

fight for freedom, of the change that we all are coming together as Americans.

Let's not erase all of our history.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN FLOOD COALITION

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend congratulations to the American Flood Coalition. They celebrated 5 years of driving solutions to build resilience in the face of flooding just this past Sunday.

As a nonpartisan group of cities, elected officials, military leaders, businesses, and civic groups, the American Flood Coalition provides a platform to advocate for a unified voice for solutions to flooding.

My district in north Texas knows firsthand the destruction caused by extreme weather and floods, including in 2015, when Ray Roberts, Grapevine, Lewisville Lakes flooded after sudden heavy rainfall.

I recently joined the coalition as a Federal champion, and I look forward to working with the American Flood Coalition and other Members of Congress on long-term solutions that speed up the recoveries, boost local economies, and prepare us for what lies ahead.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 260

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed seven hours, with three hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees, three hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, and one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees. After

general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend and the ranking member on the Rules Committee, 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. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 260, providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1 under a structured rule. It provides 7 hours of general debate, with 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees. Additionally, the rule provides for 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their designees, and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees.

Further, this rule makes in order 37 amendments and provides 1 motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation. H.R. 1 unleashes American energy, and it immediately will lower costs for families by resuming lease sales on Federal lands and waters. It will repeal fee increases on energy production, and it will end the moratorium on coal leasing.

Additionally, H.R. 1 strengthens America's critical mineral supply, prohibits a moratorium on hydraulic fracking, and streamlines the permitting process.

Let's remember, on day number one of his Presidency, President Biden launched a war on American energy. He canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, also, by the way, killing tens of thousands of union jobs, and he paused new and oil gas leases on Federal lands. That was day number one.

Under President Trump, we had independence with U.S. energy, but, now, President Biden has drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to the lowest level since 1983. That is the lowest level since I have been alive.

Meanwhile, the administration is increasing regulations on domestic energy production by easing regulations and incentivizing energy production in foreign, communist, and authoritarian states like Venezuela.

□ 1215

In the words of President Biden, climate change is the existential threat to humanity. Apparently, that only applies when the U.S. is the one producing the oil and gas, not when nations like Venezuela produce the natural gas.

President Trump, by contrast, opened 100 million acres of public land and water to exploration. But Biden has leased fewer acres of Federal land for oil and gas drilling than any President since the end of World War II. The results have directly impacted all Americans.

On the day Joe Biden took office, the average price for a gallon of gasoline was \$2.39. Today, the national average is \$3.47. That is a 44 percent increase. And let's not forget June's highest rate of \$5 a gallon.

Due to inflation, the average American family is now paying \$10,000 more in household costs under President Biden.

By leaving our resources in the ground and turning to places like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela for help, Democrats are choosing to increase energy costs and risk the national security of American families.

Why? All to appease far-left, radical activists, since they, the Democrats, lack the moral clarity to do what is right for our citizens.

However, instead of focusing on lower energy costs, this administration thinks the most pressing energy issue is—wait for it—banning our gas stoves. That is their priority. Don't take my word for it. While the administration is now gaslighting the American people,

saying they don't stand for this, in places like New York, they have already taken the lead by announcing just yesterday they will ban gas stoves in new buildings.

Americans shouldn't have to choose between driving to work, paying their electric bills, or putting food on the table. We have to lower energy costs for Americans. We have to do it now.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider a rule for H.R. 1, a bill that might as well be called the polluters over people act. It is yet another example of how this majority, instead of helping everyday Americans, is doing the bidding of their deep-pocketed friends.

We had another mass shooting yesterday, but Republicans won't lift a finger because of the gun lobby. We had another train derailment this week, but Republicans won't lift a finger because of the polluters. Our planet is on fire, but Republicans won't lift a finger because of Big Oil.

Banks are going under, but Republicans want to deregulate more to help their friends on Wall Street. They want to protect kids from what teachers teach in the classroom but not against lead pipes in schools. They say they want to stop inflation but won't go after the billionaire corporations who aren't paying any taxes while they rip people off.

Time after time after time, Republicans continue to put politics over people, and it shows. Anyone who spends 2 seconds reading this bill can see that it is a dirty energy, pro-polluter plan that would drag our economy back decades. This bill puts polluters over people. It makes it easier for companies to strip public lands of their resources and harder to hold corporate polluters accountable for the mess they make. It gives more handouts to Big Oil, as if the industry's CEOs and shareholders haven't already raked in enough money with record profits over the last few years. It guts half a century of environmental protections that ensure the air we breathe and the water we drink is clean, and it sets our country back as the rest of the world moves toward a clean energy future.

There will be plenty of time for us to talk about all the damage the polluters over people act could do to our country and communities, but let me just highlight a few of the worst.

First, it increases the national deficit by half a billion dollars. Considering how much we hear from our colleagues across the aisle about the deficit and the deficit and the deficit, it is fascinating that their most important bill blows a hole in the deficit. So

much for their commitment to fiscal discipline. Don't take my word for it, just consult the CBO. It is a little bit ironic on a day that they are asking that there be dramatic cuts in all kinds of programs that help people in this country, they come up with this bill and add close to a half a billion dollars to our deficit.

Second, it is a job killer. This bill will kill jobs. Over the last few years, Democrats have invested in building a homegrown, clean energy system so we don't have to rely on foreign cartels like OPEC and greedy Big Oil companies for our energy. Investing in these clean energy projects meant we created millions of clean energy jobs. The polluters over people act would kill these jobs and pull our country off course from our path toward a cleaner, cheaper energy future.

Third, it makes it easier to pollute, and it makes it easier for companies to get away with polluting. Just yesterday, a local grandfather in East Palestine, Ohio, detailed the pain caused by the terrible toxic spill there. He said he has "never cried this much in his life." His young granddaughters developed blotches all over their bodies, and their eyes were burning.

This bill would mean more billionaire corporations getting away with polluting without being held accountable, more wells with toxic chemicals, more days where windows are shut because the air is not safe to breathe, more kids diagnosed with asthma because the air quality is so poor.

The worst part is that the Republicans do not care. Their bill literally puts polluters over the people we are here to serve. It forces American taxpayers to foot the bill for cleanup while billionaire corporations dump their toxic waste on our communities. This is sick.

Look at what is happening to our planet, Mr. Speaker. Year after year, the warmest ever recorded; species going extinct at rates not seen in millions of years; sea levels rising and coastal communities feeling the impact; farmers struggling to cope with changing seasons, unprecedented droughts, and crop failures. The answer from my Republican friends is more fossil fuels, more pollution, more drilling, more toxic waste dumped into our communities, more giveaways for Big Oil, and nothing, not a single thing, to lower energy prices.

This bill might as well put ExxonMobil and Chevron in charge of our response to climate change. It might as well put Norfolk Southern in charge of chemical safety. It is a terrible bill that will shackle us to dirty fossil fuels for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Just in rebuttal, my friend and Chairman BRUCE WESTERMAN put it

best. He said when the Democrats talk about polluters over people, what they are actually referring to is not this bill. It is actually a reference to where we are now, thanks to Democratic reckless and radical policies.

Right now, China is actually the largest emitter of CO₂. Russian gas is much dirtier than gas from other places around the world, especially the United States where we have cheap, reliable, and clean natural gas. But instead of taking advantage of our God-given resources, Democrats and their reckless, radical policies make us more dependent on these forms of energy that are much dirtier.

My good friend from Massachusetts said this bill will drag us back decades. Well, I do want this bill to take us back, not decades, but just to a few years ago when we had a Republican in the White House. Let us not forget that the United States, again, we currently lead the world in CO₂ emission reduction, but between 2018 and 2019, the total reported greenhouse gas emissions from large facilities fell nearly 5 percent. Yeah, let's go back. Let's go back to that time.

I find the talk about costs somewhat interesting because only in Washington, D.C., only in a place that lacks logic and accountability like Washington, D.C., can future revenue be considered a cost. Think about that. It is considered a cost. The math does not make sense.

It is also quite fascinating that my friends across the aisle are now talking about deficits, which in the last 4 years they voted for over \$4 trillion of increases to spending.

Before I yield to my good friend from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, I will point out a real-life example of what happens when we follow far-left, Democratic environmental policies.

Often I wish that we had a real-life example that we could talk about in terms of policy, and here we do. It is called Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka, trying to search for a great ESG score to—I don't know, appease globalists, appease the ruling elite, appease woke Wall Street investors—they went for this ESG score and right now they are almost a failed state. Sri Lanka's green new deal, to be clear, was a human disaster. It is an ill-advised national experiment.

Let me explain it. They went to organic farming. Organic farming yielded nothing but starvation, poverty, and chaos. President Rajapaksa, with no warning, with no attempt to teach farmers how to cope with change, announced a ban on all synthetic fertilizers and pesticides. Again, he was after that ESG score.

Ninety percent of Sri Lankan farmers relied on synthetic fertilizers. After the ban, 85 percent of farmers experienced crop loss. The damage done by this organic order was so extensive that the former President had to reverse himself less than 7 months later.

Now, let's just bring this to political reality, the goals of the United States,

where only 20 percent of electricity is powered by renewable energy, 20 percent renewable, and less than 10 percent of American families own an electric vehicle. By the way, those that own electric vehicles are overwhelmingly people who make over six figures a year. It is not your average Americans who are driving around in Teslas. Yet, the left seeks to unilaterally ban all hydrocarbons and instill these pipe dreams that the U.S. will generate all of its energy through wind and solar.

All you have to do is look at California to see what comes next. Last August, Governor Newsom announced that they will ban the sale of gasoline cars by 2035. Just 1 week later, after that announcement, the electric grid was overwhelmed in California, and the State had to ask EV owners to limit when they plugged in their vehicles to charge.

So if you ask yourself: Where does the policy of the left lead us? Look no further than to the idiocy of the policy in California and look no further than to the almost failed state of Sri Lanka. That is where these reckless, radical policies will lead the U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the good doctor, my good friend, and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do want to rise in support of the rule and in support of the underlying bill.

It is interesting that our Secretary of Energy, Secretary Granholm, came to Austin, Texas, 3 or 4 weeks ago and talked about how we should learn from the communist Chinese and their approach to climate change. Talk about putting polluters over people. If she would consult her own energy information agency, she would see that China gets 55 percent of its energy from coal, whereas the United States gets 11 percent of its energy from coal.

Guess what? China is building more and more coal-fired plants each and every week that goes by.

So who, indeed, is putting polluters over people?

I submit it is this administration, and in the last Congress it was congressional Democrats.

This bill before us today is a culmination of years of hard work by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It is a critical step forward.

One of the things that I have worked on for a number of years is the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act. It is included in this bill. I think it is critically important, not just for a State like Texas but, literally, the entire country. I am grateful that other Republicans Members saw fit to include this legislation as we seek to address the obstacles preventing Americans from actually achieving lower energy costs.

In less than 2½ years, we have gone from relative energy abundance to energy scarcity. We have gone from energy affordability to energy unaffordability.

Why in the world would we want to continue down that pathway?

□ 1230

H.R. 1 also contains the repeal of section 50131 of the Inflation Reduction Act. This provided a billion dollars to coerce State and local governments into adopting costly energy codes. If these grants were allowed to stand, they would take away local control over energy code adoption and Federalize these overreaching mandates.

Efforts to push costly and restrictive energy codes across the country overburden new construction and largely ignore the energy performance of the existing housing stock. New homes built to modern codes are already energy efficient, and further increases in that stringency must be carefully considered because, in fact, we are not doing that with these grant programs.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Congress started with what was called the American Rescue Plan. It brought us high inflation and it brought us high prices. This is truly the American Rescue Plan. Let's put energy affordability back within the reach of the average American.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues seem to want to debate energy policy in China and in Sri Lanka. That may be a fascinating topic, but that is not what we are here debating. We are here debating energy policy in the United States of America.

I don't want us to go down the path of more fossil fuels and reliance on more energy sources that are going to contribute to climate change. I want us to lead the world toward a greener and cleaner energy future. I guess the question really here is: Who do you trust?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, their argument is basically: Trust the big oil companies. Give them unfettered access. Give them more money and they will lower your prices. Really?

They have the capacity to produce more now, but they are not, and they are gouging people at the pump. Does anybody believe that the CEOs of these big oil companies making record profits give a damn about average people in this country, about your constituents or my constituents? Give me a break. All they care about is profits. That is the question that people have to answer: Who do you trust? Do you trust the big oil companies?

I certainly don't after the way they have behaved—not just recently, but over time. They gouge people all the time.

The other stuff is fascinating, but we can talk about Sri Lanka at some other time. I would rather talk about the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House's unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and states that it is the position of the House of Representatives to reject any cuts to these programs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are the cornerstone of our Nation's social safety net. These vital programs are under threat as my Republican colleagues continue to demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills.

Some Republicans have recently claimed that they won't cut Social Security or Medicare benefits. Mr. Speaker, that empty rhetoric has not been reassuring to the American people who continue to fear that these programs will be slashed by my Republican friends.

Today, once again, Democrats are giving Republicans a chance to back up their claims with action by providing them with a chance to reassure the American people, not just with their words, but with their votes. Today, they can vote unequivocally that they will not cut these vital programs. Anything short is an empty promise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Vermont (Ms. BALINT), to discuss our proposal.

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that the House can address more serious matters like the future of seniors' hard-earned benefits.

Bringing forth H. Res. 178 gives this body the opportunity to finally affirm our commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

This is what American families want us focused on. When I talk to Vermont families, they are concerned with putting food on the table, with keeping their families safe, with how to afford lifesaving medications, not with propping up corporate polluters at the expense of our future.

Americans need us, on the record, promising that families won't have to choose between essentials like medication, food, and housing. Cutting Social Security and Medicare hurts the poorest and most vulnerable among us. These programs support seniors to age with dignity. They support Americans with disabilities to receive the security that they absolutely depend on.

We are not going to let Social Security benefits go away—we are not. Over 65 million Americans rely on hard-

earned Social Security benefits—65 million. These programs are how we preserve the American middle class, and it is how we support all of the working families in each of our districts.

We need to expand the infrastructure and funding of these programs to fully support seniors in their retirement. We owe them this.

Mr. Speaker, I want all Americans to know, Americans are not going to stop fighting to protect your hard-earned benefits. Again, I urge my colleagues to turn their attention to real issues that impact real American families, and defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we want to help senior citizens and if we want to help the working class, we can make sure that the working class and seniors on a fixed income can actually pay their heating bills.

According to Ipsos polling, one in three Americans have reported trouble affording gas in Biden's energy crisis. Almost 35 percent of Americans, over 40 million, use a gas stove. The Democrats want to ban the gas stove.

Let's talk about the economic pain that is coming to all Americans. Electricity prices are expected to rise over 11 percent this winter. Natural gas prices are expected to rise as much as 25 percent since last winter. About 47 percent of households use natural gas to heat their homes, by the way.

Heating home oil prices are expected to rise as much as 45 percent since last winter. Over 80 percent of homes in the northeast use heating oil. Regions that heavily depend on home heating oil, such as, may I dare say, Massachusetts, they will pay an average bill of \$2,354 extra due to the draconian measures on energy, the reckless and radical policies of the left on energy production.

If we want to actually help these individuals, like Republicans want to do, we can pass H.R. 1. I also want to focus on the comment: Who do we trust? We heard that refrain over and over from my good friend from Massachusetts. I can tell you who we shouldn't trust. We shouldn't trust the so-called experts that the Democrats are infatuated with.

Let's talk about some of the statements we have heard, some of the predictions from these so-called experts. Al Gore in 2006 said: "If you look at the 10 hottest years ever measured . . . they have all occurred in the last 14 years. The hottest of all was in 2005."

"Within the decade there will be no more snows of Kilimanjaro."

He said that in 2006. Last time I checked, it was 2023 and we still had snow on Mt. Kilimanjaro.

Al Gore also said:

The North Pole will be ice-free in the summer by 2013 because of manmade global warming.

That was 2013. It is 2023. Another prediction that has not come true.

John Kerry, the climate czar, in 2009 said:

You have sea ice, which is melting at a rate that the Arctic Ocean is now increasingly exposed to. In 5 years, scientists predict we will have the first ice-free Arctic summer. . . .

That was 2009. It is 2023. Last time I checked, there was still ice in the Arctic.

Let's talk about Barack Obama and his predictions. In 2015, he said:

No challenge poses a greater threat to the future generations than climate change.

When he left office, let's not forget that this man bought beachfront property in Martha's Vineyard, while having the audacity to tell us that we are facing rising sea levels due to climate change. Again, he bought a beachside mansion in Martha's Vineyard, so spare me.

In talking about the greatest threat, notice there was no mention of the CCP, notice there was no mention of Russia, which in debate with Republicans—when Republicans were pointing to the threat posed by Russia, Barack Obama said the 1980s want their foreign policy back.

Let's talk about another so-called expert that the left loves to talk about, Greta Thunberg. In 2018, she tweeted: "A top climate scientist is warning that climate change will wipe out all of humanity unless we stop using fossil fuels over the next 5 years."

Conveniently, Greta Thunberg deleted that tweet this month. Why? Because that was said in 2018. It is now 2023, 5 years later, and humanity is still around.

It is easy to say that the experts have just been wrong in the last few years, since the early 2000s. The so-called experts have been wrong on this topic since the 1960s.

In 1969, The New York Times published a piece from Paul Ehrlich, and he said—the so-called expert, by the way: "We must realize that unless we are extremely lucky, everybody will disappear in a cloud of blue steam in 20 years." Again, that was 1969. That didn't happen. Yet, in 2023, Paul Ehrlich—I think he is 90 years old—this man is still being published and still being held up as an expert on climate change, and appearing on 60 Minutes telling us that we are all going to die. Spare me.

I have got more quotes. I could go on, but it is very clear who you should trust. The Republicans are the party of science. The Democrats are the party of political science. The Republicans are the party of chemistry. The Democrats are the party of alchemy. We are the party of astronomy. They are the party of astrology. The science is with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania. I couldn't help but notice my colleagues on the

other side of the aisle going, yet again, to one of their pages in their playbook that they love to bring out every single time we have a debate—oh, who can you trust?

You can't trust corporate America. Guess what? I don't trust corporate America. I don't trust Big Oil. I don't. I don't trust them any more than I trust any of the big government bureaucrats that decide what is best for me. I do trust the market.

I do trust people being able to go out and use their capital to go out and produce the best energy for the American people. This administration and my Democratic colleagues don't want to do that, as exemplified by the fact that the President of the United States dumped 300 million barrels out of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve last year heading into an election.

Mr. Speaker, 300 million barrels. They cut the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in half in order to bail out their election because their policies were so bad. Even Goldman Sachs is saying that the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, which massively expands unreliable energy, would cost \$1.2 trillion. That is the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for this bill. I think it is critically important that we take a massive step forward to try to ensure that we open up exploration on lands, repeal the methane tax, and overall permitting.

It is only a simple step because the step that has to be taken is to free up the market from the ungodly amount of subsidies coming from Washington, subsidizing unreliable energy at the expense of capital being able to flow into the development of oil and natural gas and nuclear power to ensure that we have the power to live our lives.

When you have a cloudy, windless day, you have to have power. This building is powered by natural gas. Hospitals across the country stay open because of natural gas. The fact of the matter is, you cannot power the world right now with wind and solar power.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle live in unicorn land with fairy dust, completely ignoring the reality of what happens to real Americans when the cost of their goods and services go up; when they have inflation skyrocketing and raising up; when it is destroying their way of life because people want to feel good about themselves hopping in their Tesla and rolling around pretending there is a magic energy tree. There isn't.

People's lives are at stake. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the American people to lack the energy that they need to live their lives productively and affordably. You want to know why inflation is going up?

Because this body has spent money it doesn't have. The Fed has printed money and jacked up the extent to which we have massive easy money out in the supply money. We have spent money we don't have. We have regulated the oil and gas industry to death,

such that we don't have the ability to actually back up their magic fairy dust energy supplies with wind and solar.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that this building is powered by natural gas. I think it is probably more accurate to say it is powered by hot air.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that this bill is a giveaway to the oil companies. The gentleman says he doesn't trust Big Oil, but this is a bill that gives them everything they want—their wish list.

Trust the markets? I don't know that the market can clean up a toxic waste dump or the market can clean up an oil spill or the market can monitor clean air.

□ 1245

The bottom line is this bill goes after all of those protections and actually endangers the American people.

To the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I hope will read more quotes because I think it is making it clear—which is shocking in the year 2023—he is making the case that climate change doesn't exist going all the way back to Al Gore, who actually was right when he said that climate change was a problem, and selectively taking these quotes from way back when.

Does anybody believe that climate change isn't real?

Come to Massachusetts. I will introduce you to my farmers who complain about the impacts of climate change on their ability to make a livelihood. Maple syrup producers wonder whether they will be able to get maple syrup out of trees in Massachusetts because of climate change. I could go on and on about the impacts of climate change on our local farmers.

Much of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, can be tied back to Republicans' affinity for culture wars. They just claimed a little while ago that President Biden and Democrats were planning to come after Americans' gas stoves. It couldn't be further from the truth. No one is taking your stove.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Vox article titled: "Five myths about gas stoves, the latest culture war clash."

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

There was no objection.

[From Vox, Jan. 20, 2023]

5 MYTHS ABOUT GAS STOVES, THE LATEST CULTURE WAR CLASH

(By Rebecca Leber)

The debate over the future of the gas stove has been going on for years, long before last week, when it turned into a full-fledged culture war.

Public health officials, researchers, and doctors have long been taking note of the abundant research linking pollution from the gas stove to respiratory problems, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission announced in December it was taking a look at the health risks to determine what regulations would be appropriate for the gas stove.

But after a member of the CPSC told Bloomberg in an interview last week that "products that can't be made safe can be banned," the fervor built quickly. Republicans (and some Democrats) portrayed the commissioner's remark as a sign that the Biden administration was coming for the gas stove as its next attack on American freedom. And plenty of defenders of the gas stove came out insisting it's the superior way to cook.

The fracas generated some new myths about gas stove regulation—and perpetuated other long-held misunderstandings. Here's how to separate fact from fiction.

MYTH 1: BIDEN—OR FEDERAL REGULATORS—WANT TO TAKE YOUR GAS STOVE AWAY

The hysteria that ensued when the Consumer Product Safety Commission said it would be taking a closer look at gas stoves could be summed up by a tweet from Rep. Ronny Jackson (R-TX). "I'll never give up my gas stove. If the maniacs in the White House come for my stove, they can pry it from my cold dead hands. Come and take it!"

Some confusion comes from remarks from CPSC Commissioner Richard Trumka Jr., who told Bloomberg that "any option" is on the table as the independent agency considers the hazards posed by the gas stove: "Products that can't be made safe can be banned," he said. The CPSC later clarified those remarks: The commission said that there is no ban under consideration, and "the CPSC is looking for ways to reduce related indoor air quality hazards."

There are a lot of other options, like requiring range hood ventilation to be sold alongside the gas stove and warning labels, that the commission could consider before an outright ban. And any CPSC regulation for stoves would apply to new products being sold, not those already in people's homes.

What's more, it's not the White House that's calling all the shots here. The CPSC commissioners are appointed by the president, but otherwise, its regulations are not vetted through the White House, unlike the Environmental Protection Agency's process. States and cities are also already taking action to minimize the climate and health risks involved with combusting gas indoors.

The White House has said it doesn't support a ban, but it is promoting incentives through the Inflation Reduction Act that help people voluntarily electrify their homes.

MYTH 2: GAS STOVE HAZARDS ARE "NEWFOUND"

In a letter to the CPSC's Trumka, Sen. J.D. Vance (R-OH) calls the gas stove a "newfound 'hidden hazard' that rests on limited research." In another section, Vance says there's a "lack of compelling evidence."

The study that caught national attention estimated that almost 13 percent of childhood asthma cases in the U.S. are linked to gas stove use, similar to the level caused by secondhand smoke. That study is based on a review of the evidence from 2013, which examined 41 studies from multiple countries, dating as far back as 1977, to conclude that children living in households with gas stoves had a 42 percent higher risk of currently being diagnosed with asthma and a 24 percent higher risk of being diagnosed with asthma at some point in their life.

"Although the effects of gas cooking and indoor NO₂ on asthma and wheeze were found to be relatively small . . . the public health impact may still be considerable because gas cooking is widespread," the authors of the 2013 evidence review concluded.

These studies looked at the impact of gas cooking specifically. But there's an even longer trail of studies looking at the pollutant nitrogen dioxide, which is emitted by gas

stoves, and the damage it does to people exposed to it outdoors. In fact, outdoor NO₂ pollution is regulated by the EPA, which has done its own thorough reviews of NO₂ risks.

MYTH 3: NO TYPE OF COOKING CAN COMPARE TO THE GAS STOVE

The idea that gas is vastly superior to all its alternatives is pervasive and is eagerly pushed by both appliance makers and the natural gas industry. Whirlpool, which manufactures both gas and electric, says matter-of-factly on its website, "If you like to make meals that require rapid temperature changes, gas ranges might be the way to go."

The comparisons between gas and electric are usually comparing apples and oranges: the contemporary gas stove against dated electric stoves. The better modern equivalent is induction, which uses electromagnetic energy that makes the pans themselves a heat source, leaving the actual stovetop relatively cool. These new models come with settings that allow you to cook precisely at a certain temperature and hold that heat, with a lower risk of burns. Other positive reviews note that induction stoves are easier to clean and can boil water faster than gas stoves.

Chefs are also more split on induction versus gas than the public realizes. In a Vox interview, Jon Kung, a Detroit-based chef, noted that he prefers induction because it improves his indoor air quality and heat in the home. He also noted you can use woks with it, a common complaint about switching away from gas. Sierra magazine has talked to other chefs who prefer induction. "For me, it was an economic no-brainer," chef Michael Godlewski said on opening an all-induction restaurant in Pittsburgh in spring 2022 called EYV (Eat Your Veggies). "They asked me where I wanted the gas line, and I said, 'Nowhere.'"

An induction range is expensive; it can run you in the thousands of dollars. But the cost is coming down. One program some households may qualify for is the Inflation Reduction Act's kitchen appliance tax credits and rebates. The 25C tax credits cover a range of energy-efficient products in the home, including an induction range. It allows you to deduct 30 percent of the costs of electrical work on the house (up to \$1,200). Later this year, there will be rebates available, too, under the High-Efficiency Electric Home Rebate Program. Households making up to 150 percent of the local median income will lower the upfront costs of the appliance and installation. Lower-income households (below 80 percent of the median income) can have all their costs covered under the program.

In the meantime, households that don't want to wait or don't qualify could also opt for a portable plug-in induction stovetop, which costs much less and is renter-friendly.

MYTH 4: MOST OF AMERICA USES GAS STOVES

Gas stoves are common but not ubiquitous. Per the Energy Information Administration, on average, 38 percent of the country uses gas for cooking, or about 40 million stoves. But those numbers vary widely depending on where you are. New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and California have the highest rates of gas stoves in the country, over 60 percent. Southeastern states have some of the lowest rates in the country, under 20 percent.

Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) reacted to the CPSC uproar by tweeting, "I can tell you the last thing that would ever leave my house is the gas stove that we cook on."

Manchin himself may have a gas stove, but many in his state do not. In fact, a survey from the EIA in 2020 found that a quarter of West Virginia residents have a gas cooking appliance, while 73 percent use electric.

The consequences of gas appliances aren't also evenly distributed. Children, who have

smaller lungs, are at higher risk of developing complications from NO₂, and so are older adults and people with preexisting health conditions. Another risk factor is if a person is already exposed to other pollution sources in addition to the stove. They might live near a highway, an industrial site, or even in an area with concentrated gas appliances all venting outside, so they are breathing dirty air both outside and indoors.

MYTH 5: AS LONG AS YOU USE VENTILATION, THE RISKS DON'T MATTER

The American Gas Association's website emphasizes that with ventilation like a working range hood, the gas stove is not a problem for indoor air quality. The Wall Street Journal editorial board echoed this: "Studies flogged by the climate left don't account for the effects of ventilation. One even sealed a test kitchen in plastic tarps in an effort to show that gas stoves increase pollution."

More recent research from LBNL found that a gas stove can also be leaking methane, a greenhouse gas, even when the appliance is shut off. Inside the home, the level of methane is probably low enough that the researchers don't consider these leaks to be a health threat. But methane is also a larger problem, not just for its climate risks but because it contributes to ground-level ozone that harms human health.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, our neighbors back home send us here to Washington to stand up for them and to stand up to the powerful special interests that have all too much influence here in the halls of Washington. They expect us to work to lower costs and for good-paying jobs and safe and healthy communities.

That is why this Republican polluters over people act is so dangerous. It does the opposite of what we should be doing here. This bill would reward the price gouging of the big oil and gas companies. This bill would roll back our bedrock environmental protections for clean air, clean water, and lower-cost clean energy.

Mr. MCGOVERN, I think it is important that you know that in the Energy and Commerce Committee last week, at the very last minute, with no hearing and very little debate, they included a provision that would roll back an important piece of the Inflation Reduction Act that puts money back into people's pockets back home for energy efficiency rebates and discounts to help lower energy bills. They do this at a time when Exxon made record profits last year, \$56 billion, and Chevron \$36 billion.

Fossil fuels were the main driver of inflation, yet you want to give another massive giveaway to oil and gas companies and take away simple energy rebates for homeowners?

They are doing it at a time when it looks as if this bill would increase the deficit by half a billion dollars. This is an irresponsible giveaway to polluters at the expense of our neighbors back home. It deserves a big "no" vote.

Let's think about the people we represent for a change.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, spare me the gaslighting on gas stoves. We know that, just yesterday, New York banned all gas stoves in new buildings. We are talking about New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), who is my good friend on the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, which provides consideration of legislation to bring relief to Americans and unleash the power of American energy.

Forty percent—that is the spike in heating costs borne by many of my constituents in New York State during a bitter, life-threatening winter. For a family on a budget and a retiree on a fixed income, that 40 percent hike is a painful one. It means doing without certain items from the grocery store or carefully rationing when and how you keep the heat on in your home despite bitterly cold temperatures.

Mr. Speaker, these are the terrible choices that my constituents must make due to the Biden-Hochul energy agenda. This is life for many Americans in the unaffordable, inflation-ridden Biden economy.

Let's not be fooled by the President's rhetoric about a Putin price hike at the pump. The regulatory machine imposed on American energy has been built for one objective in mind: to destroy our Nation's energy sector as we know it.

In New York State, our Governor, Kathy Hochul, has made it a top priority to force our State's farmers, the guarantors of our Nation's food security and leaders in conservation, into a future of expensive and unreliable electric vehicles and equipment.

That technology doesn't even exist yet. We know that current EV technology is inferior to diesel machinery. We know that a future with more EV batteries and EV motors means greater dependence on China. God forbid we let those inconvenient truths get in the way of the left's radical and out-of-touch Green New Deal religion.

The southern tier of New York sits atop one of our country's greatest natural resource endowments, the Marcellus shale. Just across the border from my district in neighboring Pennsylvania, hydraulic fracturing has created an economic miracle and newfound prosperity. It has transformed their economy while counties in my district in the southern tier are some of the poorest in our State.

Yet Governor Hochul, who is taking her cues from Democrats here in Washington, has made it her mission to ensure those same opportunities, that dream of prosperity and economic revival, are denied to New Yorkers in the southern tier.

Democrats in Albany and Washington have locked away the promise of natural gas production. They have blocked the construction of oil and gas pipelines. They are now leading the way in banning natural gas to our homes.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are desperate for relief and an end to the left's destructive anti-energy agenda. H.R. 1 promises to unleash the power of our Nation's energy sector once again. It will create countless new jobs and bring investment and economic rebirth into communities across this great country. It will allow Americans once again to live in a world where they can afford to farm their farms, drive their cars, put food on their tables, and heat their homes. I support this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, the way everybody is yelling and screaming over there, you would think that they want to have a debate on ideas, but this rule actually blocks over three-quarters of all the amendments submitted.

Democrats offered 95 amendments. Mr. Speaker, do you know how many they made in order? Seven.

That is not just an interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker. It means that real and important ideas are completely blocked from even being debated on this House floor on their signature piece of legislation. Many of these amendments would protect public health and safety and our environment.

Take, for example, an amendment by Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, No. 37, that requires permits prepared under the NEPA process to include an analysis of health and safety impacts. That is it. It seems like a good idea to me.

The amendment sponsored by Mrs. SYKES, No. 118, takes into account drinking water quality when approving permits. I don't think clean drinking water ought to be a radical idea, but maybe it is on the Republican side of the aisle. We should debate it.

Another amendment submitted by Mrs. DINGELL, No. 15, would require the United States to actually reduce its emissions before repealing a section of the law, the greenhouse gas reduction fund, set up to spur clean energy projects and reduce air pollution.

I offered three amendments, and they were all blocked. One of them, No. 94, struck language in this bill providing blanket immunity to polluters who violate our country's bedrock environmental laws.

Really? Do you think that is objectionable? We can't even debate it here? We can do 7 hours of general debate, but we can't take 10 minutes to discuss whether companies should get a blank check to pollute. Whose side are you on?

Back in January, Speaker MCCARTHY actually promised both sides "more openness, more opportunity for ideas to win at the end of the day." Mr. Speaker, that promise has been broken. This Republican majority knows their

bills fail to address real problems, so they continue to block our good ideas from even coming to the floor rather than debating them. They are scared to let Americans hear our ideas, and that tells you everything you need to know.

This is important, I think, for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know. My friends across the aisle blocked all six amendments from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, Mr. FITZPATRICK, who happens to be a Republican. They blocked all six.

Mr. FITZPATRICK's amendments would have opposed drilling in the Delaware River Basin, ensured the act doesn't preempt a State constitution, established an infrastructure and environmental innovation trust fund, preserved the greenhouse gas reduction fund, prohibited energy exploration activities on any protected public land, and added a sense of Congress that U.S. citizens have a right to clean air and clean water.

I get it. My friends are pushing this polluters over people bill, but our colleague, a Republican who is the co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, was denied all six of these amendments.

What are you afraid of? Why don't you debate these?

It is unfortunate that those ideas apparently were just too radical to even be debated on the House floor.

I truly hope that Mr. FITZPATRICK, after witnessing his own majority block all of his amendments, even the ones the gentleman watered down with a revision, I hope he will not support this rule. Supporting this rule would mean the gentleman would be voting to block his own amendments.

In fact, I ask all Republican members of the Problem Solvers Caucus to vote "no" on this rule because if you don't, this will be the pattern.

Mr. Speaker, I rhetorically ask the Problem Solvers Caucus how they plan to solve any problems if their Republican leadership won't even let them offer their ideas and won't even give them a fair fight on this floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, spare me the pearl-clutching about this amendment process. Let me remind my friends across the aisle that last Congress, their H.R. 1 was a closed rule. Zero amendments from either side were allowed.

We have Democrat and Republican amendments on this bill, so, again, spare me. Also, spare me that we don't want to debate this. Spare me that we don't want to have this debated and other viewpoints heard.

White House climate adviser Gina McCarthy recently called for Big Tech censorship of Americans who dared to speak out against the Biden administration's radical, far-left Green New

Deal agenda. I think it is very clear who wants censorship. I think it is very clear who is afraid of ideas that don't fit their narrative. It is the Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD), who is my good friend.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1.

From day one, this administration has demonized American energy producers, forcing prices to skyrocket and compromising our national security.

My Missouri constituents care about three things, Mr. Speaker: food, fuel, and fertilizer. This President has done nothing but raise prices on all three.

Our constituents don't want to be forced to drive a Prius. They want affordable prices at the pump. The F-150 is the model of a truck made in Missouri. It shouldn't be what it costs to fill it up, but that is exactly how much it cost this past summer. It has to end.

Since taking office, President Biden has canceled construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, which could have supplied us with more than 800,000 barrels of oil a day. He has depleted our strategic reserves to their lowest levels since 1983. The cherry on the top, Mr. Speaker, is that he has prevented any new permits on Federal lands and completely undermined the permitting process.

This President has kneecapped American energy producers.

America should not have to choose between driving to work and putting food on the table, but that is exactly what is happening in America today. This administration is making them make those tough choices, and that is exactly why we need H.R. 1.

We promised the American people that we would make sure they could fill up their trucks. We promised that we would fight to make it affordable to heat their homes. We promised to fight the woke Green New Deal policies that are killing our energy sector.

This legislation does just that. It will increase domestic energy production. It will reform the permitting process for all industries. It will reverse the anti-energy policies being perpetrated by the Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not complicated. We know that American energy producers make the cleanest energy in the world. Let's not only make America energy independent; let's make America energy dominant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rules package on this critical piece of legislation and "yes" on H.R. 1.

Let's put a tiger back in the tank and not a kitty cat in the glorified golf cart.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania just said that when we introduced H.R. 1, our H.R. 1 was a closed rule. I would urge him to go back and look at the statistics because our H.R. 1 in the 117th Congress had a structured rule with 56 amendments in order, more than the 36 on this bill. In the previous Congress, our H.R. 1 had even more amendments in order.

If the gentleman can't even be kind of factual about that, what else should we wonder whether it is based on fact or not?

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, Democrats believe in putting people over politics. Last Congress, Democrats tackled climate change and brought down energy costs for the American people. Those investments in the Inflation Reduction Act have already spurred investments in clean energy projects and created good-paying jobs. At a time when we see rising costs, the Inflation Reduction Act will save the average American family \$1,800 a year.

The Biden administration is also moving forward with an important rule to limit methane emissions nationwide. New Mexico led the way on this. We strengthened our methane emissions rules in 2021.

The Energy Information Administration data shows that even though we strengthened our methane emissions, we grew year after year for 5 years in natural gas and energy production. The Land of Enchantment shows us that we don't have to sacrifice the environment for energy production.

H.R. 1 would sacrifice the environment and put polluters over people. Members of the majority are pursuing this at a time when CEOs for large corporations have made record profits. While the industry made \$451 billion in profits just last year, New Mexicans and people throughout rural America were taking groceries out of their carts to pay for gas.

H.R. 1 will not make it cheaper for the ranchers I know in Colfax County to fill up their trucks. Republicans dispute this and say the bill will lower costs. Let's see.

I offered an amendment to see if that is true. My amendment simply states that H.R. 1 does not take effect until the Secretaries of Energy and of the Interior certify that it will lower costs for American taxpayers and consumers.

What did the Republicans do with this commonsense amendment? They voted it down unanimously.

What are they afraid of seeing?

What are they afraid of debating?

The reality is H.R. 1 guts our long-standing environmental safeguards. It makes it easier to dump toxic and hazardous wastes. It threatens clean drinking water and lines the pockets of the wealthiest CEOs.

The Clean Water Act has long been key to protecting America's water. As

we say, “agua es vida”, “water is life.” This bill guts our Clean Water Act in favor of polluters.

The Republicans also rejected my amendment to protect our water from mining for our farmers, ranchers, and Tribes. We have to remember that the mining that is proposed that would decimate our waters is often proposed by Chinese-owned subsidiaries or foreign-owned subsidiaries.

The Republicans also blocked an amendment that would have required that Chinese subsidiaries not own our minerals.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I admit I misspoke, it wasn't H.R. 1 in the 117th. It was—wait for it—H.R. 5, the Equality Act; H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act; and H.R. 4, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. Three of the low-numbered bills that my friends across the aisle ran last Congress, their so-called priority bills, were run with closed rules. Just to be clear on that, it wasn't H.R. 1, but it was the three other ones that they ran as a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for admitting his error and admitting that he was wrong when he said H.R. 1 was a closed rule we brought up. I think perhaps the gentleman might want to go back and consult some of his research because I think he would also find out that some of the things he said about climate change would be proven factually wrong.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, as I said last night before the Rules Committee, I don't disagree with this legislation. Every day I hear from my constituents, gasoline prices are way too high. They have got to choose between paying for groceries and filling up their gas tank. I agree, we should ease the burden on American taxpayers. However, I disagree that this is the right way to do it.

Just last year, the Inflation Reduction Act made historic investments in home energy rebates, tax credits, clean energy vehicles, land and water conservation, and grants for greenhouse gas reduction.

This legislation, in contrast, does not make any new investments. It simply walks back all the progress we have made before we can see the results of those investments.

That is why I introduced last night an amendment to simply say that any future investments in gas and oil be equaled in clean energy investments.

Why? Because we want to make sure we keep America on the world stage as leaders in energy production.

Sadly, my colleagues across the aisle will not be bringing up my amendment for a vote this week.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I didn't prepare a speech today. I brought the bill to the floor because I have great empathy for my colleague on the other side of the aisle who has the unenviable task of somehow trying to defend this 200-page bill, the polluters over people act. These 200 pages put polluters first at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe me, I encourage you to read the bill. Buried in this 200-page bill, on page 40, is a provision that gives the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the EPA the power to grant a waiver to any refinery in this country from the key requirements of bedrock environmental laws that have governed this space for the better part of the last 50 years, since the days of President Richard Nixon.

Look at subparagraph (c) that enables any party who acts under a waiver granted under this bill to violate any environmental law and have blanket immunity. The Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, NEPA, you name it, they will waive it. That is not a bill that puts people first. It is a bill that puts polluters first. It is why I am proud to vote “no” and why I encourage every Member of this distinguished body to vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until my closing.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from nearly 100 energy and environment groups including the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, and Oceana.

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

There was no objection.

MARCH 27, 2023.

Re Vote Recommendation on H.R. 1, the “Lower Energy Costs Act”

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, the undersigned organizations write to express our strong opposition and to urge you to vote NO on H.R. 1, the so-called “Lower Energy Costs Act,” which the House will take up this week.

This legislation would exacerbate the climate crisis, perpetuate environmental injustices, and undermine U.S. economic and national security by prolonging reliance on risky and volatile energy sources. Its sweeping changes to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Mineral Leasing Act, the Mining Law of 1872, and the Clean Water Act prioritize polluter profits over public health and exhibit an astonishing disregard for government accountability and the voices and welfare of communities impacted by federal decisions.

DIVISION A

Division A would encourage new fossil fuel production and infrastructure, despite the scientific consensus that there is no room for

investment in new fossil fuel production if we are to keep the world on a 1.5 °C compatible pathway. It would also undermine bedrock environmental laws, including NEPA, by short-circuiting permitting processes and limiting public input. NEPA is a critical environmental law and an important tool for frontline and environmental justice communities to influence federal infrastructure projects that will impact them the most.

Division A's most egregious provisions:

Repeal the Methane Emissions Reduction Program created by the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). This critical program supports efforts to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas sector, improve methane monitoring, fund environmental restoration, and help communities reduce the health impacts of pollution.

Undercut public transparency and input from communities by arbitrarily limiting the time for environmental reviews. The bill alters the approval process for gas pipelines by requiring all other federal and state agencies to defer to FERC.

Strip away the federal government's responsibility to examine the full impacts of LNG expansion on US energy markets, the environment, and local communities. It would make it easier to approve LNG exports by removing the first three sections of the Natural Gas Act, which require a public interest determination for LNG exports to non-FTA countries and by mandating that FERC deem gas exports in the public interest. LNG exports negatively impact Americans by exacerbating climate change, raising domestic energy prices, and perpetuating environmental injustices, and these factors need to be taken into account when deciding whether to approve additional LNG export terminals.

Authorize the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to waive the Clean Air Act (CAA) and Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA) requirements for waste produced by certain energy facilities. Exempting energy waste potentially including everything from fracking wastewater to mine processing facilities and tailing sites to nuclear facilities from these laws threatens the health of people in frontline communities, as well as our air and water. The waste from energy production are some of the most threatening products and sites, and often they exist for hundreds of years, even in perpetuity, which is part of the reason why the Superfund program is overwhelmed.

Undermine the Toxic Substances Control Act by short circuiting the review and approval process for new chemicals used in the energy sector, whether that is for fracking, petrochemicals, mining or dozens of other products. This rushed and weak assessment, which would lead to default approvals, would result in the blind rubber-stamping of chemicals for use in energy that have deleterious impacts on human health and the environment. Virtually any chemical that plays a role in the production, refining, distribution, and use of energy could be designated as “critical” by the Department of Energy.

Allow the EPA Administrator to circumvent the scientific process of approving or denying flexible air permitting at the agency. Doing so could potentially allow the EPA Administrator to increase air pollution from so-called “critical energy resource facilities,” subsequently harming environmental and public health. A broad spectrum of facilities that emit toxic air pollution could evade scrutiny for health impacts, including processing and refining products of oil, gas, coal, minerals, and fertilizers.

Modify the organization of the Department of Energy, taking the authority on many issues and processes that are vital for the protection of communities, air, lands, and

water away from those who have the expertise in understanding the potential impacts of extraction and production, whether that is the Department of Interior (DOI) or Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In doing so it makes the only metric for consideration economic, which would mean that communities, lands, and waters would be sacrificed.

This Division also contains a provision purporting to support domestic supplies of “critical minerals,” but in reality creates a new legislated term—“critical energy resources”—which the majority has defined to mean virtually anything related to the energy sector, whether that is oil and gas, coal, petrochemicals or nuclear production, mineral processing, and refining.

Other notably problematic provisions in the remainder of Division A would:

Prohibit the President from issuing a moratorium on fracking unless authorized by Congress. Fracking releases massive amounts of methane, a potent greenhouse gas that has more than 80 times the power of carbon dioxide over a 20-year period, driving approximately one quarter of the warming our planet has experienced to date. Fracking also harms local communities and ecosystems by releasing air pollutants and contaminating water sources.

Exempt certain energy facilities from requirements to secure an interim permit before operating, instead allowing the facilities to operate before securing such a permit. The result could be the release of harmful pollutants into our air and water, threatening the environment and health of people in frontline communities. The facilities that could receive a permit without an accurate assessment of their impact include everything from radioactive waste to petrochemicals to fertilizer to mining waste, all extremely toxic industries.

Express disapproval of President Biden revoking the Presidential Permit for Keystone XL pipeline. If built, Keystone XL would have carried 830,000 barrels per day of the dirtiest oil on the planet, threatening our climate, farmland, critical water resources, and wildlife habitat along the pipeline's path.

Express the sense of Congress that the federal government should not restrict the export of crude oil or other petroleum products. Increased oil drilling and exports have enormous climate repercussions and pollute communities and ecosystems. They also open U.S. consumers to the whipsaw effects of geopolitical tensions and conflicts, creating energy instability and often driving significant increases in energy prices. The federal government must ensure that these exports do not compromise US climate and environmental justice goals or undermine our global climate leadership.

DIVISION B

Title I would take us in the wrong direction on onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing. It would lock in decades' worth of fossil fuel infrastructure, preclude protections for millions more acres of public lands, split estates, and offshore waters, and handcuff the Biden Administration's ability to address the climate crisis through thoughtful management of our shared public resources. Like many recent proposals from the present House majority, it attempts to further prop up the federal fossil fuel program despite rising (and record) production, and industry's existing access to tens of millions of acres of our shared public spaces and thousands of approved and unused permits to drill on federal lands and in offshore waters.

To start, Title I:

Mandates leasing onshore and offshore, eviscerating long-standing precedent that defers leasing decisions to the President and the Secretary of the Interior.

Rushes oil and gas drilling permits through the environmental review process with zero regard for community input, effects on endangered species, or emissions consequences.

Exempts as many permitting decisions from the federal review process as possible.

Severely restricts the President's authority to protect specific lands with natural, cultural, or scientific significance.

Repeals the hard-fought common-sense reforms to the outdated oil and gas leasing program that were enacted in the Inflation Reduction Act to ensure that industry pays a fairer share when reaping—and profiting from—shared, public resources. Title II, which incorporates the BUILDER Act, would eviscerate NEPA and fundamentally gut the review of environmental, health, and economic impacts of decisions by over 80 agencies in the federal government. If passed, local community voices would be silenced, the public would be essentially unable to hold the federal government accountable, and polluting industries would be allowed to steer a review process designed to be in the public, not private, interest. The ways this bill would radically undermine informed government decision-making and accountability are too numerous to detail here, but a few merit particular attention:

Dramatically Narrows Application of NEPA and Limits the Scope of Reviews—The bill would radically limit the application of NEPA by redefining the threshold consideration of what is a “major federal action” for the purposes of NEPA. Further, the bill excludes oil and gas gathering lines, federal loans, projects not occurring on federal lands, loan guarantees, and other forms of financial assistance from NEPA, which could potentially allow projects such as offshore oil and gas development, coal fired generating facilities, LNG projects, nuclear facilities, roads, bridges, highways, and concentrated animal feeding operations to evade any review or public scrutiny. For reviews that do occur, it relieves agencies of any responsibility to undertake any new research necessary for informed decision making and potentially prevents the consideration of upstream and downstream impacts of decisions, thus codifying climate denial into federal decisions.

Essentially Eliminates Judicial Review—In addition to reducing the statute of limitations to a mere 120 days, the bill would bar legal challenges to categorical exclusions as well as many environmental assessments. For the few remaining projects subject to judicial review, injunctive relief would be prohibited, thus ensuring that projects move forward regardless of how egregiously deficient a review or harmful the impacts of a project on a community or the environment.

Allows Inherent Conflicts of Interests In Review—The bill would allow project sponsors to prepare their own environmental reviews, thus eliminating objective analyses about the environmental and related social and economic effects of federal actions and institutionalizing bias in the review process. This potentially undermines the entire purpose of NEPA to have federal agencies make informed, unbiased decisions in the public interest.

Prioritizes Project Sponsors Over the Public Interest—The legislation not only would impose arbitrary timelines on reviews but would also prohibit an agency from extending the time if needed to do essential scientific work or to accommodate public comment, unless the project sponsor agrees. Further, the bill would severely narrow what has long been considered the “heart” of the NEPA process, by prioritizing consideration of alternatives that meet the project sponsor goals.

Finally, Title II would exacerbate deficiencies in the existing 151-year-old mining law, result in an unnecessary increase in mining on federal public lands, and put at risk irreplaceable protected lands, special places, endangered and sensitive wildlife, tribal sacred sites, and culturally significant sites. Current mining law has allowed for the pollution of America's environment and waterways, placing additional unjust burdens on communities who have already borne the brunt of our nation's toxic mining legacy. The GAO estimates America is littered with hundreds of thousands of abandoned mines while the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates hardrock mines have polluted 40 percent of the headwaters of western U.S. watersheds and will cost taxpayers more than \$50 billion to clean up. Under current law, taxpayers are potentially liable for billions more in cleanup costs at currently operating mines because the legal requirements for mining companies to remediate lands and waters remain inadequate. This legislation does nothing to address the legacy of abandoned mines or promote remediation of American lands and waters.

Of particular concern, this Title upends more than a century of practice by validating mining claims under the Mining Law of 1872 before the claimant has proven a mineral discovery. Currently, mining claims do not become valid just because the claimant says so: mining rights fully vest only after the miner discovers valuable minerals. Yet, under Section 20307, a claimant would no longer need to actually prove they discovered valuable minerals. Instead, any person could “claim” mining rights on unwithdrawn public lands merely by grounding a stake, paying a fee, and filing some paperwork. This Section would effectively lock out most other uses of public lands, prioritizing mining instead regardless of whether those lands had any value for mineral development.

Title II also continues the current majority's constant attempts to unnecessarily prop up the domestic uranium industry. Under Section 20308, the U.S. Geological Survey is once again directed to reevaluate its list of critical minerals. However, under this bill, “fuel minerals” are now defined to specifically exclude uranium, making it an automatic candidate for consideration despite its dominant use as a fuel mineral.

DIVISION C

Division C (as well as Section 10008(e) of Division A) would weaken state and tribal authority under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, one of the law's most important provisions empowering states. Native, rural, and socioeconomically disadvantaged communities have been fighting to stem the marginalization accompanying resource extraction for decades and Section 401 enables those communities to work through states and tribes to protect their waters.

States and authorized tribes depend on the Clean Water Act Section 401 certification process to ensure that projects requiring federal licenses and permits will not harm the waters within their borders—projects like dams, river alterations, wetland fills, and interstate pipelines. If this bill is enacted, state and tribal experts would lose a key oversight tool for activities that can threaten state and tribal investments in pollution control programs, fish recovery programs, temperature control mechanisms, minimum-flow requirements, and other essential activities.

The bill seeks to limit states' longstanding authority under Section 401 to broadly consider the impact of a project or activity on water quality. It would significantly curb Section 401's express authority enabling states to make certification decisions based

on requirements of state law, which would severely hamstring states' and tribes' ability to comply with laws they have adopted to maintain and improve the condition of their water bodies. As tribes often do not receive the required government-to-government consultation, they depend on Section 401 certification to ensure their waters remain protected. Rollbacks in this proposed legislation would severely restrict the usage of this tool, leaving tribes without one of the few tools they have to ensure their waters are healthy enough to support tribal rights and traditions.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 1 would encourage new fossil fuel production and infrastructure, locking us into increased extraction, high and volatile energy prices, and even greater profits for fossil fuel companies. It would undermine bedrock environmental laws through its short-circuiting of government accountability, meaningful public input, and review. It would put the interests of industry ahead of the public. We urge all Members to vote NO on H.R. 1, and to instead prioritize efforts to meet the challenge of the climate crisis, secure our clean energy future, and protect public health, community voices, public lands, waters, and oceans.

Sincerely,

350.org, Accountable.US, Alaska Clean Water Advocacy, Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Animal Welfare Institute, Azul, Bold Alliance, C.A.N. Coalition Against Nukes, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Oil and Gas Organizing, Change the Chamber, Clean, Healthy, Educated, Safe & Sustainable Community, Inc., Climate Action Campaign, Climate Hawks Vote, Concerned Citizens of Cook County (Georgia), Conservation Colorado, Conservation Lands Foundation, Cook Inletkeeper, Dayenu: A Jewish Call to Climate Action, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Investigation Agency, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Environmental Protection Information Center—EPIC, Environmental Working Group, Fenceline Watch, For a Better Bayou, Friends of the Earth, Friends of the Kalmiopsis, Grand Canyon Trust, Green New Deal Network, GreenLatinos, Greenpeace, HG Conservation Solutions, Hip Hop Caucus, Hispanic Access Foundation, Honor the Earth, Humanity, Indigenous Environmental Network, Interfaith Power & Light, John Muir Project, Kalmiopsis Audubon Society, League of Conservation Voters, Los Padres ForestWatch, Lynn Canal Conservation, Malach Consulting, Micah Six Eighth Mission, Mining Impact Coalition of Wisconsin, Montana Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Nevada Wildlife Federation, NEW MEXICO SPORTSMEN, North American Climate, Conservation and Environment (NACCE), Northern Alaska Environmental Center, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Oceana, Ocean Conservation Research, Ocean Defense Initiative, Operation HomeCare, Inc., Oregon Wild, Oxfam, PACAN, Project Eleven Hundred, Property Rights and Pipeline Center, Public Citizen, Public Citizen, Inc., Rachel Carson Council, Rio Grande Indivisible, NM, Rocky Mountain Wild, Safe Energy Rights Group, Save the Eau Claire River, Seven Circles Foundation, Sierra Club, Soda Mountain Wilderness Council, Southern Environmental Law Center, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, Standing Trees, Stop The Oil Profiteering, Surfrider Foundation, Tapeats, The Wilderness Society, Trustees for Alaska, Tucson Audubon Society, Turtle Island Restoration Network, U.S. PIRG, Voices for Progress, Waterkeeper Alliance, WE ACT for

Environmental Justice, Western Environmental Law Center, Western Organization of Resource Councils, Western Watersheds Project, Winter Wildlands Alliance, Zero Hour

Please note that the organizations listed may not have positions on every topic included in this letter.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are saying that this bill doesn't put polluters over people. This letter I include states: "H.R. 1 would encourage new fossil fuel production and infrastructure, locking us into increased extraction, high and volatile energy prices, and even greater profits for fossil fuel companies. It would undermine bedrock environmental laws through a short-circuiting of government accountability, meaningful public input, and review. It would put the interests of industry ahead of the public."

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, H.R. 1 puts polluters over people. It does nothing to lower energy costs. Their bill makes it easier for companies to contaminate our water and spew pollution and God knows what else into the air. It will make us pay for corporations' messes while they leave behind a toxic trail of disaster.

The polluters over people act is a massive giveaway that ensures the GOP's industry friends make more money. I would say to those who are watching this, follow the money. Look at who the oil companies are giving their money to.

It jeopardizes American jobs. It worsens the climate crisis, and it takes monumental steps back from achieving a clean energy future.

Mr. Speaker, we can do so much better. This is such a blatant giveaway to polluters. This is such a blatant giveaway to big corporate interests. This is such a blatant giveaway to Big Oil. It is offensive.

I urge a strong "no" vote on this rule. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend across the aisle wants to say follow the money so we can see where people's priorities are.

Let's just follow the Strategic Petroleum Reserve release. President Biden shipped 5 million barrels of this emergency fuel overseas to countries, including China. If you want to see where the priorities lie, don't follow the money, follow where the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is going, and that is going to China.

Also, quotes on climate change, I will provide my friend across the aisle with all my quotes regarding climate change. I have got pages and pages of them. What you might find very interesting are all the ones from the 1980s where the so-called experts were calling for the next ice age, so I would direct you to that just for the fun of it.

It is interesting to see how wrong these so-called experts are and somewhat ironic that we are still being told that the experts are right after literally decades of getting almost everything wrong.

The U.S. produces more oil and natural gas than any other country in the world. As a global energy power, we can provide lower energy prices, we can create steady jobs, and we can secure America and our allies with cheaper gas that is cleaner.

Just imagine if the U.S. were supplying LNG from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to our allies in Europe. Think about that instead of our allies in Europe being dependent on Russian gas, which is 41 percent dirtier.

However, the left's goal is to eliminate fossil fuels. They want to make the United States dependent, unstable, poorer, needier, and weaker because they refuse to allow us to exploit our natural resources.

If you want to think about what lies ahead in the future if we allow the Democrats to get their energy plan in place, just look at Sri Lanka. I have already talked about it. Sri Lanka has a great ESG score. They also have an almost-failed state.

Don't think that this is just some misguided plan or misguided misinformation from the Democrats. This is their plan. They want to make hydrocarbons more expensive because their base, the liberal elites that sit at home on Zoom all day, they don't have to put gas in their tank, they work from home. It is the guys who are working, who shower after work that have to put gas in their trucks and cars. That is why it is necessary to pass H.R. 1.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 260

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question 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 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY 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 on House Resolution 260; and

Adoption of House Resolution 260, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 260) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Armstrong	Baird
Alford	Arrington	Balderson
Allen	Babin	Banks
Amodei	Bacon	Barr

Bean (FL)	Gosar	Moolenaar
Bentz	Granger	Mooney
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Bice	Graves (MO)	Moore (UT)
Biggs	Green (TN)	Moran
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Murphy
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Nehls
Boebert	Grothman	Newhouse
Bost	Guest	Norman
Brecheen	Guthrie	Nunn (IA)
Buchanan	Hageman	Obernalte
Buck	Harris	Ogles
Bucshon	Harshbarger	Owens
Burchett	Hern	Palmer
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Pence
Burlison	Hill	Perry
Calvert	Hinson	Pfluger
Cammack	Houchin	Posey
Carey	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Carl	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hunt	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Chavez-DeRemer	Jackson (TX)	Rose
Ciscomani	James	Rosendale
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Cole	Jordan	Salazar
Collins	Joyce (OH)	Santos
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Crane	Kean (NJ)	Schweikert
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Self
Curtis	Kiggans (VA)	Sessions
D'Esposito	Kiley	Simpson
Davidson	Kim (CA)	Smith (MO)
De La Cruz	Kustoff	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	LaLota	Smucker
Donalds	LaMalfa	Spartz
Duarte	Lamborn	Stauber
Duncan	Langworthy	Steel
Dunn (FL)	Latta	Stefanik
Edwards	LaTurner	Steil
Emmer	Lawler	Steube
Estes	Lee (FL)	Stewart
Ezell	Lesko	Strong
Fallon	Letlow	Tenney
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Ferguson	Lucas	Tiffany
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Fischbach	Luna	Turner
Fitzgerald	Mace	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Fleischmann	Mann	Van Dуйne
Flood	Massie	Van Orden
Foxx	Mast	Walberg
Franklin, C.	McCaul	Waltz
Scott	McClain	Weber (TX)
Fry	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	McCormick	Wenstrup
Gaetz	McHenry	Westerman
Gallagher	Meuser	Williams (NY)
Garbarino	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)
Garcia, Mike	Miller (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Gimenez	Miller (WV)	Wittman
Gonzalez, Tony	Miller-Meeks	Womack
Good (VA)	Mills	Yakym
Gooden (TX)	Molinaro	Zinke

NAYS—203

Adams	Castor (FL)	Eshoo
Aguilar	Cherfilus-	Espallat
Alfred	McCormick	Evans
Auchincloss	Chu	Fletcher
Balint	Cielline	Foster
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Frankel, Lois
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Frost
Bera	Clyburn	Gallego
Beyer	Connolly	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Garcia (IL)
Blumenauer	Costa	Garcia (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Garcia, Robert
Bonamici	Craig	Golden (ME)
Bowman	Crockett	Goldman (NY)
Boyle (PA)	Crow	Gomez
Brown	Cuellar	Gonzalez,
Brownley	Davids (KS)	Vicente
Budzinski	Davis (IL)	Gottheimer
Bush	Davis (NC)	Green, Al (TX)
Caraveo	Dean (PA)	Grijalva
Carbajal	DeGette	Harder (CA)
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Hayes
Carson	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Carter (LA)	Deluzio	Himes
Cartwright	DeSaunier	Horsford
Casar	Degrell	Houlahan
Case	Doggett	Hoyer
Casten	Escobar	Hoyle (OR)

Huffman	Moskowitz	Schrier
Ivey	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Jackson (IL)	Mrvan	Sewell
Jackson (NC)	Mullin	Sherman
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Sherrill
Jacobs	Napolitano	Slotkin
Jayapal	Neal	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Neguse	Sorensen
Johnson (GA)	Norcross	Soto
Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Keating	Omar	Stansbury
Khanna	Pallone	Stanton
Kildee	Panetta	Stevens
Kilmer	Pappas	Strickland
Kim (NJ)	Pascarell	Sykes
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Takano
Kuster	Pelosi	Thanedar
Landsman	Peltola	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Perez	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Peters	Titus
Lee (NV)	Petterson	Tlaib
Lee (PA)	Phillips	Tokuda
Leger Fernandez	Pingree	Tonko
Levin	Pocan	Torres (CA)
Lieu	Porter	Torres (NY)
Lofgren	Pressley	Trahan
Lynch	Quigley	Trone
Magaziner	Ramirez	Underwood
Manning	Raskin	Vargas
Matsui	Ross	Vasquez
McBath	Ruiz	Veasey
McClellan	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
McCollum	Ryan	Wasserman
McGarvey	Salinas	Schultz
McGovern	Sánchez	Waters
Meeks	Sarbanes	Watson Coleman
Menendez	Scanlon	Wexton
Meng	Schakowsky	Wild
Mfume	Schiff	Williams (GA)
Moore (WI)	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
Morelle	Scholten	

NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX)	Kamlager-Dove	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Swalwell
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Wagner
Ellzey	Luttrell	
Foushee	Nickel	

□ 1358

Messrs. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and PALLONE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—218

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