

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the young men of Warwick School District's baseball team.

The Warwick Warriors baseball beat Liberty High to close out a successful 23-2 season by winning the district's first PIAA 6A State Championship.

The game, held last month, was impacted by a prolonged weather delay, but the warriors held firm to the early lead to capture the championship.

Throughout their dominating season, the Warriors also clinched the District Three title, as well.

Madam Speaker, it is no surprise that the community is very proud of these students for their achievement on the baseball diamond. It was great to see the local law enforcement and volunteer firefighters join with the community by participating in a parade to honor their achievement.

Congratulations to the members and coaches of the Warwick Warrior State championship baseball team. The whole community is wishing them continued success. May they carry the lessons they learned playing as part of a successful team toward their future goals.

□ 0915

BRING THE CHIPS INDUSTRY HOME

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

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, the CHIPS and Science Act is critical legislation to ramp up American production of semiconductor chips.

Our economy relies on these chips, which are key components in everything from cell phones to cars to advancing national security measures.

By increasing production here in America, we will onshore a critical capability, reduce dependence on foreign manufacturers, and lower costs for hardworking families.

The United States invented the semiconductor chip. We used to make 40 percent of the world's chips. Now, we make 12 percent, leaving key industries vulnerable to foreign interference. It is high time we counter the threat posed by countries like China and Russia and bring this industry home.

The CHIPS and Science Act does just that, and this investment helps North Carolina chip manufacturers, including Qorvo and IQE, major employers in my home district, to ramp up production and create good-paying jobs.

Madam Speaker, I proudly cast my vote to send the CHIPS Act to the President's desk. I am ready to see this legislation work for North Carolinians and for the country.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1300, WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117-447) on the resolution (H. Res. 1300), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1300 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1300

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 29, 2022.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 7 of House Resolution 1289 shall have no force or effect.

(b) Clause 7(a)(1) of rule XV shall not apply through the legislative day of Friday, September 16, 2022.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1300, waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules against any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 29, 2022.

The rule also allows certain legislation to qualify for the Consensus Calendar before the end of Congress.

Madam Speaker, we are here on a same-day rule, which I hope will give us the opportunity to address a critical and urgent issue: gun violence in America.

We are here because gun violence is destroying communities, tearing apart families, and making our streets less safe. This majority is going to try to do every single thing we possibly can to stop it. I don't know whether we will succeed, but we are going to try.

Democrats actually passed the Safer Communities Act, the first piece of major gun safety legislation in decades, and we sent it to President Biden's desk. We are taking action. We are getting things done, and we are trying to save lives.

Contrast that with what Republicans did to address gun violence and crime the last time they were in charge, which is absolutely nothing. Their answer to gun violence is more guns, and if that is not enough, even more guns. For God's sake, America already has more guns than people. How many guns do we need until everybody is safe?

I get it. My Republican friends are going to complain about the process. They are going to complain about same-day authority, even though they used it themselves, but let's not go there because we want to have a productive debate here.

The reality is this: This is the last day before the district work period, and this is urgent work.

Now, let me tell you, as chairman of the House Committee on Rules, I want to do whatever I can to get us to vote on and pass an assault weapons ban because I am sick and tired of the mass shootings and the terror and the fear. I am sick and tired of shattered families having to grieve.

Enough is enough. I am going to do everything I can to get this bill passed, and I am not going to apologize for that. This rule preserves that option. If it means that we stay here a little bit longer today, so be it. We need to act with urgency.

Let me just say, for the record, the assault weapons bill that we may possibly consider today went through regular order. The Committee on the Judiciary had a hearing; it was marked up. If we decide to bring it to the floor today, which I hope we will, the Committee on Rules will meet, and we will debate this, and we will vote on this. But let me just say to everybody: We have an obligation to act with urgency. We have a responsibility to address this crisis.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to, for the record, say there is nothing before us in the rule that has anything to do with any kind of assault weapons ban or policing. This is simply a rule that would waive the 24-hour requirement.

Look, to be candid, the Democrats have now opened the door for Republicans to use this in the future to push

forward our agenda, which is going to protect the rights and liberties of individual people.

I would like to take this time to point out the hypocrisy and the irony I see coming from across the aisle. Let me just talk about that.

Madam Speaker, 9 days is all it took before the Speaker reinstated her authoritarian COVID lockdown, proving once again that House Democrats are unable to govern unless they stack the deck. I would also remind my good friend that he consistently referred to these tactics as “martial law” during his time in the minority.

If I can just quote the chair on same-day authority during the 109th Congress: “My problem is with significant pieces of legislation, some legislation which may not have even been heard by committees of jurisdiction, which may not have been reported out of committees of jurisdiction, bills that will come before us that the House has never even considered, things that we will not have an opportunity to be able to read before we vote on them.”

That was in the 109th Congress. Where is the outrage now?

Madam Speaker, for over 790 days, the Speaker used COVID-19 as a weapon to deny the Republicans the ability to advocate on behalf of millions of Americans that they represent. Just last week, it looked like we were finally returning to regular order. Now, it is more of the same tricks and tactics.

The blanket same-day rule before us this morning allows House Democrats to ram through their radical agenda, an agenda that does nothing to address the serious problems the American people are facing.

What are those problems? Under the Biden administration, our Nation has careened from one crisis to the next. It has been absolute chaos.

Right now, families across the country are facing 40-year high inflation that is expected to cost the average American household an extra \$6,000 a year. Yesterday, we were told that we are officially in a recession when the GDP fell for a second quarter in a row. Although the Biden administration is attempting to deflect blame by referring to this latest economic disaster as a “transition period,” the American people know that we are in a recession and facing hard times to come because of the radical policies of the left.

It is only going to get worse with the recently announced build back broke deal, which will raise taxes on Americans. It will try to socialize American healthcare, and it will try to implement the radical Green New Deal policies that have led to this energy crisis in the first place.

Madam Speaker, this is no way to run the people's House, but I want it noted that the door is now open. I find it absolutely hypocritical that there was outrage against us when Republicans used the same tactic but now it is okay when the Democrats want to do

it. I am looking forward to the day when power returns to the Republicans, and we will see if there is outrage at that point.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentleman used the words that we are opening the door. Opening the door to what? My friends used this all the time when they were in charge. We learned this from you. I just want to say that, for the record.

As I have said, I am not the biggest fan of same-day authority, but it exists for a reason.

In December 2018, when the Democrats were in the minority, I actually voted for a rule providing for same-day authority. I stood here and urged my Democrat colleagues to support the rule. More Republicans voted “no” on that rule than Democrats, believe it or not.

Madam Speaker, we are about to break for a, hopefully, productive district work period, and this rule provides us with a little extra time and flexibility to be able to consider measures that are critical to our public safety.

I hope that this rule paves the way for us to bring up an assault weapons ban. That is what I hope this rule does, and I think that is urgent. I want to do everything I possibly can to get that bill to the floor and get it passed.

The gentleman quoted me, and let me quote me, too. With regard to the same-day authority, I said on the House floor: “This House needs to move quickly and responsibly. Everyone understands that, so I will simply say that I will be voting for this rule. I urge my colleagues to do the same, so we can finish our business and prevent another government shutdown.”

That was when you were in charge. That was what I said in response to when you brought up a same-day rule.

So, nobody is opening the door. You opened that door a long time ago. But I am going to say, again, if this paves the way for us to be able to bring up an assault weapons ban, I am not apologizing at all. I want to get that legislation to the floor. I want to have that debate. I want to have a vote on it.

People are dying all over this country. They are sick of our inaction. It is time to act. Enough is enough.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentleman also quoted himself. You can tell how I am handling this debate because I don't want to be quoted in the future when the shoe is on the other foot. But I will point out the hypocrisy from my friends on the other side of the aisle that their outrage is obviously selective of who is waiving the rule and who is not.

Look, we can talk about procedure all day here. That is not going to fix the real problems that are facing the American people. According to the National Federation of Independent Business, inflation is the top problem reported by businesses. This is the highest inflation we have had since 1980, literally the highest inflation in my lifetime.

Instead of working to lower costs for businesses and workers, the SEC proposed burdensome new rules requiring businesses to disclose extensive climate-related data and additional “climate risks.”

Setting climate policy is the responsibility of Congress, not unelected career bureaucrats who are absolutely unaccountable to the American people.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 8589 that would prohibit the SEC's woke climate rule from moving forward.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, here to explain my amendment is my good friend, a senior member of the House Committee on Financial Services and the sponsor of this bill, Congressman FRENCH HILL of Arkansas.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 8589 to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing its proposed climate rule.

Now, Madam Speaker, it is the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is not the securities and environment commission.

Last night, we had the pleasure of playing baseball. I am glad to see my colleagues up early this morning to be on the House floor. It was a great game. I was proud to see the right team won, but we are once again back on the floor talking between Republicans and Democrats, Republicans being the party for growth, opportunity, and liberty, and the House majority, the Democrats, doubling down, Madam Speaker, on dumb in the midst of inflation, runaway spending, failed energy policy, and open borders.

□ 0930

Today, as the winds of recession and stagflation blow, House Democrats are here to talk about higher taxes and higher crippling regulations on job creators. There is no evidence that there

is any lack of knowledge in public companies that they have an obligation under the existing securities laws to disclose material impact from anything to do with climate change, and there is zero evidence that they are unaware of climate change and are not talking about it on a regular basis with their shareholders, their boards, and their employees.

Now, the Securities and Exchange Commission has three mandates: investor protection, maintaining orderly markets, and capital formation. But rather than focus on those three missions, Gary Gensler, the chairman of the SEC, is typical of this administration: a Big Government, nanny state supervisor who is going beyond his statutory authority and delving in and trying to become, as I argue, a climate czar.

His proposal has been met with significant substantive rejection. Ninety-one advocacy groups just last week, including the Farm Bureau, community bankers in every State of the country, and the Job Creators Network wrote the Small Business Committee chairman and ranking member their opposition to this proposal, and that it should be withdrawn.

Alfredo Ortiz, the president of Job Creators Network, said:

The SEC's proposed rule would be an unnecessary and costly burden on America's small businesses, at a time when we are dealing with "Bideninflation", higher interest rates, and a supply chain crisis.

Now, Madam Speaker, Gary Gensler, the chairman, argues that this proposal is the right thing to do. We argue it is not, that it shouldn't be implemented, and we shouldn't spend any money there to do it.

Let me tell you what Nasdaq, the National Association of Securities Dealers—the market system for the growth of our country—wrote Gary Gensler. Now, these people are not anti-climate. They are not climate deniers. They run the Nasdaq marketplace.

They wrote:

The proposal creates additional disclosure obligations outside of existing frameworks. The proposed timeline for reporting is unreasonable. Prescriptive disclosures are too costly.

The Commission itself says this will triple the cost to be a public company.

Huh? Triple the cost to be a public company?

We don't have enough public companies as there are.

The materiality standards deviate from the law. The prescriptive disclosures do not facilitate meaningful comparisons. The prescriptive disclosures create disincentives for companies. And they say that scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions disclosure requirements could harm small private suppliers. Finally, they say that the proposal's timing and scope could harm the initial public offering market.

This is an economy that has half the public companies we had in 1980, and this administration and their SEC want to make that even worse and more costly.

Let me remind you, the Commission itself tripled the cost to be a public company.

Madam Speaker, we have people who are private companies now because they cannot afford to be public. And if we don't have public companies, then we don't have investments in labor union pension plans, we don't have opportunities for investment in our 401(k) plans, we hurt this economy, and we hurt job creators if this proposal is implemented.

So it is very easy for me to stand here and argue against it.

Finally, I would say that this is part of a longstanding practice of this administration to use every tool they have in the regulatory space to do something that is the prerogative, as my good friend from Pennsylvania said, of Congress.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I want to reiterate this point. This is the responsibility of Congress if we are going to set environment and energy regulatory policy. It is not the purpose of our independent regulatory commissions.

Aren't we clear now that the Supreme Court agrees with that position?

Just in the last few days they ruled in a case called *West Virginia v. EPA* which basically says: hey, independent regulatory agencies, stay in your lane. Stay in your lane. Listen to what Congress has written in the statute. And Congress has not written this in a statute, which is why the SEC is way out of line with this proposal, while the Nasdaq market system rejects it, while small businesses reject it, while public company CEOs reject it, and why the Farm Bureau rejects it.

As I say, this administration came to power with an idea that this was their number one issue, and you can tell it because the people who worked on the task force to propose this rule are the Chief of Staff at the Treasury Department, the head of the National Economic Council, and the White House staff. All came to Congress with an idea to propose this rule.

So I urge my colleagues to support Republicans' efforts to not see this rule implemented and to not fund it. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say that I think as everybody knows, Democrats are focused on inflation. Tackling inflation is certainly our top priority.

Let's take a look at the facts.

We passed the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act to bring down costs to families, and almost every Republican voted no.

We passed the Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act, but not a single Republican voted with us.

What is the Republican solution on inflation?

Who the hell knows?

They haven't offered any policy ideas. They seem content cheering for President Biden to fail and for inflation to go up. In fact, Leader McConnell is holding hostage a bill to lower costs for families and to deal with the issue of prescription drugs.

The only plan I have seen from the GOP is from Senator RICK SCOTT, Republican, which would raise taxes on the middle class—raise taxes on the middle class—and put Social Security and Medicare on the chopping block.

That is the same old same old from my friends on the other side.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an MSNBC opinion article titled: "The GOP keeps slamming Biden over inflation, but it has no solutions to offer."

[From MSNBC, June 21, 2022]

THE GOP KEEPS SLAMMING BIDEN OVER INFLATION, BUT IT HAS NO SOLUTIONS TO OFFER

(By Dean Obeidallah)

Republicans want you to believe that inflation in the United States is not part of a global problem but is 100 percent, President Joe Biden's fault.

Just check out their recent over-the-top rhetoric. House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-Calif., has blamed Biden for "creating raging inflation." In a tweet, Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, called inflation "#Bidenflation," saying it was caused by Biden's policies. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., even made a speech on the Senate floor last week focused on inflation, in which he detailed the rising prices of goods, gas, etc., all leading to the crescendo that it was Biden and the Democrats' fault.

What the GOP has left out of all its speeches, television appearances and tweets slamming Biden is even a hint of a proposal to reduce prices.

But what the GOP has left out of all its speeches, television appearances and tweets slamming Biden is even a hint of a proposal to reduce prices. Even worse than the GOP not having a plan of its own, though, is Republicans' determination to block Biden's efforts to help Americans. They've opposed his agenda to lower child care costs, create affordable housing and more. Biden made that very point in his June 14 speech about his plans to address inflation, in which he declared that "Republicans in Congress are doing everything they can to stop my plans to bring down costs on ordinary families."

There's no disputing that prices in our nation rose 8.6 percent in May since last year at that time, the highest rate since 1981. Food prices have risen over 10 percent since May 2021, and gas prices have skyrocketed. Just about everything we use on a daily basis costs more.

Biden candidly acknowledged this reality in last week's speech, noting that inflation is "sapping the strength of a lot of families." He said he understands firsthand what this is like, noting that when he was a child growing up in a blue-collar family, "it mattered if the price of food went up."

A convergence of issues has caused this spike in inflation. The well-documented supply chain issues that followed Covid shutdowns drove up prices. Some of it was fueled by us, consumers who unleashed our pent-up demand to travel and buy goods after things reopened. More demand equals higher prices.

Russia's attack on Ukraine added to higher gas prices, which contribute to higher prices for goods, since it costs more to transport them.

This is in no way a Biden-caused problem—unless Republicans are telling us he caused inflation worldwide, which they very well might say before November. A Pew Research Center report released just last week documented that in 37 of the 44 nations with “advanced economies,” the “average annual inflation rate in the first quarter of this year was at least twice what it was in the first quarter of 2020.” In fact, the United States during the first quarter of this year was 13 of 44 in terms of inflation, far eclipsed by countries such as Italy, Israel, Spain, Greece and Turkey.

This leads us to the hard reality that there's no easy solution for inflation; if there were, Biden would've flipped that switch months ago. And cynical Republicans know that.

At least Biden does have a plan, which, like the causes of inflation, is multifaceted.

With respect to gas prices, in addition to releasing oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase supplies, the president last week sent a letter to U.S. oil companies demanding that they increase the production of oil and to stop unfairly profiting on Americans' need for gas. He even threatened to “use all reasonable and appropriate Federal Government tools and emergency authorities to increase refinery capacity and output in the near term.” In his speech last week, Biden noted that on food costs, he was “working closely with our European partners to get 20 million tons of grains locked in Ukraine out onto the market to help bring down food prices.” The president also explained his efforts to reduce other household costs to offset the higher gas and food prices, such as capping the cost of insulin at \$35—a bill for which passed the House in March but still has not passed the Senate due to lack of Republican support.

So where is the GOP plan to address inflation? Republicans have had plenty of time to come up with one, given that they have been screaming since last summer that Biden caused inflation.

Here's the best I can find: In May, Sen. Rick Scott, R-Fla., the chair of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, laid out his plan. “The most effective thing Joe Biden can do to solve the inflation crisis he created is resign,” Scott said. Then there's McCarthy, who earlier this month offered the following proposal as his “solution” to rising costs: “I call on Speaker Pelosi and House Democrats to hold a prime-time hearing on the out-of-control inflation their policies have created.”

Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-N.Y., the third-ranking member of the House GOP, isn't even pretending her party has a plan. She recently said of inflation, “House Republicans will address these crises when we earn back control of the House this November.” Sure, America, let's trust the party of tax cuts for the wealthy to look out for the rest of us.

We all get how politics works. The party out of power blames the party in power for everything that's bad. But in this case, inflation is directly impacting the lives of all Americans. It's time Democrats and the media press every Republican who blames Biden for inflation to answer this simple question: What is the GOP plan to reduce it? Americans deserve an answer.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, since my friends want to change the subject, let's change the subject.

Republicans right now, as we are meeting here, over in the Senate are trying to kill the PACT Act, a bill to

guarantee healthcare to veterans with service-related cancers. This is a bill that passed the Senate originally 84-14, and it passed the House with a majority vote of 342. Many of my Republican colleagues supported that. I appreciate that. But now Republicans are trying to kill it and play politics with it over in the Senate. They are putting politics ahead of people when, in fact, we should be putting people ahead of politics.

So while we are here having this conversation, I would urge my Republican friends to pick up the phone and call your counterparts in the Senate and say: Get out of the way and do what is right for our veterans.

My office is getting calls from veterans who were exposed to burn pits when they were overseas. I am sure my Republican friends are getting calls in their offices. You don't have to agree on everything, but I thought we all agreed on this.

Can we please tell MITCH MCCONNELL and tell the Republicans to get out of the way and allow this bill to go forward?

That might be a good use of time right now while we are having this conversation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time and his leadership on this.

Madam Speaker, every day capital markets are under attack here with this Securities and Exchange Commission.

The climate disclosure rule, which was released in March of this year totals over 500 pages—over 500 pages—and includes over 1,000 technical footnotes. And oh, by the way, the SEC initially gave everybody 30 days to comment on that—30 days. Now, you can't even get through the analysis of the original 500 pages much less the 1,000 technical footnotes on that within those 30 days. But in reality the SEC doesn't really know what this far-reaching rule will cost small, independent, and nonpublic businesses across our country.

In fact, very deep in the summary of the rule the SEC admits:

In many cases, we are unable to reliably quantify the potential benefits and costs of the rule and, therefore, we encourage commenters to provide us with relevant data or empirical evidence that would allow us to do so.

Let that sink in: We have no idea what the impact is, so why don't you just give us some data to help us work through this? Now, I remind you, this is not a study, and this is not research. This is a finalized proposed rule that the SEC is trying to jam through in 30 days.

Oh, but they expanded that now, so thank you very much. Now, there are three basic rules on real estate.

What is the most important part about real estate?

Location, location, location.

Well, for the SEC it should be materiality, materiality, materiality.

How is this information material to a publicly traded company and to the investors who are investing and putting their hard-earned money into those companies.

So materiality, materiality, materiality should be the battle cry. But it is not with this SEC.

In fact, in recent months, the Commission has put forth a huge volume of additional proposals. At times it doesn't appear to be fully informed about the likely economic consequences of the proposed rules and that display significant misunderstandings of the activity the Commission seeks to regulate. So without proper economic analysis, mistakes and unintended consequences are going to be inevitable.

Madam Speaker, since late last year, the SEC has embarked on a remarkable rulemaking agenda. In the 14 months since he was sworn into office, Chair Gensler has charted a path for the SEC unlike it has seen in its 88-year history. To be charitable, he is pushing the envelope.

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

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. To be charitable, this aggressive stance of the chair is unprecedented. The reality is they can't get their agenda done through the legislative process, so they are just going to regulate it. So the SEC is going to continue to push the boundaries of the statutory authority Congress has given them.

Unfortunately, instead of protecting investors, maintaining fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitating capital formation—that is part of their three-part directive, facilitating capital formation—they are actually going to regulate small, privately held companies in your district right out of business.

So Congress did not establish the SEC to set climate policy nor for it to be the final arbiter of businesses' strategies to combat climate change. In her recent dissent over the proposed rule, Commissioner Hester Peirce rightfully noted that the SEC is not the securities and environment commission.

My colleagues and I have grave concerns that this rule will set a precedent that will allow regulators to expand their authorities far beyond the bounds of the law. In fact, we have seen some recent Supreme Court cases about that with the EPA. The proposed climate rule shifts the SEC's rulemaking authority—to be charitable—taking a novel, activist approach to climate policy.

What is next?

All of it. Frankly, that is what is on his agenda: all of it. They want all of

it. That is their idea of how this economy ought to be running, not how to protect investors, not how to facilitate efficient markets, and certainly not how to build capital. That is not the job of the SEC that has been proposed here.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. HILL's resolution and restore sanity to the rule-making process.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say that I really enjoyed listening to my friends on the other side of the aisle. They are opposed to this rule because the process will expedite progress on behalf of the American people. Yet they are not outraged over using process to block progress for the American people.

Again, since we are changing the subject, I didn't hear anything about the veterans who right now are desperately pleading with Republicans in the Senate to pass the PACT Act. The gentleman even got extra time and didn't mention that at all.

Again, I would urge my Republicans, as we are still here today, before you leave, call Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, call your Republican counterparts in the Senate, and say: please pass the PACT Act. Please do that now.

Our veterans who are suffering from cancer as a result of their service and being exposed to burn pits are desperately pleading with my Republican friends to stop blocking it.

Do you want to be outraged about something today?

Be outraged about that.

So, again, I would urge that they do something.

Many of my colleagues on the Republican side supported the PACT Act when it came before the House.

□ 0945

A majority of Republicans in the Senate voted to support it; but now they are putting politics ahead of people. It should be reversed. Put people ahead of politics.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their comments to the Chair.

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

I just want the RECORD to reflect that I am not outraged about this rule. I just was simply, at the beginning of my remarks, my opening statement, pointing out the hypocrisy from my friends across the other side of the aisle who had this selective outrage when we waived the 24-hour requirement. But it is okay when they do it.

And again, I am almost gleefully looking forward to the opportunity when we are in the majority for myself to help the then Chairman COLE of the Rules Committee do the same thing;

and we will see what kind of hypocrisy comes from the other side of the aisle and how they will then have outrage when we do it.

But I am not outraged about this. I think that if we are going to move forward today, we should defeat the previous question. That is what I am passionate about, and that is what my friends that have spoken here today are passionate about, because they want to run a bill, authored by my good friend from Arkansas, that would actually help the economic crisis; that would actually help fight inflation.

So, please don't confuse passion for helping the American people out of this financial problem with outrage. There is no outrage on this side of the aisle.

But to explain more, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), my good friend, and a rising star of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider H.R. 8589.

We heard earlier our friends across the aisle say that understand this rule, which they could pretty much bring up any bill they so desire, they are going to address inflation.

Well, count me excited that my colleagues across the aisle are finally ready to address inflation; inflation brought upon all Americans by the reckless policies of Democratic one-party control; reckless policies of—starting—this administration by spending \$1.9 trillion; reckless policies by refusing to unleash American energy. And Americans are paying the price for the reckless policies of Democrats here in Washington.

It is early in the morning. People are making their way here, up to the House floor, following a great victory by my Republicans in the Congressional baseball game last night—10-0, I may note.

But what is really playing out across America right now is people can't afford the things that their family needs. I was speaking to a woman the other day in south Milwaukee at a gas station, and I asked her how much it costs her to now fill up her car with gas. And she looked at me and she said, Bryan, I don't know because I have 40 bucks, and 40 bucks doesn't fill up my tank with gas.

I spoke to another woman who said, Bryan, I can't take my daughter out to dinner on Friday night for pizza because I can't afford it because costs keep going up.

Americans are suffering from runaway inflation from the reckless policies from one-party Democratic control. We have an open rule. The Democrats could bring up any bill today. They could bring up any bill.

Americans are getting clobbered, clobbered with runaway inflation; energy costs going through the roof. This woman in South Milwaukee can't afford to fill up her car with gas.

And what will we see in the bills brought up today? They will intend to

distract, to change the subject. They want to talk about bills that already passed the House. They want to talk about bills that have nothing to do with inflation because they don't care about the woman in South Milwaukee who can't afford to fill up her car with gas. They don't care about the woman who can't afford to take her kids out to pizza on Friday nights.

And count me as darn surprised if we see legislation brought by the Democratic majority today that addresses the inflation crisis; that addresses the energy crisis.

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

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, they are going to send everybody in this institution home for more than a month with runaway inflation; interest rates going up so people can't afford to buy a house; an energy policy that refuses to unleash American energy so that this woman in South Milwaukee can't afford to fill up her car.

Republicans have answers to the challenges of the day. And I thank my colleague from Arkansas for his thoughtful bill that would be brought up if we defeat this previous question; that would actually put a check on the runaway bureaucratic process that we see. This one attacks the runaway process at the Securities and Exchange Commission, that should properly be named securities and environmental commission.

And my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, really like renaming things, so I suggest, while we redefine recession, we throw in redefining the SEC today.

People are getting clobbered. The bill by my colleague from Arkansas is a pretty thoughtful approach. It says, hey, instead of all this additional regulation, these costs that get passed on to consumers at the end of the day, maybe what we do is we focus on getting some economic growth back; bringing inflation down.

And so count me as excited if, under this rule—and again, the Democrats could bring any bill to the floor on the last day. Is that bill going to be something that substantively and meaningfully addresses inflation, addresses energy costs? Or are they going to bring up another topic to distract the American people from the crisis that is playing out across our country?

Count me as shocked if we see a bill that addresses inflation today.

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

So, Madam Speaker, I don't know who that guy who was yelling is, but I would refer him to my earlier comments on all the things that we are doing to combat inflation and the stuff that we will be rolling out in the days ahead.

But I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to go over to

the Senate and yell at MITCH McCONNELL so that we can help our veterans. I mean, it is unconscionable that, as we are gathering here right now, Republicans in the Senate are blocking a bill to provide care for veterans exposed to burn pits who have cancer.

I mean, what is going on here? I mean, people who are responsible for that are unfit to serve in the United States Congress, quite frankly.

Do you want to be outraged about something? Be outraged about that at this moment. And we also should be outraged at the alarming rate of gun violence in this country. And my hope is that this same-day rule will pave the way for the Rules Committee to meet and to bring forward a ban on assault weapons so we can save lives in this country. So that is what this is all about today.

But, again, with all of the yelling and screaming, please go over to the other Chamber and yell and scream at them because right now a lot of our veterans are concerned that they will succeed in killing a bill that will provide them healthcare that they desperately need.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, it is quite remarkable that the gentleman is now telling us that this is about gun-related bills, because 14 hours ago we had questions in the Rules Committee. Those questions went unasked because the minority is unsure.

You know who was unsure when they were in the minority? My good friend. Let me quote him again. When the Republicans tried to waive the 24-hour requirement, my good friend said: "Once again, we are here on the floor debating a martial law rule that also makes the suspension day. Here we are, once again, unsure of what we will be considering today, tonight, or tomorrow."

So last night, at 7 P.M., my good friend, ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. COLE, asked a series of questions because we wanted to get some light shed on it. He asked, what would this rule specifically be used for? The majority said they didn't know. They were unsure.

He asked if this were to be related to gun-related bills, and if those bills would be changed. The majority said they didn't know. We are unsure here.

He asked if this authority would be used for other bills. The majority said they didn't know.

He asked if the House would be in session this weekend, and also the response was, the majority didn't know.

So it's amazing how the majority is, today, so confident on what is being run today through this rule when, just 14 hours ago, when we asked those questions, those answers were not provided to the minority.

But here to talk more about the resolution that I will personally offer if we defeat the previous question is my good

friend. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, listening to the other side, and listening to my friend from Pennsylvania, I hear a lot about uncertainty; that we are not sure what we are here for; we are not sure what we are going to bring up on the House floor.

Well, I will tell you what: We are certain that inflation is hurting American families. We are certain that people don't know how to fill up their car; what that is going to cost; what they are going to sacrifice; moving from beef to chicken; working on prescriptions this week, maybe gas next week. So we are certain the American people have inflation, top concern.

This bill proposed today will help attack inflation by reducing the costs that will be imposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission in this act.

And I will read, Madam Speaker, from the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures, the Bloomberg Commission, and it says: All these efforts must be cost-effective, reliable. They must be comparable across countries, across industries, within industries. And the proposal of SEC does not do that.

So I hope that we will be successful in H.R. 8589, which will save the government money. And if we are looking for bills to bring up, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I recommend H.R. 7209, which is the Price Stability Act, which will focus the Federal Reserve solely on fighting inflation; not fighting climate change; not fighting socioeconomic disparities, focused on inflation because inflation is a thief. That is what we should be on this floor debating.

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

So, Madam Speaker, the gentleman who just spoke was yielded time again, and again, didn't say anything about the veterans who are getting screwed by Senate Republicans right now in the other Chamber.

Right now, we should take our outrage and we should demand that Republicans get out of the way.

And, by the way, to my friend from Pennsylvania, I just went back and I read the transcript of what our exchange was in the Rules Committee, and I think I was pretty clear.

When I am looking at the transcript, I was asked last night, you know, why we needed this authority, and I said it was to consider public safety bills.

I was further asked if we would use it to consider gun legislation, and I said, yes, potentially.

Now, I don't know whether it is my Massachusetts accent or what, but I think I was pretty clear about what we were going to bring to the floor today. And, again, I hope that we will follow through with what I said yesterday.

So this idea that, oh, I didn't know—and by the way, there are times, as I said at the opening, when same-day au-

thority is, to me, necessary. There are other times when it is not. And when the Republicans were in charge and they used it for frivolous things, yeah, I objected to it. But when they used it in an attempt to try to keep government open, I favored it.

So I don't know what the gentleman is talking about, hypocrisy. I mean, I have been in favor of it when I was in the minority, and I have been opposed to it when I was in the minority. So it all depends on the circumstances.

I think maybe my Republican friends have trouble with nuance and trying to understand the complexities of the system here. But I am totally comfortable with my position, past, and present.

And by the way, if this same-day authority means that we can bring up an assault weapons ban, I don't apologize to anybody. I don't apologize to anybody. I think it is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

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

I want to again say we asked a litany of questions to try to give the minority guidance on what bills would be considered today, the context of those bills, the timing of those bills, whether we would be here this weekend. The response constantly was either: I hope not; I am unsure; I don't know. So, here we are, in the dark.

But for the purpose of a rebuttal, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my good friend.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I really don't understand this debate, talking about the PACT Act, my friend from Massachusetts. That has passed the House. Let the Senate do its work.

We supported it here. Let's be serious here. I voted for the bill. The Senate is working out some concern they had. They changed the bill. They made the bill that is controversial over there. Let them figure it out.

In the Senate, they don't even know that revenue bills originate in the House. It was blue-slipped. They don't really know what they are doing over in the upper Chamber.

We know we have the advantage over them on that, but what we are talking about today are bills being considered today. The Speaker is leaving on some foreign trip tonight, so we are rushing around. We don't know why we are here today, and the people deserve to know in advance what we are voting on so we can prepare our arguments.

So, it is not about some bill over in the Senate. It is about what bills will be on the floor of the House today.

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

The gentleman said we should let the Senate do its work. Exactly. The Senate Republicans are blocking the Senate from doing its work. What do my friends not understand?

Veterans with cancer are depending on Republicans to get out of the way so they can get the care that they, quite frankly, are entitled to, that they deserve.

It passed overwhelmingly originally in the Senate. It passed overwhelmingly in the House. But Senate Republicans are playing politics with the lives of our veterans.

I am outraged by that. Maybe my friends on the other side are not, but we ought to be demanding that they move immediately.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to quote my good friend, the chairman, again, this time from 2017, when he stated that martial law allows the majority to “rush their bill with its brand-new backroom deals to the floor today without any proper deliberation.”

I think that pretty much sums up perfectly what we are doing here today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I don't think it is appropriate for my Republican friends to lecture us on hypocrisy. The last time the Republicans were in charge of this place, they ran it into the ground.

When Republicans were in charge, they broke the record for the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

When Republicans were in charge and our country was on the brink of a shutdown, the Rules Committee, under Republican control, held an emergency meeting. Do you know what that emergency meeting was on? Not on emergency funding but on cheese, actually, as we were about to shut the government down. We had a major crisis, and they did an emergency meeting on cheese.

They couldn't even get their act together to keep the lights on. They literally lost the majority because of how badly they ran this place, and then they handed us a shutdown of government, the longest shutdown in history, by the way. That cost American taxpayers \$11 billion.

When Republicans were in charge, I voted to give them same-day authority. I stood on this floor and urged my Democratic colleagues to support the rule because I wanted to give us extra flexibility to do the work the American people had asked us to do.

Republicans ran this place like a dictatorship, and then they tried to turn our country into one on January 6, 2021, a day that will live forever in history as a date that a twice-impeached ex-President and Republicans tried to unconstitutionally overturn a free and

fair election and subvert the will of the American people in an attempted coup.

So, please do not lecture us about Democratic process or any process at all. Do not lecture us on hypocrisy.

I said last night in the Rules Committee what I hoped we would bring forward today, and I still hope we will move forward on an assault weapons ban.

Do you know why? Because people in this country are being massacred, and they are tired of thoughts and prayers. They are tired of press releases in which we say that our hearts are with the families of those who were killed.

They want action. The question is whether or not we can deliver on what the American people want.

Do you want to talk about outrage? I am outraged by the gun violence in this country. I am outraged that an 18-year-old who can't legally have a sip of beer can go into a gun store and buy an AR-15 and then go out and kill people, massacre people. Enough of this.

This rule preserves the option, if we decide to move forward, to be able to move forward. That is what this is all about. We can talk about whatever you want to talk about, but the bottom line is that is what this rule does.

We have an obligation to act with urgency. We have a responsibility to address this crisis.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1300

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8589) to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from finalizing the proposed rule titled “The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors”. 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 Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8589.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam 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, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 205, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

YEAS—216

Adams	Garcia (IL)	Newman
Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Norcross
Allred	Golden	O'Halleran
Auchincloss	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Axne	Gonzalez,	Omar
Barragan	Vicente	Pallone
Bass	Gottheimer	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Bera	Grijalva	Pascarell
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Phillips
Bonamici	Horsford	Pingree
Bourdeaux	Houlihan	Pocan
Bowman	Hoyer	Pressley
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Price (NC)
F.	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Brown (MD)	Jacobs (CA)	Raskin
Brown (OH)	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Brownley	Jeffries	Ross
Bush	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Bustos	Jones	Ruiz
Butterfield	Kahele	Ruppersberger
Carbajal	Kaptur	Rush
Cardenas	Keating	Ryan
Carson	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Carter (LA)	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cartwright	Kildee	Scanlon
Case	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Casten	Kim (NJ)	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kind	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
McCormick	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Chu	Lamb	Scott, David
Cicilline	Langevin	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cleaver	Lawrence	Sires
Clyburn	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Soto
Cooper	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Correa	Levin (CA)	Stansbury
Costa	Levin (MI)	Stanton
Courtney	Lieu	Stevens
Craig	Lofgren	Strickland
Crist	Lowenthal	Suozi
Crow	Luria	Swalwell
Cuellar	Lynch	Takano
Davids (KS)	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny K.	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Dean	Carolyn B.	Titus
DeFazio	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
DeGette	Manning	Tonko
DeLauro	Matsui	Torres (CA)
DeBene	McBath	Torres (NY)
Demings	McCollum	Trahan
DeSaulnier	McEachin	Trone
Deutch	McGovern	Underwood
Dingell	McNerney	Vargas
Doggett	Meeks	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Meng	Velázquez
F.	Mfume	Wasserman
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Eshoo	Morelle	Waters
Espallat	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Evans	Mrvan	Welch
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Wexton
Foster	Nadler	Wild
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Williams (GA)
Galleo	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Neguse	Yarmuth

NAYS—205

Aderholt	Bishop (NC)	Carter (TX)
Allen	Boebert	Cawthorn
Amodei	Bost	Chabot
Armstrong	Brady	Cheney
Arrington	Brooks	Cline
Babin	Buchanan	Cloud
Bacon	Buck	Clyde
Baird	Bucshon	Cole
Balderson	Budd	Comer
Banks	Burchett	Conway
Barr	Burgess	Crawford
Bentz	Calvert	Crenshaw
Bergman	Cammack	Curtis
Bice (OK)	Carey	Davidson
Biggs	Carl	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais

Babin (Pfluger)	Bourdeaux	Bush (Ocasio-
Bass (Neguse)	(Correa)	Cortez)
Beyer (Connolly)	Bowman (Ocasio-	Bustos (Kuster)
Blumenauer	Cortez)	Carter (TX)
(Kuster)	Boyle, Brendan	(Weber (TX))
	F. (Trone)	Casten (Neguse

Cherfilus-	Jeffries	Rice (SC)
McCormick	(Velázquez)	(Meijer)
(Neguse)	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Comer (Keller)	(Pallone)	(Trone)
Crist	Jones (Trone)	Ryan (Kuster)
(Wasserman	Joyce (PA)	Sires (Pallone)
Schultz)	(Keller)	Spartz (Banks)
DeGette	Kahele (Correa)	Speier (Garcia
(Perlmutter)	Katko (Meijer)	(TX))
DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick	Stefanik (Keller)
(Perlmutter)	(Pallone)	Stevens (Kuster)
Deutch	LaHood	Stewart
(Wasserman	(Wenstrup)	(Crawford)
Schultz)	Levin (MI)	Strickland
Donalds	(Correa)	(Neguse)
(Norman)	McBath (Bishop	Swallow
Evans (Neguse)	(GA))	(Correa)
Gonzalez (OH)	McEachin	Taylor
(Meijer)	(Trone)	(Armstrong)
Gosar (Gaetz)	McHenry	Thompson (CA)
Green (TN)	(Wagner)	(Correa)
(Fleischmann)	McNerney	Tlaib (Dingell)
Guthrie (Barr)	(Pallone)	Torres (NY)
Herrera Beutler	Moore (WI)	(Correa)
(Moore (UT))	(Neguse)	Trahan (Trone)
Higgins (NY)	Nehls (Weber	Van Drew
(Pallone)	(TX))	(Fleischmann)
Huffman	Newman (Trone)	Vargas (Correa)
(Neguse)	Porter (Wexton)	Walorski (Banks)
Jacobs (NY)	Rice (NY)	Williams (GA)
(Fleischmann)	(Wasserman	(Neguse)
Jayapal	Schultz)	Wilson (SC)
(Pallone)		(Norman)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 8167

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor from H.R. 8167.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 783

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 783, a bill originally introduced by Representative Young of Alaska for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 7769

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) as cosponsor of H.R. 7769, the Helicopter Safety and Noise Management Act.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 28, 2022, at 5:13 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 3369.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 7334.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 7352.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

CONTINENTAL DIVIDE TRAIL COMPLETION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 1254 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. 5118.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1136

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. 5118) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to prioritize the completion of the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes, with Mrs. LEE of Nevada 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 amendments specified in House Resolution 1254 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 5118.

The CHAIR. That request cannot be entertained in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 5118, the Wildfire Response and Drought Resiliency Act. This legislation represents another major effort to act on climate by responding to record-setting wildfires and drought that are impacting communities across our country.

I represent Colorado's Second Congressional District, and it was barely over 6 months ago, in December, when the Marshall Fire burned through Boulder County and became the most destructive fire in Colorado history. The fire destroyed a 30-acre subdivision in a matter of hours; nearly 200 homes burned to the ground and caused over \$1 billion in damages.

This comes on the heels of my district experiencing the first and second largest wildfires in the history of Colorado in Larimer and Grand Counties in 2020, and as parts of the western United States is currently experiencing their driest drought conditions in over 1,000 years.

Fires have become the primary occupation of so many of our offices. Countless constituents come to us, grieving the loss of their homes, but also seeking the resources that they deserve from the Federal Government. We have a duty to provide our constituents with the support that they need to rebuild and to recover.

The reality is that we are living with a new normal as climate change results in a hotter, drier, planet where historic drought and record-setting wildfires are not merely a possibility, but an inevitability. Wildfires no longer occur in a season, but throughout the entire year.

I am grateful to my colleagues, to Chairman GRIJALVA, Chairman SCOTT, Chairwoman MALONEY, Chairwoman JOHNSON, Chairman DEFazio, Chairman PALLONE, Chairman NADLER, Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, Chairwoman WATERS, Chairwoman LOFGREN, and House leadership for helping bring this package to the floor. This is exactly the kind of response that our constituents desperately want to see from Congress.

H.R. 5118 provides a whole-of-government response to the droughts and the wildfires impacting American communities across the country, and it combines more than 50 standalone pieces of legislation originating from nine different House committees, including Republican and Democratic bills.

We began this important work last year, as my colleagues know, working with President Biden to pass the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which included historic investments to reduce wildfire risks, improve ecosystem resilience, and ensure reliable water supplies.

The Wildfire Response and Drought Resiliency Act builds on those investments. It provides an increased starting wage for our brave and courageous Federal wildland firefighters. It invests in water security and in drought resilience and advancing wildfire science.

As climate-change-induced drought means long-term reductions in rain, snow, and necessary water supplies, this legislation invests in drought-proof water projects like water recycling, modern desalination, advancing water data management and technology, protecting and restoring ecosystems.