) and 42 U.S.C. 910(a); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title VII, Sec. 709 (as added by Public Law 98-21, Sec. 143); (97 Stat. 102) (H. Doc. No. 118-137); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

EC-4089. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2024 Annual Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395i(b)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1817(b)(2) (as amended by Public Law 108-173, Sec. 801(d)(1)); (117 Stat. 2359) and 42 U.S.C. 1395t(b)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1841(b)(2) (as amended by Public Law 108-173, Sec. 801(d)(2)); (H. Doc. No. 118-136); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 6960. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program (Rept. 118-488), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 820. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to publish a list of entities that hold authorizations, licenses, or other grants of authority issued by the Commission and that have certain foreign ownership, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-489), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4581. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to support stillbirth prevention and research, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-490), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2864. A bill to amend the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 to provide for the addition of certain equipment and services produced or provided by DJI Technologies to the list of covered communications equipment or services published under such Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-491), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4766. A bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-492), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit the Federal reserve banks from offering certain products or services directly to an individual, to prohibit the use of central bank digital currency for

monetary policy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-493), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 8261. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend certain flexibilities and payment adjustments under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 8262. A bill to provide for greater cooperation and coordination between the Federal Government and the governing bodies and community users of land grant-mercedes in New Mexico relating to historical or traditional uses of certain land grant-mercedes on Federal public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BOEBERT:

H.R. 8263. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to encourage non-Federal hydropower development with respect to Bureau of Reclamation projects; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8264. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to improve the timeliness of examination reports and other guidance and to establish panels to oversee appeals from insured depository institutions and insured credit unions of material supervisory determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CARAVEO (for herself and Mr. ALLRED):

H.R. 8265. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require a 120-day period between notice of an overpayment of benefits under titles II and XVI and beginning recovery of such overpayment, and to require the Commissioner of Social Security to submit a report to Congress on a strategy related to recovery of such overpayments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 8266. A bill to place a 2-year moratorium on financial institutions handling, using, or transacting with funds routed through digital asset mixers and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out a study of digital asset mixers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 8267. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that priority research drugs shall not be treated as line extensions of existing drugs for purposes of calculating manufacturer rebates under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 8268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 8269. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to allow recruiters to access the secondary schools served by the local educational agency for recruiting activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINSTAD:

H.R. 8270. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to modernize the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MANNING, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 8271. A bill to appropriate funds for the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 8272. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from conditioning the receipt of Federal financial assistance on reducing the dimensions of a runway, an apron, or a taxiway of certain airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE (for herself and Mrs. HOUCHIN):

H.R. 8273. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless and foster care youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 8274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the transfer of intangible property from controlled foreign corporations to United States shareholders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MACE (for herself and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 8275. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a public blockchain-based system to securely store and share data related to border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN (for herself and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 8276. A bill to make data and internal guidance on excess personal property publicly available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 8277. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on the effects of solar panel installations on covered farmland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 8278. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend certain telehealth flexibilities with respect to hospice care under the Medicare program, and to establish a modifier for recertifications of hos-

pice care eligibility conducted through telehealth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOONEY (for himself, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 8279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that gain or loss on the sale or exchange of certain coins or bullion is exempt from recognition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa (for himself and Mr. SORENSEN):

H.R. 8280. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to local educational agencies to enhance school and community safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. EMMER, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. RESCENTIALER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GUEST, Mr. HERN, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. PALMER, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SELF, Mr. FALLON, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HUNT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BOST, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 8281. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. HERN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BARR, Mr. SELF, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. RESCENTIALER, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. BURCHETT):

H.R. 8282. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8283. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for a demonstration project to support automatic claim submissions under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 8284. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to exclude providers of certain abortion services from participation in the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the

Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWALWELL (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 8285. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to award grants to provide financial assistance to certain educators to make down payments on certain homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8286. A bill to prohibit Federal funding for National Public Radio and to provide for the transfer of certain Federal funds that would have been made available to National Public Radio to reduce the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SELF (for himself, Mr. ROY, Mr. BRECHEEN, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.J. Res. 137. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Short-Term, Limited-Duration Insurance and Independent, Noncoordinated Excepted Benefits Coverage"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H. Res. 1205. A resolution finding that Merrick Garland, Attorney General of the United States, is in contempt of the House of Representatives for disobeying a certain subpoena; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SALINAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PORTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. CHU, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. PETERSEN, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BACON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BALINT, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H. Res. 1206. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2024 as "Mental Health Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Ms. TENNEY):

H. Res. 1207. A resolution censuring Representative Ilhan Omar of Minnesota for her recent hateful comments and history of antisemitism; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H. Res. 1208. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week, to be observed from May 6 through May 12, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-102. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Engrossed Senate Joint Memorial 8005, requesting that Congress pass, and the President of the United States sign measures addressing actions taken by financial institutions in terminating or restricting business relationships with certain customers to avoid regulatory concerns, or similar legislation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ML-103. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 8007, requesting that Congress pass, and the President of the United States sign legislation to fully fund 40 percent of the costs of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ML-104. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Substitute Senate Joint Memorial 8009, requesting that Congress pass, and the President of the United States sign legislation reforming the Harbor Maintenance Tax; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend certain flexibilities and payment adjustments under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ:

H.R. 8262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal lands

By Ms. BOEBERT:

H.R. 8263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

The single subject of this legislation is:

To spur additional non-federal hydropower development on Reclamation projects and streamline the permitting process through amending the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to improve the timeliness of examination reports and other guidance and to establish panels to oversee appeals from insured depository institutions and insured credit unions of material supervisory determinations.

By Ms. CARAVEO:

H.R. 8265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Social Security Act to require a 120-day period between notice of an overpayment of benefits under titles II and XVI and beginning recovery of such overpayment, and to require the Commissioner of Social Security to submit a report to Congress on a strategy related to recovery of such overpayments.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 8266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Digital Assets

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 8267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that priority research drugs shall not be treated as line extensions of existing drugs for purposes of calculating manufacturer rebates under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 8268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prevent American domiciled multinational corporations from inverting to evade U.S. taxes.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to allow recruiters to access the secondary schools served by the local educational agency for recruiting activities, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FINSTAD:

H.R. 8270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would make improvements to the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) by utilizing science-based targeting of acreage for enrollment.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York:

H.R. 8271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the Execution for the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

Provides \$280 million in additional funding for the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) at the U.S. Department of Education

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 8272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from conditioning the receipt of Federal financial assistance on reducing the dimensions of a runway, an apron, or a taxiway of certain airports.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE:

H.R. 8273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18). Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of

The single subject of this legislation is: to provide access to higher education for homeless and foster youth.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 8274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes. . ."

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would amend the tax code to encourage the transfer of intellectual property from controlled foreign corporations to U.S. shareholders.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 8275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a public blockchain-based system to securely store and share data related to border security.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H.R. 8276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the General Services Administration (GSA) to make excess personal property information public, so decision makers and taxpayers understand how agencies are working to cut wasteful spending.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 8277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Agriculture

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 8278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

health care

By Mr. MOONEY:

H.R. 8279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Monetary metals

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa:

H.R. 8280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to local educational agencies to enhance school and community safety, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 8281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1—"The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations. . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—"To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization. . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

15th Amendment—Referring to "The right of citizens of the United States to vote. . ."

19th Amendment—Referring to "The right of citizens of the United States to vote. . ."

24th Amendment—Referring to "The right of citizens of the United States to vote. . ."

26th Amendment—Referring to "The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote. . ."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require States to obtain documentary proof of U.S. citizenship to register an applicant to vote in Federal elections.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 8282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To sanction the ICC if they investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute a United States person, or ally of the United States that are not part of the ICC or have not granted the ICC jurisdiction.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for a demonstration project to support automatic claim submissions under Medicare, and other purposes.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 8284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XI of the Social Security Act to exclude providers of certain abortion services from participation in the Medicare program.

By Mr. SWALWELL:

H.R. 8285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to award grants to provide financial assistance to certain educators to make down payments on certain homes, and for other purposes.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill prohibits Federal funding for National Public Radio.

By Mr. SELF:

H.J. Res. 137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Healthcare

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 68: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 175: Mr. OGLES.
 H.R. 354: Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 386: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 472: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 549: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. AMO, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 559: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 567: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 619: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CARSON, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
 H.R. 743: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BOST, and Mr. BALDERSON.
 H.R. 789: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 891: Mr. LIEU.
 H.R. 982: Mr. ESPALLAT.
 H.R. 1015: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. GIMENEZ.
 H.R. 1065: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 1077: Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 1139: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1321: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 1359: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H.R. 1405: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. MILLS.
 H.R. 1437: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 1447: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 1477: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 1536: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 1572: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 1626: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1740: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1760: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 1812: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 1822: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1831: Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. PEREZ, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 2537: Mrs. TORRES of California.
 H.R. 2584: Mr. LIEU, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. BENTZ, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. KILEY, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 2630: Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 2700: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2706: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
 H.R. 2800: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2845: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. THANEDAR.
 H.R. 2880: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
 H.R. 2907: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 2950: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2952: Mr. THANEDAR.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 3170: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
 H.R. 3225: Mr. PANETTA.
 H.R. 3333: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 3347: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. COLE and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMERS.
 H.R. 3394: Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. BOWMAN.
 H.R. 3423: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 3468: Mr. THANEDAR.
 H.R. 3541: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 3582: Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 3752: Mr. THANEDAR.
 H.R. 3755: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 3875: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 3882: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. BROWN, and Ms. STEVENS.
 H.R. 3916: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 3933: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4013: Mr. CARL.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 4020: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 4050: Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CASTEN.
 H.R. 4068: Mr. CASTEN.
 H.R. 4092: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 4121: Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CROW, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 4184: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BOWMAN, and Ms. SALINAS.
 H.R. 4334: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 4338: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 4439: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. STEVENS.
 H.R. 4549: Mr. STANTON.
 H.R. 4581: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
 H.R. 4769: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 4897: Mr. DELUZIO and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H.R. 4931: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 4968: Mr. TIFFANY.
 H.R. 5027: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5030: Mr. BENTZ.
 H.R. 5099: Ms. MALOY.
 H.R. 5141: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 5397: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 5399: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 5403: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 5408: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
 H.R. 5414: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 5506: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 5530: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 5568: Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 5628: Mr. DELUZIO.
 H.R. 5663: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 5995: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 6017: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 6049: Mr. EZELL and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 6066: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 6103: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 6171: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H.R. 6352: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. CURTIS.
 H.R. 6455: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 6468: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 6487: Mr. PANETTA.
 H.R. 6519: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 6634: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 6860: Mrs. TRAHAN.
 H.R. 6946: Mr. GIMENEZ.
 H.R. 6951: Mr. D'ESPOSITO and Ms. MALOY.
 H.R. 7002: Mr. MEUSER and Mr. VASQUEZ.
 H.R. 7007: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 7039: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 7131: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
 H.R. 7158: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SWALWELL.
 H.R. 7227: Mr. SORENSEN and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 7249: Mr. DONALDS.
 H.R. 7258: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 7274: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 7373: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

- H.R. 7380: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 7401: Mr. MCCORMICK.
 H.R. 7405: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 7438: Mr. GUEST, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 7450: Mr. RESCHENTHALER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 7469: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 7479: Mr. BACON and Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 7481: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 7564: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 7577: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 7581: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 7586: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 7601: Mr. OGLES.
 H.R. 7602: Mr. OGLES.
 H.R. 7629: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 7688: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 7692: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 7766: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 7802: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 7810: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 7825: Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 7826: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 7829: Mr. BENTZ.
 H.R. 7844: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 7849: Mr. PANETTA.
 H.R. 7866: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 7908: Ms. STANSBURY and Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 7914: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 7921: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 7930: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 7932: Mr. CARL.
 H.R. 7936: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 7944: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 7953: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 7971: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
 H.R. 7972: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 7991: Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 8026: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 8029: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 8045: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8055: Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 8061: Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 8072: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 8111: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8126: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 8141: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 8178: Mr. BURLISON, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MEUSER.
 H.R. 8191: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. STANTON, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 8192: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 8211: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 8215: Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.R. 8221: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 8238: Mr. FALLON.
 H.R. 8240: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 8241: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 8247: Mrs. SYKES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 8253: Mr. FROST.
 H.J. Res. 107: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.J. Res. 130: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.J. Res. 135: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. KUSTOFF.
 H. Con. Res. 38: Ms. OMAR.
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. STAUBER.
 H. Res. 520: Mr. LAWLER.
 H. Res. 579: Mr. LAWLER.
 H. Res. 733: Mr. THANEDAR.
 H. Res. 796: Mrs. HINSON.
 H. Res. 946: Mr. FALLON.
 H. Res. 1019: Mr. JAMES.
 H. Res. 1031: Mr. ROUZER.
 H. Res. 1072: Ms. PEREZ.
 H. Res. 1079: Mr. FROST.
 H. Res. 1087: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H. Res. 1136: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
 H. Res. 1148: Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. BENTZ.
 H. Res. 1196: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MFUME.
 H. Res. 1197: Mr. ALFORD and Mr. LAWLER.
 H. Res. 1201: Mr. CAREY and Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H. Res. 1202: Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. NEGUSE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8182: Mr. BOST.