

voice to preserve and strengthen the Hawaiian people.

Prince Kuhio championed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which was signed into law by President Warren G. Harding in 1921. The Act enables Native Hawaiians to return to their lands in order to support self-sufficiency and self-determination. This Act created a homeland to build homes, farms, ranches, and otherwise engage in economic activities.

This legacy of championing Native Hawaiian causes and preserving Native Hawaiian history is what Prince Kuhio is most remembered for, and I am proud to continue that legacy here in the United States House of Representatives.

BIDEN ELECTRICITY COST SURGE

(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, American families are paying the highest electricity prices in over 40 years with a 16 percent increase from a year ago. Additionally, natural gas prices to heat homes are up 30 percent as winter nears due to the extremist Biden energy failing policies.

According to a HelpAdvisor survey in the last year, a quarter of Americans reduced food and medicine so they could pay the energy bill. Unfortunately, one in six people, more than 20 million households, are behind on utility bills and in danger of losing utility services. The Energy Information Administration anticipates an additional increase this year.

The policies of Biden and Democrats are responsible for high utility costs and destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from a safe haven in Afghanistan to America. With the open Biden border for terrorists, American families today are at a greater risk of mass murder than ever before.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BATTA VUCIJIC

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor the life of my dear friend, Batta Vucijic.

Batta was a leader in our community whose contributions to North LA County will live on for several generations. As a founding board member at the Ministry of Life Without Limbs, he spread the good word of our savior Jesus Christ to many, including those in prison ministries.

Batta is served by the love of his life, Rita; their seven children, Marco, Natalie, Elena, Lara, Daniela, Dario,

Ariana, and Nataliya, who he loved as his own; their spouses; and dozens more family members.

I will always remember Batta's commitment to our community and his friendship. We will miss him dearly. Today, he sits next to the one true king in heaven and looks down upon us all with pride with his warm, humble demeanor.

Batta was a dear friend, a great American, and a true believer. We love you and miss you, my friend. God blessed us with Batta's presence and now has brought him home.

NATIONAL RICE MONTH

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, September is National Rice Month, and even though the month is two-thirds over with, it is never not time to have rice for your next meal.

I want to pay a special tribute to the hardworking farmers, millers, merchants, suppliers, and the consumers who make rice not only such a nutritious product, but an important part of our economy.

My home State of California is the second largest rice-producing State with the Sacramento Valley home to 95 percent of California's production. It is an important part also of the Pacific Flyway. California primarily produces medium grain sticky rice, otherwise known as sushi rice.

America's rice industry contributes 125,000 good-paying jobs and an estimated \$34 billion to our Nation's economy. Rice farmers take excellent care of their land, prioritizing resource conservation, nutrition, top yields worldwide, and product quality.

U.S. rice farmers produce more rice using less land, energy, and water than they did just 20 years ago, providing critical habitat for many species, which is really important, once again, to the Pacific Flyway as the ducks and geese move all the way from the north down to the south.

Unfortunately, drastic water cuts have taken half of the rice acreage out of California this year. We need to keep the industry going strong for all those good needs.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1098, JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOAN SEPARATION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1361 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1361

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (S. 1098) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans. 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 Education and Labor or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Thursday, September 22, 2022, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of September 19, 2022, September 20, 2022, September 21, 2022, or September 22, 2022, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) 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. PERLMUTTER. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1361, providing for consideration of S. 1098, the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member on the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as one motion to commit.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader, or his designee, the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on suspension bills considered on September 19 to September 22. This authority lasts through September 22, 2022.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased we are here today to provide consideration of

the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act, led by my colleagues Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia and Representative DAVID PRICE of North Carolina.

From 1993 to 2006, the Department of Education allowed married couples to consolidate their student loans for a lower interest rate through the Joint Consolidation Loan program requiring participating borrowers to be jointly liable for repayment of their loans.

Congress ended the program in 2006, but Congress never provided a way for borrowers to disentangle the joint debt. Across the country, there are borrowers who remain liable for their former spouse's debt, even in cases of domestic violence.

□ 1215

Today, we have an opportunity to address this problem and help borrowers regain their financial independence.

The Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act allows borrowers to apply to the Department of Education to split their consolidated loan into two separate Federal direct loans. Borrowers can submit either a joint application or an individual application in the case of domestic violence, economic abuse, or inability to reach a former spouse.

The joint consolidation loan remainder would be split proportionally based on the percentages that each borrower originally brought into the loan. The two new Federal direct loans would have the same interest rates as the joint consolidation loan.

Additionally, the bill would enable borrowers to regain access to student loan relief programs such as the public service loan forgiveness program and income-driven repayment programs for which they were previously ineligible due to their joint consolidation loans.

Like many of my colleagues, I have heard from constituents who have joint consolidated loans with their former spouses. Some of those constituents express frustration that, due to having a joint loan, they become ineligible to apply for other student loan relief programs, even though they are no longer with their spouse and they are carrying the burden of the joint loan.

Constituents also entrusted me with their personal stories of domestic abuse and how these joint consolidated loans won't allow them to get away from their abusive former spouses.

Just a few weeks ago, a constituent from Wheat Ridge, Colorado, reached out to my office. It has been nearly 17 years since her separation from her abusive spouse. Following her divorce, not only did she and her family continue to receive harassment from this individual, but she was left with the financial burden of paying the entire loan balance because her former spouse refused to pay his share.

All she wanted was a fresh start, so she moved to Colorado, but her joint consolidated loan with her former spouse continues to loom over her.

She is not asking for her loans to be forgiven. She is simply asking to be fi-

nally freed from this abusive relationship by passing this Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act.

I thank her and all the other individuals who have come forward to share how this loan program that ended nearly two decades ago continues to affect their daily lives.

I commend Representative PRICE, Senator WARNER, and all of my colleagues for this work on this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I thank the Representative from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 1098 is intended to ensure borrowers who need to separate their loans urgently because they are victims of domestic or economic abuse are not put in further harmful financial situations due to having a joint consolidation loan that cannot be separated.

Republicans fully support the intention of the bill, and it is something we should be able to address in a fully bipartisan manner. However, they are concerned that this bill misses the mark.

According to the Department of Education, this bill could not be implemented for at least a year or longer. If we want to truly solve this problem, victims need help immediately.

This bill also broadens the Secretary of Education's authority. It gives the Secretary the authority to allow for new consolidation loans if it is in the fiscal interest of the Federal Government but does not define the term.

In addition, this bill did not receive a hearing in the House Education and Labor Committee, no discussion, no input, simply accepting the Senate's version, which was introduced before the President's announcement of student loan forgiveness.

My Republican colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have an alternative bill that will protect victims of abuse, allowing borrowers to separate their loans immediately rather than waiting up to 18 months.

It also protects taxpayers from potential abuse of authority by the Secretary of Education by narrowly tailoring the authority to help those in need. Congress should always be concerned about relinquishing authority to the executive branch.

This bill also closes all the gaps that exist in the bill that has been brought up on the floor today. Yet, my colleagues were ignored, and now we are left discussing an incomplete policy.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this alternative that would solve the problems without ceding more authority to the Secretary.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I ask the Members to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy, dated September 19, 2022, supporting this particular piece of legislation.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S. 1098—JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOAN SEPARATION ACT—SEN. WARNER, D-VA, AND 3 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of S. 1098, the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act. The bill would build on actions the Administration has taken to support federal student loan borrowers.

While the authority to originate joint consolidation loans ended in 2006, borrowers with these loans were given no way to disentangle their debts, even in the event of divorce, economic abuse, or unresponsiveness from a former spouse. S. 1098 would allow two borrowers with a joint consolidation loan to jointly submit an application to the Department of Education to separate their consolidated loan into two separate loans. The loans would be split proportionately based on the original loan amounts. This bill would also allow survivors of domestic violence or economic abuse or borrowers who are unable to reach the other borrower to submit an individual application to separate their portion of the joint consolidation loan.

The Administration urges the House to pass S. 1098, the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act, and send it to the President, to fix one part of the student loan program and provide this critical support to borrowers with joint consolidation loans.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I listened to my friend from Minnesota, and I appreciate her remarks. The amendment that has been discussed that the Republicans are proposing simply does not go far enough.

This bill really should be embraced unanimously in this House, just as it was in the Senate between Democrats and Republicans, allowing for spouses to separate, take on their own specific piece of the loan, and move forward, no longer staying in this kind of locked-in relationship, especially in those situations.

They do recognize the abusive relationships, but there are also some where there is economic abuse or where you simply can't reach the spouse. In those instances, too, there should be the ability to divide these back into their original forms.

So, this bill, like it was in the Senate, should be accepted, I think, universally by this House. I am sorry to see that there is opposition. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I point out that the vote that my colleague does point out regarding this bill in the Senate was before the President made his announcement regarding student loan forgiveness.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, all I have to say on this rule is to listen to whatever she said, nothing of what my colleague from the State of Colorado says.

I am actually here because my good friend, Mrs. FISCHBACH, is allowing me to correct a mistake. I missed the 1-minute time period, so I am going to use my time to actually honor one of my constituents.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Thomas Ramage, the fifth president of Parkland College since its 1966 inception, who will retire at the end of this year following a remarkable 15 years as president and 24 years of service to the institution.

Under the leadership of Dr. Ramage, Parkland College completed a \$92 million campus master plan that created six new buildings, adding 250,000 square feet of classrooms, labs, and student service spaces to provide the quality educational facilities that our students need.

During his time at Parkland, Tom has continued to adapt to the changing needs of industry, acquiring the Institute of Aviation at Willard Airport from the University of Illinois and forming lasting relationships with private-sector partners.

Under his guidance, Parkland also leads the Illinois community college system by enrolling more than 350 international students, representing well over 50 countries.

Dr. Ramage's strong fiscal management and guidance led Parkland College through a recession, a State budget crisis, and a pandemic. The legacy of excellence that he leaves behind is even stronger than when he became president in 2007.

I have had the pleasure of working with Tom throughout my decade in Congress. I am proud to call him my friend, and I congratulate him on his well-earned retirement.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, ordinarily, I would argue with my friend from Illinois, but since it was such a nice testimonial to the doctor, I will support him in his 1 minute and his nice comments as his friend retires.

Getting back to the matter at hand, Madam Speaker, we are here to deal with loan separation. I would say that we are looking at some 14,000 loans to which this might be applicable.

It will provide a path forward for borrowers with these loans who no longer want their debt to be tied to their former spouse. It is particularly important for borrowers who just want to meet their own debt obligation without being saddled with someone else's.

We have heard from these constituents, as we heard from my constituent from Wheat Ridge, Colorado, about the fact that she has been divorced for 17 years and is still saddled with a debt that her husband owed and won't take responsibility for.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amend-

ment to the rule allowing for the immediate consideration of H.R. 8749 to repeal the methane emissions and waste reduction incentive program for petroleum and natural gas systems.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, just last week, a constituent called my office with concerns about the President's energy policy. Joshua hauls gas for a living and said it is the best job he has ever had, but he worries that President Biden wants to take that away. He asked for my support and expressed his appreciation for anything that I can do to protect the industry.

H.R. 8749 is a key piece of that puzzle. It supports American energy independence and all those who rely on it by protecting the Permian Basin and the largest secure supply of crude oil in the world.

If the Biden administration gets their way on this issue, production will be slowed in that region, jobs will be lost, and gas prices will continue to rise.

Madam Speaker, this Presidential administration is actively working against the oil and gas industry. They have increased natural gas production taxes, prevented energy development in Alaska, and made permitting more difficult.

They are prioritizing supplemental energy technologies like wind and solar, but the U.S. Energy Information Administration's annual energy outlook projected that petroleum and natural gas will be the most used fuels in the U.S. through 2050. We cannot abandon these reliable and essential sources of energy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the author of the bill, to further explain the amendment.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for so eloquently explaining the underlying reason that I rise to oppose the previous question so that we may immediately consider H.R. 8749, which is my bill to strike the new tax on every American, the new tax on natural gas that was included in the Democrats' paycheck reduction act.

At a time when we actually are witnessing probably the most destructive energy poverty crisis in the civilized world, which is happening right now in Europe, in most cases happening in countries that are now experiencing a tenfold increase of their heating bills, a tenfold increase of their energy bills, a tenfold increase of all the requirements of energy, the most foundational piece of any economy, President Biden is driving an agenda to do the same

thing here in the United States, driving an agenda to impoverish the energy needs of this country.

While the President may deny the existence of inflation and crippling price hikes, those of us who are actually buying our own groceries and paying our bills every month know that is false. No position in the United States can deny the economic facts—8.3 percent. That, I believe, pales in comparison to what areas in rural America are actually paying.

Price hikes on energy are the largest driver of this inflation by far. Gas utility bills are up 33 percent. Electricity is up almost 16 percent. It is 16 percent more expensive than it was this time last year.

In the United States right now, today, energy costs are so high that one in six Americans are facing a notice from their electric company that they may be disconnected—one in six.

When I said these words just a couple of months ago, everybody on the other side of the aisle laughed at that proposition. Yet, it is the policy that started with the flurry of activity last January, the executive orders that were aimed at killing the industry that underpins our economy, the industry that won World War II, the industry that has lifted 1 billion people out of poverty, 1 billion people around the world in places like sub-Saharan Africa, the Indian subcontinent, and the Far East. That is because of the shale revolution. That is because of technology.

The Paris climate accords have absolutely nothing on the reduction of harmful pollutants and emissions that private innovation has actually done.

□ 1230

And even knowing this, President Biden and Democrats in Congress have introduced another tax on American energy that will continue to drive costs up.

How many more Americans will be unable to heat their homes this fall and this winter when Democrat tax initiatives make their utility bills 50 percent more expensive than last year?

Does the Green New Deal lobby group want America to follow in the footsteps of the Europeans I just mentioned who have returned—literally returned to burning wood chips in their homes?

Restarting coal plants, where was that in the Green New Deal? Where was that in the Paris climate accord in COP26?

Make no mistake. These costs will swiftly be passed along to the 180 million Americans and 5.5 million businesses that rely on natural gas.

In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates this fee will increase taxes by \$6.5 billion and raise natural gas bills an additional 17 percent, in addition to the inflationary pressures already facing our economy. What an inexcusable error.

Instead of encouraging more U.S. production of oil and gas, House Democrats have opted instead to cut government checks to favored green special interest groups.

And by the way, what happened to the President's promise not to raise taxes on Americans earning less than 400,000? It is laughable.

Americans are begging for lower prices. They are begging for the government to simply allow free market principles to work; to allow the companies that underpin energy to do what they do best, which is to do it better, to do it more efficient; to do it cleaner and to not be dependent on adversaries like Russia and China and other adversaries.

The crowning achievement of President Biden's energy policies will be dependence on adversaries for our energy needs. In Maslow's hierarchy, I couldn't think of something that is worse; dependence on OPEC oil as he goes to Saudi Arabia asking for more production when we can do it here better.

We only need to look at the reckless policies in Europe to understand how bad this can be. We only need to look at the dependence that Europe had on Russia that has now, in many, many ways, led to a crisis in Ukraine.

Energy underpins everything. And I am tired of hearing that we are in an energy transition. We are not. We are in an energy expansion.

Another billion people will be added to the population of this globe within the next 15 to 20 years, one billion. Where is their energy going to come from? Can those people afford electric vehicles?

Where does electricity come from?

These are the questions it would be nice to have in a transparent, open, and realistic debate. In this energy expansion, I invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come to my district to see the fact that my congressional district has more wind energy than the entire State of California. Come see what we do with regards to solar.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PFLUGER. Come to my district to see that, in this energy expansion, it is going to take every available source of energy. But most importantly, it is going to take reliable energy, base-load energy, sources that are primary that can provide the reliability.

We don't need to go the direction that Europe has gone, and we certainly don't need to go the direction that our friends in California have gotten used to with rolling blackouts.

And we don't need higher taxes. Every American family is struggling. The solution is literally directly below our feet. It is literally at the hands of the most innovative and experienced entrepreneurs, engineers, hardworking

patriots. It is here. We can provide that reliability and reduce dependency.

I urge my colleagues to cast their vote for the American family, for the senior on a fixed income, for the small business owner, and for energy security.

And let me issue a warning. If we continue down this path, it will end in energy poverty right here in this country; and those that will be affected most are the vulnerable in our population, the ones that are disconnected from their energy companies; the ones that can't afford to do anything because energy costs are so high.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 8749 which would strike the new tax on natural gas, and get us on a path, once again, to energy dominance, energy security and reliability.

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

I remind my friend, Mr. PFLUGER, that this bill is about separating loans. It is not about the energy policy, although I will address some of his remarks in a second.

This is about the some 14,000 people that have taken advantage, clearly of consolidating loans, but since that point, there has been some disruption in their marriage. So we now have people, as I mentioned earlier, that have been divorced for 17 years, still burdened by a student loan of their ex-spouse and, in that particular instance, an ex-spouse who had been abusive and continues to refuse to pay his share of the loan.

So this gives the spouse who was in the abusive relationship, the spouse who can't find the ex-spouse to help take care of this joint loan, the ability to separate, take care of their own loans, and take advantage of other programs that we, in Congress, the administration, Democrats and Republicans, have put into place, like the public loan forgiveness.

If you are working for the government, in some instances, you can get credit for that service. Many of these people have been unable to take advantage of that. So that is what this bill is about. That is what this rule is about.

Now, as to my friend, I would say to him, you know, gas prices—I don't know about Texas, maybe Texas has higher gas prices than Colorado. But in Colorado, the gas prices have dropped a buck 30 to a buck 50 over the course of the last 4 months, to the point where it is under three bucks.

Madam Speaker, I refer my friend to the article in The New York Times and that I will include in the RECORD titled: "U.S. Gas Prices Have Fallen for 91 Straight Days, a Relief for Consumers."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 2022]

U.S. GAS PRICES HAVE FALLEN FOR 91 STRAIGHT DAYS, A RELIEF FOR CONSUMERS
(By Isabella Simonetti)

The price of gasoline continues to fall steadily, easing pressure on American con-

sumers as the cost of filling a tank continued to tumble from record levels reached earlier in the summer.

Gas prices fell 10.6 percent in August, which helped moderate still-sky-high inflation, Tuesday's Consumer Price Index report showed.

The energy index, which tracks gasoline and electricity among other energy sources, dropped 5 percent last month, as electricity and natural gas prices rose.

After peaking at \$5.02 in June, gasoline prices have dropped for 91 straight days, and the national average stood at just over \$3.70 a gallon on Tuesday, data from AAA show. But analysts point to a few reasons this streak of declines is unlikely to continue.

Because they're determined by oil prices, gasoline prices are also susceptible to a wide range of challenges, like hurricanes that knock out drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and efforts to punish Russia for its invasion of Ukraine by curbing its ability to sell crude on the global market.

While gas prices are down, the overall energy index still remains up 23.8 percent over the 12 months that ended in August. Electricity prices alone jumped 15.8 percent, representing the largest 12-month increase since August 1981, the inflation report said. The jump in electricity prices is largely attributable to the high cost of natural gas, said Laura Rosner-Warburton, an economist at MacroPolicy Perspectives.

As winter approaches, other fuel prices could influence inflation data. The cost of heating a home with natural gas, the most common source of home-heating fuel in the United States, is expected to jump more than 25 percent from last year, to \$952 for the six months from October through March, according to the National Energy Assistance Directors Association.

"You would expect that a hard winter could create a significant increase in demand in price of natural gas," said Bryan Benoit, U.S. national managing partner of energy at Grant Thornton. "And then of course all of this is further exacerbated by what's going on with the war in the Ukraine."

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would also say to my friend from Texas, as it relates to inflation, the gentleman is correct. There has been, on a year-over-year basis, a jump of about 8 percent, 8.3 percent, I think he mentioned. But since the beginning of the year, that has fallen dramatically.

Of course, over the summer we saw deflation in a couple of months, and the most recent inflation report in August was it rose .1 percent. So, annualized, that is a 1.2 percent inflation rate now because we are seeing prices drop, particularly in the energy sector.

So as much as my friends on the other side would like to wish that we had inflation, it is going away because we have been able to pass legislation like the Inflation Reduction Act, which takes a good look at both climate responsibilities that we have in urging and incentivizing towards renewable energy. But it also has a huge piece in there to allow us to negotiate prescription drug prices and bring those down.

So I would say to my friends on the other side, this bill is about dealing with loans, consolidated loans that now need to be separated.

But on the subjects brought up, I can tell you that inflation is dropping

based on the most recent reports, and gas prices are falling.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, we did address some of the issues that we have and the concerns we have regarding the bill that is in front of us. But we also offered a previous question because we should be talking about energy.

The American public is concerned about energy independence and what is happening with energy; how they are going to cool and, in my case, in Minnesota, how we are going to heat our homes. It gets cold in Minnesota, and people are concerned about how they are going to heat their homes this winter and what they will have to cut out of their family budget if prices continue to rise on heating their homes.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) to discuss it even further. And it is cold in North Dakota, too.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, it is actually pretty nice in North Dakota right now, but we are on our way to winter.

Saying gas prices have lowered 91 days in a row is a whole lot like giving a medal to an arsonist for helping put out a fire he started. Gas prices are not lower than when President Biden took office, and other energy prices are continuing to rise.

And I want to see the report that says inflation has gone down because I have seen it has gone up in the most recent numbers to 8.3 percent. I think there was very great dueling chryons going on as we are celebrating an Inflation Reduction Act that does nothing to reduce inflation while the stock market is tanking, and we get a new report that inflation is actually going up.

But I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can consider commonsense policy that would reverse the decision by 220 Democrats in this Chamber to tax American energy producers and raise prices on consumers.

Democrats frame their price-increasing \$1,500 methane tax as a way to reduce emissions, but the small and medium oil and gas companies in States like mine were already taking steps to reduce pollution in an economically viable way. These small and medium companies are the ones that drive energy production, particularly in North Dakota, and are going to be double-regulated from the wellhead to the market.

The structure of the methane program is unwieldy; it is burdensome, and it will only serve to increase prices for consumers. And we have seen just that.

In New York, a typical customer's electric bill is expected to increase by 29 percent from last year—29 percent.

Ratepayers in New Hampshire saw the price of electricity double over the summer.

With one in six families falling behind on their utility bills, and winter right around the corner, the last thing we need are policies that make it more expensive to produce energy in the United States. We need to take the handcuffs off domestic producers and deliver affordable, clean, and reliable energy.

In any rational place in the world, California's energy policies, where they are demanding electric vehicles by 2035 and, 2 days later, ask people to not charge their electric vehicles, and the energy policies of our allies in Germany and other countries in Europe that are seeing the highest utility rates of any civilized country in the world should be a big, red blinking stop sign.

But we are not in a rational world. We are in Washington, D.C., and instead of taking the time to reflect and take reasonable steps to ensure that our country doesn't go down the same path as these other places, we double down on policies that will not work, and they have the added benefit of not actually doing anything to clean up the environment.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone to defeat the previous question so we can go back and deal with an energy policy that is based on reality and not ideology.

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

With respect to the bill that we have before us and the rule that we have before us involving the separation of these loans, I would just say there was a woman named Angela who is on the hook for nearly \$200,000, she has been divorced since 2016.

What she owes is five times what her initial loan was because of this consolidation of loans. And she suffered from domestic violence and has had her credit score drop like a rock. She is faced with crippling debt. And until we are able to uncouple and decouple these joint loans through this separation loan act, she is going to continue to be burdened by something that really is not her responsibility.

That is the bill we are here to really debate and discuss, S. 1098. And obviously, the rule is to allow its debate on the floor of this House.

This weekend, I was out walking precincts on Saturday—going back to the energy discussion that we are having. And at one of the houses was a young man getting his electrical engineering degree at the Colorado School of Mines. And he didn't really recognize too many of the candidates.

But he did say that he was familiar with the Inflation Reduction Act because it is the first time we have done anything of any real significance for a long time to deal with climate change, and he was very appreciative of that. A gentleman who doesn't have an affiliation; he is not a Democrat, he is not a Republican, unaffiliated. But he was aware of the substantial policy changes

and investments we are making to deal with extreme climate that we face all across this country.

I am glad it is nice in North Dakota right now. But across the country, we have seen wildfires at times that nobody has ever experienced before. We have seen terrible floods, and we continue to see the ocean rise.

□ 1245

There are so many pieces to that Inflation Reduction Act dealing with improving our climate and dealing with the change that I certainly was proud to have supported it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Just before I get into my formal remarks, I just want to mention, we did a quick Google search, because I know that my colleague from Colorado just mentioned the dropping gas prices earlier in his comments. We did a quick Google search, and in 2019, the gas prices in Colorado were \$2.14, and they are currently in 2022, \$3.70. So those gas prices, while you may say they are going down a bit, that is a significant increase from 2019.

Madam Speaker, S. 1098 is well intentioned, but there are other ways to accomplish this goal effectively. The current bill will not help victims of abuse for a year or more. The Republican bill would help them now.

The bill we are debating today includes vague language that creates loopholes that would allow the administration to spend billions of tax dollars on broader loan forgiveness without justification and oversight. The Republican bill closes this loophole to ensure that those who really need the help are the ones receiving it.

We owe it to the victims of abuse to have a straightforward and efficient process to help them, and we owe the taxpayers to protect their tax dollars.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule and encourage Members to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I compliment my friend or her Googling talent, because I am sure that is true. The situation that we faced is gas prices shot up to about 4½ bucks, and they have dropped now almost to \$3, or in places across the State, less than \$3.

But, obviously, in Colorado, we are enjoying a very good economy. Virtually everybody is working. We have an unbelievably low unemployment rate. So we feel gas prices are going in the right direction, prices generally are going in the right direction, and there are a lot of people to credit for that, starting with the President of the United States.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining me here today to speak on the rule and the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KAHELE) at 1 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:

Ordering the previous question;

Adoption of House Resolution 1361, if ordered;

En bloc motion to suspend the rules, if offered;

A motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 2490.

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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1361) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1098) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 206, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—219

Adams	Cooper	Horsford
Agullar	Correa	Houlahan
Allred	Costa	Hoyer
Auchincloss	Courtney	Huffman
Axne	Craig	Jackson Lee
Barragán	Crow	Jacobs (CA)
Bass	Cuellar	Jayapal
Beatty	Davids (KS)	Jeffries
Bera	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)
Beyer	Dean	Johnson (TX)
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Jones
Blumenauer	DeGette	Kahele
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bonamici	DeBene	Keating
Bourdeaux	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bowman	DeSaunier	Khanna
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Kildee
F.	Dingell	Kilmer
Brown (MD)	Doggett	Kim (NJ)
Brown (OH)	Doyle, Michael	Kind
Brownley	F.	Kirkpatrick
Bush	Escobar	Krishnamoorthi
Bustos	Eshoo	Kuster
Butterfield	Espallat	Lamb
Carbajal	Evans	Langevin
Cárdenas	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Foster	Larson (CT)
Carter (LA)	Frankel, Lois	Lawrence
Cartwright	Gallago	Lawson (FL)
Case	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Casten	García (IL)	Lee (NV)
Castor (FL)	García (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Castro (TX)	Golden	Levin (CA)
Cherfilus-	Gomez	Levin (MI)
McCormick	Gonzalez,	Lieu
Chu	Vicente	Lofgren
Ciilline	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Green, Al (TX)	Luria
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Lynch
Cleaver	Harder (CA)	Malinowski
Clyburn	Hayes	Maloney,
Cohen	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Connolly	Himes	Maloney, Sean

Manning	Phillips	Soto
Matsui	Pingree	Spanberger
McBath	Pocan	Speier
McCollum	Porter	Stansbury
McEachin	Pressley	Stanton
McGovern	Price (NC)	Stevens
McNerney	Quigley	Strickland
Meeks	Raskin	Suoizzi
Meng	Rice (NY)	Swalwell
Mfume	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Moore (WI)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Morelle	Ruiz	Titus
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Tlaib
Mrvan	Rush	Tonko
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (NY)	Torres (CA)
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Torres (NY)
Napolitano	Sánchez	Trahan
Neal	Sarbanes	Trone
Neguse	Scanlon	Underwood
Newman	Schakowsky	Vargas
Norcross	Schiff	Veasey
O'Halleran	Schneider	Velázquez
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrader	Wasserman
Omar	Schrier	Schultz
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Waters
Panetta	Scott, David	Watson Coleman
Pappas	Sewell	Welch
Pascrell	Sherman	Wexton
Payne	Sherrill	Wild
Peltola	Sires	Williams (GA)
Perlmutter	Slotkin	Wilson (FL)
Peters	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth

NAYS—206

Aderholt	Franklin, C.	McCarthy
Allen	Scott	McCaul
Amodei	Fulcher	McClain
Armstrong	Gaetz	McClintock
Arrington	Gallagher	McHenry
Babin	Garbarino	McKinley
Bacon	García (CA)	Meijer
Baird	Gimenez	Meuser
Balderson	Gohmert	Miller (IL)
Banks	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (WV)
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller-Meeks
Bentz	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Bergman	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Bice (OK)	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Biggs	Granger	Moore (UT)
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Bishop (NC)	Graves (MO)	Murphy (NC)
Boebert	Green (TN)	Nehls
Bost	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Brady	Griffith	Norman
Brooks	Guest	Oberholte
Buchanan	Guthrie	Owens
Buck	Harris	Palazzo
Bucshon	Harshbarger	Palmer
Burchett	Hartzler	Pence
Burgess	Hern	Perry
Calvert	Herrell	Pfleger
Cammack	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Carey	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Carl	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (TX)	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Cawthorn	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Hudson	Rose
Cheney	Huizenga	Rosendale
Cline	Issa	Rouzer
Cloud	Jackson	Roy
Clyde	Jacobs (NY)	Rutherford
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Conway	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Crawford	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Joyce (OH)	Sempolinski
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Davidson	Keller	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Donalds	Kustoff	Smucker
Duncan	LaHood	Spartz
Dunn	LaMalfa	Stauber
Ellzey	Lamborn	Steel
Emmer	Latta	Stefanik
Estes	LaTurner	Steil
Fallon	Lesko	Steube
Feenstra	Letlow	Stewart
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Finstad	Loudermilk	Tenney
Fischbach	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Fitzgerald	Luetkemeyer	Tiffany
Mace	Fitzpatrick	Timmons
Fleischmann	Malliotakis	Turner
Flood	Mann	Upton
Flores	Massie	Valadao
Foxx	Mast	Van Drew

Over the course of the Joint Consolidation Loan program, more than 14,000 borrowers participated. It seemed like a simple consent. Joint consolidation loans allowed for couples to have one single monthly payment with a lower interest rate, but Congress never provided a way for individuals to separate their loans if and when the time came necessary; whether it is an abusive relationship where there is domestic violence, economic abuse, or you simply can't find your ex-spouse to have them help carry the burden.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle who claim they want to help these borrowers, the opportunity to help them is right here, right now. Borrowers who have experienced physical and mental abuse from former partners who now refuse to pay their student loans, like my constituent from Wheat Ridge, say this legislation would set them free. Supporting this legislation is the right thing to do to help borrowers who for years have been stuck in these joint loans with no way out.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1361

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. 8749) to repeal the methane emissions and waste reduction incentive program for petroleum and natural gas systems. 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 & Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8749.

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

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

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam 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 for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.