

closes the value gap these neighborhoods face with a tax credit to encourage investing in single-family homes to revitalize these communities.

Over the next 10 years, this bill could help build or rehabilitate 500,000 homes and create more than 700,000 construction jobs. For the families whose dreams of homeownership feel unattainable, this can be a game changer.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join Representative MIKE KELLY and me in supporting this legislation for communities across the Nation and the families who want to see them thrive long into the future.

WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER NARENDRA MODI OF INDIA

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

Mr. McCORMICK. Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity to address a very important visit by Prime Minister Modi this week.

I am excited that this person is coming to America to extend goodwill between our two nations in one of the most strategically important relationships we have in the world.

If you consider their relationship to Pakistan, China, and Bangladesh, and the economic power that they hold, it is an economy that has been blossoming in the last 10 years and has increased by over 30 percent while Canada and Russia have actually maintained a flat or decreasing GDP.

The reason this has happened is because they have embraced a constitution very similar to the United States' and values very similar to ours.

I call that we continue to extend our military actions, our military purchasing power, and our economic reliance on each other into the future as we accept Prime Minister Modi here in the United States in the most important accolades that we recognize leadership across the world.

CONGRATULATING OKEZUE BELL

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

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate one of my constituents, Easton's own Okezue Bell.

A Moravian Academy graduate, Okezue is making a mark not just on Pennsylvania's Seventh District, my district, but on our entire country and our world.

Okezue created "WeArm," a prosthetic limb for below-the-elbow amputees that has reached more than 4,000 people. He founded an award-winning app called Fidutam that offers microloans to unbanked, low-infrastructure communities. He was a United Nations youth delegate for climate justice, environmental sustain-

ability, and education, working on educational initiatives for underprivileged students across the globe.

He somehow still has the time to be a standout violinist and tennis championship winner.

I was honored to celebrate his graduation with him this past weekend, and I cannot wait to see what he does next because his intelligence, curiosity, and dedication to making the world a better place represent the best that this country has to offer.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 277, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2023; PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 288, SEPARATION OF POW- ERS RESTORATION ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1615, GAS STOVE PRO- TECTION AND FREEDOM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDER- ATION OF H.R. 1640, SAVE OUR GAS STOVES ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 463 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 463

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. 277) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-6 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for divi-

sion of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 288) to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-7 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. 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. 1615) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to ban gas stoves. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. 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. 1640) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the proposed rule titled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Conventional Cooking Products", and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIM of California). The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), 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. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported House Resolution 463, providing for the consideration of four measures: H.R. 277, H.R. 288, H.R. 1615, and H.R. 1640.

The rule provides for H.R. 277, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, also known as the REINS Act, to be considered under a structured rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective

designees. The rule makes 15 amendments in order.

The rule provides further for H.R. 288, the Separation of Powers Restoration Act, to be considered under a structured rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. The rule makes one amendment in order.

Additionally, the rule provides for H.R. 1615, the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act, to be considered under a structured rule and provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. The rule makes two amendments in order.

Finally, the rule provides for H.R. 1640, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act, to be considered under a structured rule and provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. The rule makes three amendments in order.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

With all the very real issues facing our great Nation, it is really disappointing that once again the House majority has decided to waste valuable time and resources to promote a bunch of half-baked legislative ideas and stir the culture wars pot with MAGA conspiracy theories.

The bills that we started considering yesterday in the Rules Committee and will debate and vote upon in the next couple days, consuming an entire week of scarce legislative time, will do nothing to address the most pressing issues our constituents are begging us to address: gun violence, affordable health and childcare, the growing impact of climate change, Social Security solvency, immigration, and national security.

Worse, the antigovernment philosophy inspiring these bills will ultimately harm Americans by creating dangerous bottlenecks in critical government functions, misrepresenting the role and actions of the Federal Government, and disrupting the government's ability to protect Americans from harm.

Let's get some facts straight. While our colleagues across the aisle have framed their argument as necessary to ensure that Congress exercises its legislative function, they completely ignore the fact that the Federal agencies and rulemaking processes they are attacking have been established by Congress to undertake specific functions. That includes rulemaking, which is

delegated to the agencies by Congress and ensures that they implement policies using the best and most recent expertise available, for the benefit of the American people.

By enlisting the assistance of Federal agencies to administer the laws that it passes, Congress fulfills its constitutional mandate, the mandate for our entire government to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to our colleagues.

In other words, working together with the other branches, our government is charged with accomplishing certain basic goals for the American people. The regulatory process that our colleagues seek to frame as a battle against a vast bureaucratic conspiracy is actually an essential part of ensuring that we all have clean air and water to breathe and drink; healthy food to eat; safe planes, trains, and automobiles to travel in.

In reality, regulations mean that when a senior goes to the pharmacy to pick up their prescriptions, the life-saving medication that they will take is both safe and effective.

When you boil it down, rules and regulations are extremely tangible ways that the Federal Government protects people's health and safety and helps create a fairer economy where everyone has a chance to succeed.

Subject matter experts at agencies craft these regulations, many based on highly complex and technical data. Once a rule is proposed, it undergoes an often years-long rigorous review in which comments are solicited from the public, business interests, and other agencies.

Of course, these rules and regs are issued in response to congressional directives. They are an important step towards implementing laws that Members of this body have passed while representing the people back home who elect them to come here.

We can see examples of successful rulemaking all the time across the country. Before the Clean Water Act, the Delaware River, which runs alongside my district, was so polluted that it stripped the paint off passing ships. These days, you can safely kayak on the river thanks to regulations developed by agencies to carry out that law.

While the regulatory process can always be improved upon, the proposals we are considering today are not good-faith improvements or efforts to provide checks on the regulatory process.

The first of these bills is H.R. 277, the REINS Act, which would turn the administrative rulemaking process on its head, requiring every major rule—of which there are dozens and sometimes hundreds every year—to be passed again by both houses of Congress and signed by the President.

Remember, these rules have been developed in the first instance as a result of congressional action.

What the REINS Act is really doing is creating a process that will cause

gridlock that then Republicans, or other political operatives, can take advantage of to stop rules they don't like.

The burdensome requirements of H.R. 277 are simply not needed because Congress already has multiple opportunities to shape or rescind major rules if it disapproves of them.

We can hold hearings and offer public comment. We can disapprove major regulations before they take effect, or we can rescind those regulations under the Congressional Review Act.

On that last point in particular, I will note that this majority has moved these types of measures through this Chamber already many times this Congress.

In addition, we can also pass legislation to change laws or regulations, if we so please. Of course, we are considering bills today to do just that.

□ 1230

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are aware of the avenues through which Congress can review and reverse rules. I know it because they use them, or try to use them, week in and week out.

For them to paint a bill like the REINS Act as a noble effort to empower Congress is disingenuous, and, ultimately, it diverts attention from the disastrous consequences this legislation would actually create.

Effectively, the REINS Act nullifies all new rulemaking by any administration, whether Republican or Democrat, and it would bring government operations to a standstill. Any new regulation would have to be passed by Congress in order to take effect.

So let's think about what that would really mean. A Congress, with a House majority that would rather bring the country to the brink of default instead of paying bills that Congress has already approved, would have to vote on every new major regulation from every Federal agency.

If that doesn't scare you, the Senate, hardly a model of expeditious legislation, would need to do the same.

In addition, the bill might actually be unconstitutional because it creates a mechanism in which one House of Congress can effectively veto an agency's rule by simply not acting on it within a 70-day legislative time frame.

This, in effect, is indistinguishable from the one-House legislative veto that the Supreme Court held to be unconstitutional in *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Chadha*.

The unfortunate truth is, Congress struggles every day to meet the most pressing needs of the American people. There aren't enough hours in the day, year, or congressional term for us to weigh in on all the regulations that we would need to implement the laws that we are passing.

Under this policy, crucial regulations would be left to languish unacted upon, and the health, safety, and welfare of the people we are supposed to serve would be in jeopardy.

In addition to the REINS Act, there are three other bills that my colleagues are pushing through today which would also undermine the regulatory process and threaten public welfare and safety.

H.R. 288, the SOPRA Act, eliminates the decades-long standard for judicial review of agency decisions. That is a precedent that rests, in part, on the understanding that Congress delegates to agencies certain authorities to carry out the laws that it passes.

It is clear that all the talk on the other side of the aisle about this being to restore power to Congress is empty words because this bill actually incentivizes unelected judges, not Congress, to make and enact policy from the bench. Ultimately, it would slow the rulemaking process and skew it toward more powerful, well-funded, and often corporate litigants, which may be the point.

Finally, the two gas stove bills that our colleagues are pushing this week actually demonstrate some of the flaws in the REINS Act; chief among them, the ready availability of alternatives to the REINS Act proposal and the dangers of politicizing the rulemaking process.

H.R. 1615 and 1640 are fearmongering attempts to prevent the enactment of standards to make gas stoves more safe and efficient and would hinder agencies' abilities to address potentially dangerous consumer products.

The majority's trumped-up battle to defend gas stoves from the Federal Government is nothing more than a conspiracy theory cooked up to embroil Congress in culture wars that shed more heat than light on the issues facing our Nation and are likely done so with a healthy helping of fossil fuel lobbying dollars.

Contrary to the heated rhetoric from our colleagues across the aisle, the Federal Government has not proposed to remove appliances from Americans' homes. That persuasive falsehood has been repeated for months by partisan hacks like Tucker Carlson to stoke grievances and cause chaos.

H.R. 1640, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act, nullifies new, congressionally mandated energy efficiency standards for gas stoves, for new gas stoves only, that would save consumers up to \$1.7 billion in energy bills and cut down on emissions that are being shown to be particularly dangerous to children's health.

Most of us are familiar with these energy efficiency standards, and we rely upon them when we purchase new appliances like stoves and freezers and furnaces. I know that I do because it is the responsible thing to do as a consumer from both an environmental and an economic perspective.

Contrary to my colleagues' assertions, half of the gas stoves on the market today would meet the standard, and the remainder would have 3 years to make the necessary and already available adjustments to bring their new stoves into compliance.

H.R. 1615, the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act, is even worse because it threatens the government's ability to identify and regulate unsafe gas stoves, including those with design defects that could cause injury or death to American consumers.

Just last year, the Consumer Product Safety Commission recalled a gas stove that had sent multiple people to the hospital and placed many more at serious risk of injury or death from carbon monoxide poisoning.

This bill would have prevented the recall of that dangerous appliance and would prevent the Consumer Product Safety Commission from addressing other dangerous appliances in the future. It is simply irresponsible to jeopardize the health and safety of Americans in order to promote conspiracy theories for the far right.

Overall today, my Republican colleagues take a misguided approach to the issues facing rulemaking and Federal regulations. It is clear they don't want to make the government work better. They want to break it.

They would rather allow polluters and corporations to wreak havoc on our environment, children's health, and working people's livelihoods. They would prefer to decimate a regulatory process that improves the lives of Americans every single day.

The Federal Government has long played an important role in promoting the health, safety, and welfare of the American people, and we need to ensure that it can continue playing that role.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose these bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Our constituents didn't elect us to come here and eat fancy dinners and go from one fundraiser to the next, take lavish trips, and rub elbows with important and famous people. They sent us here for one job: Pass laws or, in some cases, repeal laws. Set the rules under which they will live under; and then we are accountable every 2 years.

The Founders were very wise. Some people complain, but every 2 years our constituents have a chance to replace us if the rules we have set aren't in their favor. They have no such choice with bureaucrats.

Our Founders didn't set this system up for bureaucrats to make the laws. Excessive regulation stifles economic growth, hurts small businesses, and raises consumer prices.

In fact, much of the inflation that we see in the sectors of food and energy is due to overregulation. It is vital that Congress act to reduce our regulatory burden now, which raises consumer prices, reduces wages, and costs jobs.

I think the American people watching this debate are somewhat vexed that the other side of the aisle says we need to give up more power to the executive branch when they sent us here to do something, and they wonder why we are so feckless so often.

They are probably shaking their heads. What are these other people talking about that somebody else should make the rules that we live under?

The REINS Act would require congressional approval for regulations that have a major impact on our economy of more than \$100 million, or lead to a raise in consumer prices, or adversely affect employment.

If the REINS Act becomes law, every major regulation promulgated by the administration will come back to Congress for our approval. These regulations, they are not just regulations, these have the force of law. You can go to prison for 10 years, as we have seen with the regulation on pistol braces, just because some bureaucrat decided they wanted to pass a regulation.

In fact, the jobs-crushing OSHA vaccine mandate was one of the things that we should have voted on. If you are going to do that to your constituents, vote on it. But we didn't. We let the executive branch do it.

The idea behind the REINS Act isn't novel. It is enshrined in the Constitution. Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution says: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Does it say and a bureaucracy? No, it doesn't. Does it say some legislative powers herein granted? No, it says all legislative powers herein granted are given to the Congress of the United States.

Congress has delegated its authority to unaccountable Federal agencies over the past decades, and our constituents are feeling that burden. Unelected bureaucrats do not have the constitutional authority to write laws, nor are they accountable to the people. They are career bureaucrats.

Our Congress has this power, and ceding it to the Federal agencies undermines our representative form of government.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. McCORMICK), my good friend.

Mr. McCORMICK. Madam Speaker, I am new to Congress, so maybe I don't see the same problems that other Congressmen and Congresswomen do, but I will tell you one thing, I know the people.

I have yet to hear one constituent say we need more regulation. Nobody is telling me that they want the President to make universal decisions for all of us.

The fact is, we are out of balance. Congress doesn't have the same power it is supposed to have enumerated in the Constitution of the United States. The fact that we have a President that can spend more money than we can save is the exact reason why I just voted against the lifting of the deficit cap.

I can sum this up in one thing: You just made mention from the other side

of the House, look, we make hundreds of rules by bureaucracies, hundreds of rules per year. How can we address that in Congress?

Well, that is exactly the problem. We spend half our time in Congress litigating and debating the rules that were made by bureaucracies. You are right. We don't have time for that.

We don't have time to tell you that we shouldn't put people in jail for something that was made, essentially, law by a bureaucracy.

We don't have time to fight over money that was given away by bureaucracies or spent by bureaucracies.

We don't have time to fight a President in the Supreme Court because of a decision that he made without the approval of Congress when it comes to the budget which we, by the Constitution, should have responsibility for.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, since Austin, deep in the heart of fossil-fueled Texas, is the only place I have ever called home, I don't believe I have ever been in a home without a gas stove. But I certainly don't need any protection through this contrived bill, and neither does any other American.

I don't need to save my stove because there is no Federal bureaucrat out there about to turn off the burners and mandate cold meals forever.

After meddling in our bedrooms and in our bathrooms, as if that weren't enough, now Republicans are turning their attention to our kitchens. Republicans propose in these bills to stop regulations that no agency has ever proposed. It follows the Republican playbook. The easiest problems to fix are those that don't exist in the first place, and they are very good at that.

Pursuing this manufactured problem places this bill in the race for the silliest Republican bill of the year but, with culture warriors developing this kind of stuff all the time, that is an honor that is very competitive to get.

Nonsense like these bills represent just another way of avoiding dealing with the genuine problems that our families and our country confront.

There is a growing body of science that indicates that burning natural gas increases the chances of childhood asthma and can worsen preexisting heart and lung issues. Using gas in the home, of course, like using it anywhere else, can involve methane leaks that are important as we deal with the climate crisis.

This bill prohibits any consideration of science in the future, no matter what it shows, or what improvements might be recommended for health and safety of those who are cooking on a stove or their families.

Unfortunately, rejection of science is to be expected from a crowd of climate deniers who regularly prefer political mythology and ideology over reality.

What we should all be concerned about is not how we are cooking on our

stoves, but how our planet is cooking. It is overheating to a dangerous level.

This bill is yet another indication of Republicans' rejection of science. Our families are already encountering the human health effects of climate change, tropical diseases we have never seen before, heat exhaustion, death and destruction from one disaster after another.

When Democrats pursue solutions to these problems, House Republicans are quick to point, look over there. Look over there at this imagined Fox network fantasy that can upset you, while meanwhile they seem to have never met a polluter they didn't like or to whom they were unwilling to grant special privileges.

More and more families are, in fact, going electric with their cars, their water heaters, their solar panels and more. At some point, I expect my family also will make the change with our stove, not because we are being forced by a bureaucrat, but because science shows that it may be healthier for our grandchildren and for our planet.

Indeed, in January, the American Public Health Association called on Federal agencies to do more to educate the public about these dangers. More research is exactly what we need, including from the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Department of Energy so we can base what we do here on facts, not on fantasy.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments made from the other side of the aisle that I find absolutely laughable is this notion that the REINS Act might be unconstitutional, might have some constitutional infirmity because it requires Congress to pass the laws instead of the executive branch.

They reference a Supreme Court decision, *INS v. Chadha*, that doesn't even read on this bill. The REINS Act does not violate the Presentment Clause because it requires passage in the House, passage in the Senate, and a signature of the President. It doesn't even apply to the Supreme Court decision that was referenced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend.

□ 1245

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, he is completely correct. The only constitutional infirmity is the extent to which we are allowing bureaucrats to make up the law and make up policies without being checked by the branch represented by the people in this body and in the Senate to check them under our Constitution. That is the constitutional infirmity.

To my friend from Texas, who was regaling us on the absurdity, apparently, of our desire to protect the American people from the regulatory state clamping down on their ability to choose how they want to live and have the energy of their choice: Which is it?

The gentleman from Texas sat down in the well and was trying to say, no, we are not trying to ban this, and we are not going to do anything about that, when, by the way, the administration literally said: Ban stoves. It was a literal quote, and I think when they say something, you should actually believe them.

Then the gentleman from Texas went on to say: They want to protect all manner of pollution. We want to stop the scourge of global warming.

Well, which is it? Are we banning stoves in pursuit of unicorn energy theory, or are we actually going to allow the American people to be free?

The reality is, my friend from Texas gave up the joke. Everybody gets it. Everybody knows it. We know exactly where our Democratic colleagues are. They do want to ban the internal combustion engine. They have effectively said so. They do want to get rid of the burning of fossil fuels. They do want to make energy more expensive for the American people. They literally say so. That is the truth.

The fact is, it is not just energy. We have the REINS Act trying to restrict the power of the executive branch so we can stop things like a half-trillion-dollar student loan bailout, which NANCY PELOSI said: The President “does not have that power. That has to be an act of Congress.”

They want to force schools to allow biological men to compete in women's sports under Title IX. We have an amendment to address that.

The executive branch wants to force 10.4 million healthcare workers to take a COVID jab or lose their job, use taxpayer dollars to provide abortions at the VA, unilaterally turn potentially millions of Americans into felons overnight for owning a piece of plastic attached to a constitutionally protected gun, use the EPA to regulate gas and coal-fired power plants out of existence, and use the Department of Energy to tell Americans what type of gas stove they can and can't buy.

We get the joke. The REINS Act is necessary, and I support it. However, I have to use my last 30 seconds to say this: It is ironic that we are voting on the REINS Act just 1 week after Republicans gave up our debt ceiling leverage to actually get it signed into law. That is precisely how the swamp works, Mr. Speaker.

The REINS Act was in our good bill, the Limit, Save, Grow Act, in April. We walked away from it last week to cut a deal, and we shouldn't have. Instead, we are engaging in theater where we are going to send it to the Senate for it to die. We should be serious about forcing votes to get it done in this body.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a document titled: “Gas stove use and respiratory health among adults with asthma in NHANES III,”

the conclusion of which is: “Among adults with asthma, there was no apparent impact of gas stove use on pulmonary function or respiratory symptoms.”

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

There was no objection.

[From Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Oct. 2003]

GAS STOVE USE AND RESPIRATORY HEALTH AMONG ADULTS WITH ASTHMA IN NHANES III (By M.D. Eisner, P.D. Blanc)

ABSTRACT

Background: Gas stoves release respiratory irritants, such as nitrogen dioxide and other combustion by-products. Adults with asthma may be susceptible to the effects of gas stove exposure because of their underlying airway hyperresponsiveness, but this association has been difficult to establish.

Aims: To examine the association between gas stove use and respiratory health.

Methods: The analysis used data from the US Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey among 445 adults with asthma (representing 4.8 million persons with the condition).

Results: Nearly half of the adults with asthma had a gas stove in their home (47.1%). There was no association between gas stove use and FEV1 (mean change 146 ml; 95% CI -50 to 342 ml), FVC (0 ml; 95% CI -151 to 152 ml), or FEF25%-75% (357 ml; 95% CI -7 to 722 ml). There was also no relation between gas stove use and the risk of self-reported cough (OR 0.8; 95% CI 0.4 to 1.7), wheeze (OR 1.5; 95% CI 0.7 to 3.2), or other respiratory symptoms. Controlling for sociodemographic, smoking, housing, and geographic factors did not appreciably affect these results.

Conclusions: Among adults with asthma, there was no apparent impact of gas stove use on pulmonary function or respiratory symptoms. These results should be reassuring to adults with asthma and their health care providers.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Politico article titled: “What the right's gas stove freak-out was really about.” That is dated January 14. The first line is: “No, President Joe Biden isn't coming for your gas stove.”

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

There was no objection.

[From POLITICO, Jan. 14, 2023]

WHAT THE RIGHT'S GAS STOVE FREAKOUT WAS REALLY ABOUT

(By Alex Guillén and Ben Lefebvre)

No, President Joe Biden isn't coming for your gas stove.

Republicans and conservative pundits have spent the past week nonetheless expressing alarm about the fate of Americans' ranges and cooktops—in line with previous GOP complaints about real or imagined threats to hamburgers, toilets, air travel, incandescent light bulbs and gasoline-powered cars.

Genuine or not, the stove flap gave Republican lawmakers an opening to put Biden's energy policies back on the front burner, after last year's spurt of high gasoline prices had faded from the headlines.

It also touches on a real, coast-to-coast crusade by liberal city and state leaders to prohibit gas stoves and furnaces in new buildings, on the grounds that they endanger

health and contribute to climate change. But the White House has disavowed enacting any such ban at the federal level. (“The president does not support banning gas stoves,” White House press secretary Karine Jean-Pierre told reporters after the issue came up repeatedly at Wednesday's news briefing.)

Other Democrats in Washington are looking to avoid the uproar—including the Virginia Democrat who helped spark the fuss.

“I'm loath to touch the stove again,” said Aaron Fritschner, a spokesperson for Rep. Don Beyer (D-Va.), when asked for comment about this week's stove backlash. “It was a very stupid news cycle. So little of it was based in fact.”

In December, Beyer and Sen. Cory Booker (D-N.J.) asked the Consumer Product Safety Commission to look at the health risks posed by gas stoves' methane emissions.

Then a member of that five-person commission suggested to Bloomberg News in a story this week that a ban on new gas stoves could be one of many options to be pursued in the future. But the member, Biden nominee Richard Trumka Jr., had previously failed to get his fellow commissioners to support even regulating stoves, as POLITICO's E&E News reported Tuesday. Instead, the commission plans to gather “public input” on stoves' health hazards and possible solutions.

“I am not looking to ban gas stoves and the CPSC has no proceeding to do so,” Chair Alexander Hoehn-Saric later said in a statement.

By then, though, the issue had escalated to culture-war level—and lawmakers unleashed a barrage of snarky comments.

“God. Guns. Gas Stoves,” the conservative Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio) said in a tweet.

And Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia, a firm defender of fossil fuels, dubbed any stove ban a “recipe for disaster.”

“The federal government has no business telling American families how to cook their dinner,” he tweeted.

That was followed by the introduction of legislation in the House to protect the gas appliances.

While a federal ban is not in the cards at the moment, Biden's signature climate law, H.R. 5376 (117), includes incentives for moving consumers away from gas appliances. That includes an estimated \$4.5 billion in rebates for states to dole out for the purchase of new electric appliances, including ranges, cooktops and wall ovens.

The consumer commission also has several options it could consider should it choose to dive into stove regulation. A report last year from New York University's Institute for Policy Integrity argued that the CPSC could require warning labels on gas stoves, conduct public education campaigns about their dangers or, most directly, issue mandatory rules to reduce the risks.

“The thing that we have really been waiting for is mandatory performance standards to make sure that these consumer products aren't reaching levels that would be known as harmful to health,” said Brady Seals, manager of the environmental think tank RMI's Carbon-Free Buildings program.

Nationwide, about 38 percent of households use natural gas for cooking.

One reason gas industry officials, Republicans and fossil fuel defender Manchin have spoken out so forcefully: Gas bans are increasingly common at the municipal level as a rising number of studies point to possible health hazards, increasing the urgency of squelch any potential federal ban.

A recently published study nabbed headlines for concluding that gas stove emissions contribute to one in eight cases of childhood asthma—likening it to the dangers posed by second-hand tobacco smoke. And a 2022 report from the American Lung Association

that looked at dozens of prior studies found that gas stoves and ovens are major sources of harmful indoor air pollutants that the federal government doesn't regulate because they occur indoors.

Liberal leaders and activists in dozens of cities nationwide have also embraced bans on gas stoves and furnaces as a way to drive down planet-warming pollution from buildings.

Berkeley, Calif., paved the way with the first such ban in 2019—and since then almost 100 cities, including New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Seattle, have enacted similar bans for at least some new homes.

Other types of gas bans are cropping up as well—such as last fall, when Washington became the first state to ban gas-powered heat in newly built homes and apartment buildings, instead requiring electric heat pumps. This week, New York Gov. Kathy Hochul proposed what would be the first statewide ban on gas stoves in new homes and apartments.

"I think we'll start to see a lot more action on this at the state level," said RMI's Seals.

That, in turn, has brought backlash: More than 20 states, mostly those controlled by Republicans, have responded by passing laws prohibiting local governments from banning gas stoves.

Republicans and other fossil fuel supporters hope the conflagration will make the administration think twice about snuffing the stoves.

"I think some of the furor over this is because people do like their gas stove," said Karen Harbert, president of the American Gas Association, an industry group for gas utilities.

Natural gas is already heavily regulated, both at the utility level and through product certification for stoves and other gas-burning appliances, Harbert noted during a call with reporters on Thursday.

"This is not the Wild West," she said.

Ms. SCANLON. I also note that, in that article, it talks about the multiple studies now that are investigating the impact of gas stoves on asthma, including by the American Lung Association.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania and my good friend from Kentucky for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important to assure the American people—and particularly my husband, Dr. Lee—and to proclaim, which we have the ability to do as Members of Congress, that no one's gas stove will be lost or taken.

In fact, I even heard Members say that they are buying a gas stove or getting a gas stove. Let me proclaim again: No gas stove will be taken from any American ever—ever.

It is interesting to be on the floor fighting about freedom and protection of a gas stove. Needless to say, today is June 6. I stood earlier today to honor D-day. I know what those men died for. It is important to be able to protect consumers from dangerous explosions of any kind, and that is all that our agencies are doing.

Again, I proclaim that no one's gas stove is being taken away.

We will be debating freedom of a gas stove, protection of a gas stove, when eight children per day are dying because of gun violence.

I only want my constituents in Houston to know, my constituents in Texas to know, my constituents in the Nation to know, as we represent the entire Nation: No one's gas stove needs protection or freedom because there is an agency that, prospectively, in 3 years, is looking to ensure that all gas stoves are safe. We owe that to the American people.

I have now for the third time been engaged with the REINS Act. Please let me explain to you what that is. It is literally a stop sign of the executive functioning. If a regulation is abusive to the American people, we can file lawsuits, as often happens, to challenge that, and that would be individual consumers or companies. When you have a regulation, it takes at least almost a year for the input of the American people to be able to say this is a regulation that works or not, except the REIN Act will require the Congress to intercede every moment.

Accordingly, if it is about asthma, if it is about heart disease, if it is about good medication, and a regulation comes out, you won't get it because the Congress will have a rein around it. It will be a stranglehold, and we will get nothing done.

The separation of powers, I have done that before, as well, out of Judiciary Committee.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her kindness.

All that will do is end separation of powers and basically say that the courts—not because a petitioner or plaintiff has gone in but because the Congress intercedes and wants the court to stop lifesaving regulations that can be helpful to the American people.

Therefore, I know that we have to do our duty and be here today. I honor, again, the men and women who serve in the United States military and particularly those at Normandy on this day, of which I had the privilege of being there some years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I end my remarks by saying that the American people need us to be serious. Houstonians need us to be serious. Texans need us to be serious. I am saying that no one's gas stove will be removed from their house or their apartment, but we will offer you the ability and the instruction to make sure that everything you have in your home is safe for you and your family.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the story of how the REINS Act originated. It is one of the most popular bills in

Congress. It is the one bill that would do the most to restore the constitutional balance of government.

It was an idea from Lloyd Rogers. Lloyd is a constituent of mine. He grew up in an orphanage where he met the girl who would later become his wife. They were married for 65 years.

Lloyd served during the Korean war. Lloyd came home and ran for county judge executive, where he served the people of Kentucky once again. Time after time, when he was trying to do the right thing for the people in Kentucky, he was frustrated by laws, but he dug into them. They weren't laws. They were rules, and he couldn't talk to his Congressman to get these things fixed so that he could govern locally.

He came up with the idea of the REINS Act, gave it to the Congressman who represented the district before me, and then that Congressman brought it here to Congress. That is the way laws are supposed to happen, not by some bureaucrat.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move on to the gas stove act here. Despite media gaslighting to the contrary, the Biden administration has effectively declared war on gas stoves using varying rationales.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), my good friend.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule, which provides for consideration of legislation to protect Americans from the draconian, unaffordable energy policies of the Biden administration.

When winter storm Elliott hammered my district over Christmas, my constituents endured life-threatening blackouts as the electrical grid struggled to operate through this massive storm. It was the most deadly blizzard in my lifetime.

However, one thing that many of my constituents could count on, despite blackouts and frigid temperatures, was the use of their gas stoves.

Too often, I have heard from constituents across western New York stories of how these appliances were perhaps the only source of heat in their home for folks who were trapped in their homes for 3 days during a deadly storm, which tragically took the lives of more than 40 people.

Unfortunately, soon this access to reliable, affordable energy will be cut off by the ban on gas appliances that this administration has disguised as simply higher efficiency standards.

Democrats here in Washington and up in Albany are determined to make the pipe dreams of the Green New Deal a crushing reality for hardworking Americans.

Our Governor in New York, Kathy Hochul, not to be outdone by the Biden administration, has already marched ahead with a statewide ban on natural gas hookups in new residential and commercial buildings.

Our State's own energy auditors have already raised alarms, concluding that,

with New York's current path, we face an energy future made up of higher costs in an overstretched, less secure grid.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration is ignoring decades of proof that embracing natural gas in our energy supply leads to lower emissions, greater efficiency, and more affordability for American families. Heating bills in New York rose by 30 percent this past winter, and they will continue to climb if we allow the Biden administration to further regulate Americans out of affordable, reliable energy.

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation considered in the rule that protects American families from this administration's radical Green New Deal priorities.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle has said that nobody's gas stove is going to be banned. Let me read you a statement from Jeremy Ortiz, a spokesperson for the Department of Energy: Our "analysis is constructed so that the proposed standard would ensure that products with at least one HIR burner and continuous grates can continue to be available on the market." Here is the punch line: "We did go out of our way to make sure that these two features would remain on the market in creating our analysis. Over half the market would remain if this standard is finalized as proposed."

Wow. They went out of their way. They bent over backward to make sure they were only going to ban half of the gas stoves on the market for now.

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

□ 1300

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

My esteemed colleague from Kentucky talked about the popularity of the REINS Act, but I suggest that that popularity is overstated. The REINS Act has been introduced by its extremist advocates for more than a decade without ever being enacted into law, even when Republicans held both Houses and the White House. I would suggest that it is because saner heads have prevailed and understood that enactment of the REINS Act is bad for America.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House's responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicaid for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are vital to many of our constituents' economic and health security, yet many of my friends across the aisle have called for major cuts to these critical programs.

In fact, just last week, Speaker McCarthy announced he was forming a bipartisan commission tasked with looking at budget cuts and suggested that Social Security and Medicare could be on the chopping block, saying: "We have to look at the entire budget. . . . The majority driver of the budget is mandatory spending. It's Medicare, Social Security, interest on the debt."

It wasn't too long ago that I remember some of my Republican friends calling the President a liar during the State of the Union when he suggested that Republicans were willing to put Social Security benefits on the chopping block.

Now, instead of debating gas stoves and the finer points of administrative law, I am giving my friends on the other side of the aisle a chance to reassure the American public and unequivocally state these programs won't be cut, not just with rhetoric but also with their votes.

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

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise today in defense of Social Security because Republicans are trying to take it away.

Regular, everyday people in our country have long been promised that if you take a part of your paycheck and contribute to Social Security, you will be able to retire with grace and with dignity and you will have enough money to put food on the table, pay your bills, and keep the heat on in the winter.

Nearly 65 million people rely on Social Security benefits, including 131,000 in my home State of Missouri. People with disabilities, retired workers, and their dependents are relying on a fully funded Social Security program.

Instead of strengthening and protecting Social Security, extreme MAGA Republicans in D.C. want to end Social Security as we know it. We are talking about taking away from folks who rely on these benefits, who rely on what this government allows. They want to be able to attack that.

People are already relying on Meals on Wheels. They rely on the Circuit Breaker program. They rely on them in ways that they should have because they have given their hearts and their souls to working for this country. Every single day for decades here in this country, they rely on the fully funded Social Security program that extreme MAGA Republicans want to end.

They would rather protect gas stoves than protect retired workers or protect seniors. We cannot and we will not allow this to happen. We must ensure that lifesaving social programs are here to stay.

As Democrats, we are committed to strengthening Social Security. As Democrats, we are committed to strengthening Medicare, to strengthening the programs that everyday people in this country rely on.

We will continue to fight back against any extreme MAGA Republican attempts to cut these lifesaving benefits. We believe in saving lives, and we show up that way because we are Democrats.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from the great State of Kentucky for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support of this rule which would provide for consideration of my bill, the REINS Act of 2023.

The REINS Act would address regulatory actions by requiring every new major rule or regulation that is \$100 million or more to an industry, proposed by Federal agencies, to be approved by Congress before going into effect. Specifically, the House and Senate would be required to pass a joint resolution in order for a major rule to be approved by Congress.

During his first 2 years in office, the President added more than \$400 billion in new regulatory costs to our economy. The American Action Forum found that the new rules in his first 2 years required 193 million hours of compliance paperwork. That is 193 million hours to comply with new regulations from nameless, faceless bureaucrats who are accountable to no one.

According to the Foundation for Government Accountability, regulations cost Americans \$2 trillion a year in compliance costs, economic losses, and other expenses, Mr. Speaker. These costs are due to the ever-increasing regulatory actions that lack proper accountability by Congress. It is beyond time for Congress to reassert its role by placing new checks on regulatory actions that negatively impact Americans from all walks of life.

The core question that we have to ask ourselves is this: Where is the law-making authority vested within our Nation? Further, what is the primary principle that our system requires to function?

I can give you a hint, but I am sure you know the answer, Mr. Speaker. It is here.

The argument that I hear from my colleagues on the left is that this bill would eliminate the expertise that these nameless, faceless bureaucrats bring. However, I have spoken to thousands of businessowners, industry experts, who are continually having to navigate the regulatory regime at the hands of bureaucrats who have never once worked a day in the private sector, never once having worked a day on any of their operations.

This bill does nothing to eliminate expertise within the executive branch. What it does do is give proper oversight

authority to Congress, specifically through the regulatory process. Those who argue against this bill are quite literally arguing against their own self-interests, against their role as Representatives of we, the people.

James Madison stated in Federalist 51 that "Ambition must be made to counteract ambition." Right now, the ambitions of the executive branch have trumped those of the legislative branch. This has gone on for nearly 100 years, regardless of who is in charge of the White House.

What a poor and pathetic condition we are in if we as Members of the people's House, the House of Representatives, cannot even stand up for the institution in which we serve, that we swore an oath to serve.

Quite frankly, I don't care what party holds the Presidency. I will come down to this floor every single Congress and fight for this bill and fight for we, the people, because this bill, at the end of the day, is about empowering the people, protecting the people from the real swamp, the nameless, faceless bureaucrats who dwell in basements all over Washington, D.C.

We, in Congress, must do what the Founders of this Nation and the Framers of our Constitution expected of us to do, which is to provide a proper, real, equal check to the executive and judicial branches.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle feel the same as me. I hope that one day politics will allow all of us in Congress to make our Founders proud and jealously guard our legislative authority with all the might that we can muster.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of party affiliation, to support the REINS Act and support your folks back home. Let's reassert our Article I authority and support this rule.

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

Once again, my colleagues on the right are reverting to their favorite tactic when confronted with real problems in the real world: distraction to conceal that they are doing nothing.

They propose to grind the gears of government to a halt to impose an extreme ideology that Americans as a whole do not support, just as they threatened to tank our entire economy to impose other extreme cuts that even their own party members couldn't support.

They want to ensure that we can do nothing with these bills, that we can do nothing to protect kids from pollutants and dangerous products, to keep businesses from scamming working families out of money, or to ensure that the food people eat every day is safe.

Imagine an FDA that can't issue new food safety and drug regulations, or an EPA that can't keep our drinking water clean, or a VA that can't properly serve our veterans, or a Department of Transportation that can't en-

force safety standards for cars, trains, or airplanes. This is what the majority is proposing, and it is a very dangerous vision for America.

The people who elect us to Congress depend on us to make their and their children's lives better, and doing nothing will not accomplish that goal. If anything, we need to make our government more responsive to the needs of the people. We need to do better, not nothing at all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Make no mistake: This administration wants to ban gas stoves. They have said it out loud.

Mr. Speaker, 38 to 40 percent of Americans use gas stoves. I asked the ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction for these bills to save our gas stoves if he owns a gas stove. In fact, he does. I asked him: Does it meet the new standards? Would he be able to buy one in the market? He has no idea. He was offended that I would ask such a question.

We have two bills here to protect your gas stoves: The Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act and the Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

The Federal Interagency Committee on Indoor Air Quality has never identified gas cooking stoves as contributing to asthma or respiratory illness, nor has the Consumer Product Safety Commission nor the EPA ever identified gas stoves as a significant contributor to adverse air quality or as a health hazard.

The other side of the aisle just doesn't like gas stoves. They are reaching for any reason to ban these things. They shouldn't. It is shortsighted.

Number one, what if everybody had an electric stove, how would they get the energy? Well, you would burn natural gas, as many States do—most States do—in a turbine; you would generate electricity in a process that is hardly 50 percent efficient; then you would transmit it over power lines to the household, which could be hundreds of miles, at an efficiency of maybe 70 percent by the time it goes through all of the transformers, gets to the house, and then heats up the pot.

Why not take the natural gas to the house and burn it there directly?

Many consumers have identified that this is a lot more efficient, and that is what they do and that is why they have gas stoves. They are 3.4 times more affordable than electric stoves. Those who use gas for heating, cooking, and clothes drying on average save over \$1,000 a year in their household. When the electricity goes out, when you have natural disasters, natural gas is there and usually available to offer life-saving heat and to boil water.

I spent about 3 hours yesterday delving into the Department of Energy's regulations and their scientific basis

for what they are doing because I wanted to know: How can one appliance that burns gas be more efficient than another appliance that burns gas?

If you expose CH₄ in the presence of oxygen, you get a certain amount of Btus. Unless you have got some science project with a catalyst, you are going to get the same number of Btus from both stoves.

When I dug into it, here is what they want to do. They measured efficiency by heating up a pot of water, and they found that stoves with heavy grates or continuous grates that allow for more safety, they said those are less efficient because the grate heats up and less of your energy goes into your water.

Mr. Speaker, people aren't cooking water. They are cooking food. Those grates provide more heat as the food sits there on the stove. The continuous grates provide safety for somebody who is not strong enough to pick up a pan, yet they are saying those are less efficient.

Then in their studies, if you dig deep enough, they admit that a dogged pursuit of efficiency will result in stoves that are less healthy, because to make it more efficient, you shorten the grates and get the pan closer to the flame.

When the flame impinges on the pan, the gas doesn't combust efficiently, and you get carbon monoxide. If all you care about is efficiency, you get more carbon monoxide.

What are they doing? They are going after the high-end stoves. That is where they are going first, the ones with the heavy grates, the ones with the thick walls in the ovens that make it easier to cook good food. They are saying they are less efficient, but they are heating up water. They are not cooking food. They are making assumptions about customer preferences.

In the realm of electric stoves, they say: Induction stoves are more efficient. So we will just make everybody buy new pans because all of your pans don't work on induction stoves. So what, says the Department of Energy.

This is a war on stoves, and the war will be undone or stopped, halted, by the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act and the Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

□ 1315

I want to finish by talking about another bill in this rule, which is to restore the separation of powers. It is pretty simple. This bill is two pages long, and it is basically a legislative repeal of Chevron deference.

Chevron deference may go away soon anyway because it is based on a Supreme Court decision that said: Do you know what? If a regulatory agency does their best and makes a good guess about what they think the law is, then the court shouldn't second-guess the regulatory agency.

That is not the court's job. The court's job is to look at the law as written by Congress, not to say: Stretch it as far as you want, administrative branch.

The Separation of Powers Restoration Act would require the courts to look at all questions of law de novo, including interpretation of constitutional and statutory provisions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a wise bill. It should pass, and the rule for this should pass.

I also want to note, just in closing, that the American people don't understand why my colleagues want to give up power to the executive branch. They elected us to come up here and represent them, to live by the laws that we write, but also to be responsible for those laws when our constituents have to live under them.

It sounds absurd to the American people that we would want to give up that power that those people have entrusted to us.

Whether laws or the structure of government, if my colleagues just follow common sense, they know banning gas stoves isn't going to save the planet. It is going to increase prices. It is going to make it harder for low-income and middle-income families to get by if they have to buy more expensive appliances or if they have to cook their food longer. That is the result of these regulations.

All of that could be reined in with the REINS Act. That is what we need to do. We need to pass this resolution today and get these four bills on the floor. We have allowed amendments, and everybody under this rule has had 72 hours to read the bill. What a concept. Give the American people the time to read the bill, as well. We have read it. We know what these bills do. Put them on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on all four bills and, most explicitly, a "yes" vote on this resolution.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SCANLON is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 463 OFFERED BY
MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mr. MASSIE. 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.

Ms. SCANLON. 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES HOLO- CAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. KUSTOFF, Tennessee
Mr. BACON, Nebraska
Mr. D'ESPOSITO, New York
Mr. SCHNEIDER, Illinois
Mr. PHILLIPS, Minnesota

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 18 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. LALOTA) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 463; and

Adoption of House Resolution 463, 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. 277, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2023; PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 288, SEPARATION OF POW- ERS RESTORATION ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1615, GAS STOVE PRO- TECTION AND FREEDOM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDER- ATION OF H.R. 1640, SAVE OUR GAS STOVES 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. 463) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 277) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 288) to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1615) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to ban gas stoves; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1640) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the proposed rule titled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Conventional Cooking Products", 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 on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 203, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Ellzey	Joyce (OH)
Alford	Emmer	Joyce (PA)
Allen	Estes	Kean (NJ)
Amodei	Ezell	Kelly (MS)
Armstrong	Fallon	Kelly (PA)
Arrington	Feenstra	Kiggans (VA)
Babin	Ferguson	Kiley
Bacon	Finstad	Kim (CA)
Baird	Fischbach	Kustoff
Balderson	Fitzgerald	LaHood
Banks	Fitzpatrick	LaLota
Bean (FL)	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Bentz	Flood	Lamborn
Bice	Fox	Langworthy
Biggs	Franklin, C.	Latta
Bilirakis	Scott	LaTurner
Bishop (NC)	Fry	Lawler
Boebert	Fulcher	Lee (FL)
Bost	Gaetz	Lesko
Brecheen	Gallagher	Letlow
Buchanan	Garbarino	Lucas
Buck	Garcia, Mike	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Jimenez	Luna
Burchett	Gonzales, Tony	Luttrell
Burgess	Good (VA)	Mace
Burlison	Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis
Calvert	Gosar	Mann
Cammack	Granger	Massie
Carey	Graves (LA)	Mast
Carl	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	McClain
Carter (TX)	Greene (GA)	McClintock
Chavez-DeRemer	Griffith	McCormick
Ciscomani	Grothman	McHenry
Cline	Guest	Meuser
Cloud	Guthrie	Miller (IL)
Clyde	Hageman	Miller (OH)
Cole	Harris	Miller (WV)
Collins	Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks
Comer	Hern	Mills
Crane	Higgins (LA)	Molinaro
Crawford	Hill	Moolenaar
Crenshaw	Hinson	Mooney
Curtis	Houchin	Moore (AL)
D'Esposito	Hudson	Moore (UT)
Davidson	Huizenga	Moran
De La Cruz	Hunt	Murphy
DesJarlais	Issa	Nehls
Diaz-Balart	Jackson (TX)	Newhouse
Donalds	James	Norman
Duarte	Johnson (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Duncan	Johnson (OH)	Oberholte
Dunn (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Ogles
Edwards	Jordan	Owens