

Rodgers (WA)	Slotkin	Tonko
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Torres (CA)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Torres (NY)
Rose	Smith (NJ)	Trahan
Rosendale	Smith (WA)	Trone
Ross	Smucker	Underwood
Rouzer	Sorensen	Valadao
Roy	Soto	Van Drew
Ruiz	Spanberger	Van Dуйne
Ruppersberger	Spartz	Van Orden
Rutherford	Stansbury	Vargas
Ryan	Stanton	Vasquez
Salazar	Stauber	Veasey
Salinas	Steel	Velázquez
Sánchez	Stefanik	Wagner
Santos	Steil	Walberg
Sarbanes	Steube	Waltz
Scalise	Stevens	Wasserman
Scanlon	Stewart	Schultz
Schakowsky	Strickland	Watson Coleman
Schiff	Strong	Weber (TX)
Schneider	Swalwell	Webster (FL)
Scholten	Sykes	Wenstrup
Schrier	Takano	Westerman
Schweikert	Tenney	Wexton
Scott (VA)	Thanedar	Wild
Scott, Austin	Thompson (CA)	Williams (GA)
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Williams (NY)
Self	Thompson (PA)	Williams (TX)
Sessions	Tiffany	Wilson (FL)
Sewell	Timmons	Wittman
Sherman	Titus	Womack
Sherrill	Tlaib	Yakym
Simpson	Tokuda	Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Arrington	Goldman (NY)	Turner
Casten	Gottheimer	Waters
Finstad	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Foushee	Moore (WI)	

□ 1812

Ms. PRESSLEY changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes due to a family issue. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 249, “nay” on rollcall No. 250, “yea” on rollcall No. 251, “nay” on rollcall No. 252, “yea” on rollcall No. 253, “yea” on rollcall No. 254, “yea” on rollcall No. 255, and “yea” on rollcall No. 256.

MOMENT OF SILENCE RECOGNIZING SHAWN JACKSON AND RENZO SMITH, VICTIMS OF THE HUGUENOT HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING IN RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

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

Mrs. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside members of the Virginia delegation as we mourn the loss of Shawn Jackson, an 18-year-old high school graduate, and Renzo Smith, his stepfather, an Army veteran.

Just 20 minutes after Shawn received his high school diploma, both were tragically shot and killed when a gunman opened fire at the Huguenot High School graduation in Richmond last week.

We pray for Shawn's mother, Tameeka Jackson-Smith, and his sis-

ter, Renya Jackson-Smith, who, at 9 years old, was struck by a car fleeing the scene that night.

We invite all Members of the body to join us in a moment of silence to remember Shawn and Renzo.

SAVE OUR GAS STOVES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1640.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 495 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1640.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1820

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my bill, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act. I never would have thought that I would need to introduce legislation to protect Americans' kitchen appliances, but this only goes to show how out of touch this administration's policies have become.

In February, the Department of Energy proposed an extreme regulation that would effectively eliminate nearly all gas stoves and gas cooktops on the market today.

The Department's proposed rule sets requirements for gas stoves at the maximum technologically feasible, or

max-tech level. Based on the Department of Energy's own analysis and DOE's own technology support report, 96 percent of the market share of gas stoves will not, I repeat, not meet DOE's new proposed rule. That is a 96 percent ban.

Worse yet, no gas ranges passed DOE's new proposed rule tests. Gas ranges represent nearly 90 percent of all gas stoves sold.

What did DOE do after the public heard about this and pushed back? They adjusted their analysis, seemingly out of thin air. Now, they claim that nearly 50 percent of gas stoves will pass their rule. Guess what? That means more than 50 percent won't. Don't tell me they are not trying to ban gas stoves.

The DOE is justifying this proposed requirement under the false guise of saving Americans money. However, the estimated savings is just \$21.89 over the next 14½ years. That is only \$1.50 per year or 12 cents per month.

Consumers don't want to give up the features of the stoves they like for 12 cents per month. Consumers don't want to wait an extra 7 minutes to watch a pot of water boil for 12 cents per month.

Instead of DOE bragging about how they are going to save consumers 12 cents per month, maybe they should tell the public that natural gas is 3½ times cheaper than electricity and that, according to studies, households that use natural gas for heating, cooking, and drying clothes save an average of \$1,068 per year.

Consumers don't want the government taking away the features on gas stoves that they like and use. That is not the role of the U.S. Government. That is why I introduced the Save Our Gas Stoves Act to protect Americans' consumer choice.

My legislation prohibits the Department of Energy from implementing this extreme rule and prohibits the Department of Energy from imposing standards that result in the unavailability of a product based on the type of fuel the product consumes.

Mr. Chair, I thank the American Association of Homebuilders; the American Restaurant Association; the American Gas Association; the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers; the Arizona Restaurant Association; the American Public Gas Association; the National Propane Gas Association; and several energy companies, including Southwest Gas, which delivers natural gas to consumers in Arizona, for their support of my bill and for their support for American consumer choice.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased that this is a bipartisan bill that has received bipartisan support and that my Republican colleagues and 29 of my Democratic colleagues already voted in favor of an amendment to H.R. 1 that did virtually the same thing as this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of consumer

choice. I urge my colleagues to vote to save our gas stoves.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1640, the so-called Save Our Gas Stoves Act. This is a Republican messaging bill designed to deliberately mislead the American people about gas stoves.

Let's set the record straight with a little reality. The Biden administration is not, and I repeat, not banning gas stoves. This is nothing but a political stunt.

House Republicans continue to put politics over people. With this bill today, they are once again putting polluters over people.

H.R. 1640 is designed to prevent the Department of Energy from finalizing a recently proposed energy efficiency standard for electric and gas stoves and cooktops that would lower energy bills, improve Americans' health, and cut pollution.

DOE energy efficiency standards are extremely popular. A recent poll found that three out of five Americans support stricter energy efficiency standards for appliances and buildings.

The proposed DOE rule that Republicans are trying to prevent from moving forward is a commonsense standard. The claim that 96 percent of gas stoves on the market don't meet the proposed DOE standard is just not true. Mr. Chair, 50 percent of the market already meets the proposed standard, including all entry-level models.

More importantly, the proposed standard only applies to new gas stoves manufactured and sold 3 years after the rule is finalized. That would give manufacturers more than enough time to meet these new standards. There is simply no reason for this proposed rule to be controversial.

No one is saying you can't keep your gas stove. No one is saying you don't have a choice. No one is saying you have to move to electric stoves. This is all misinformation.

Rather than acknowledging the facts, Republicans are instead employing their usual scare tactics, putting politics over people.

Despite what you hear from my Republican colleagues today, the DOE rule does not ban gas stoves, does not remove gas stoves from homes, and does not prevent anyone from putting a gas stove in their home.

This rule only applies to new stoves, and, as I said, manufacturers have 3 years to meet the standard.

Mr. Chair, I am sorry I have to keep repeating it, but I know the other side keeps repeating the misinformation.

All this means is that if a consumer goes to buy a new gas stove in 3 years, it will be more energy efficient and cheaper to operate. That is a win for consumers, our health, and our ongoing fight to combat the worsening climate crisis.

Mr. Chair, to make it worse, Republicans are not just going after this energy efficiency standard. Since the bill does not include a sunset clause, it could forever limit the Department of Energy from taking substantive action to improve energy efficiency of cooktops. This is just another way Republicans are continuing to prop up their polluter friends.

This bill as well as the REINS Act, which is on the floor later this evening, show that Republicans are skeptical of everything agencies do, including all rulemakings and regulations.

Republicans think that they can do the math, conduct the analysis, and reach conclusions better than the subject matter experts at our Federal agencies. That is not how our government works. We hire agency experts to make the best decisions and do their jobs best. The Department of Energy rulemaking process is detailed and well researched, with ample opportunity for public engagement.

Commonsense energy efficiency standards save everyday Americans money and reduce emissions. These standards are popular, and cooktops that meet the standard are already available on the market.

Republicans claim to care about energy prices, but this Republican bill prohibits the Department of Energy from finalizing a rule that can save consumers up to \$1.7 billion.

□ 1830

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1640 should be rejected so that the Department of Energy can proceed with its commonsense energy efficiency standards.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, respectfully, my Democratic colleague, Mr. PALLONE, said: We are not banning gas stoves.

Yet, the Department of Energy studied this for many years, and in their own analysis, their own book, and their own standards called the technical support document in table 1032, it says that only 4 percent of the gas cooktops that they have tested will meet the qualifications. That is 96 percent that will not. It says that is 4 percent of market share, meaning 96 percent won't.

Even if it is true, which I don't think it is, where Mr. PALLONE says that now 50 percent already qualify, that means 50 percent don't. To me, that is at least a 50 percent ban.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I can't even believe we are at this moment where the administration wants to take your gas stove—not take your gas stove but limit what you can purchase in the future.

I rise in support of H.R. 1640, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

It is no secret this administration has waged war on American energy.

From day one, President Biden has waged war on American energy, doing everything possible to phase out the use of all fossil fuels, including American-produced oil and clean-burning, American-produced natural gas.

Now, they are taking it a step further. They are dictating what appliances Americans can purchase for their homes.

In February, the Department of Energy announced a new proposal that would ban most natural-gas-fueled stoves on the market today. According to DOE's evaluation, only 4 percent of the gas stove cooking tops tested would meet DOE's proposed standard. DOE's proposed regulation would render gas stoves almost completely unavailable to the American consumer.

The average annual savings under the proposed rule would be only about \$1 over the average lifetime of the appliance—\$1 a year. We are debating a proposed rule that would save Americans, on average, \$1 a year over the life of the appliance?

Mr. Chair, we have a lot more to do in this United States Congress than debating a proposed rule that will limit Americans' choices for appliances that would only save them \$1 a year.

This clearly does not achieve the significant savings of energy as the law, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, requires.

So, what is this all about? I will tell you what it is about, Mr. Chair. The Democrats and this administration hate fossil fuels, and they want to diminish Americans' standard of living.

This rule is illegal, and it should be withdrawn. It is not a sincere effort to improve efficiency but rather a part of the whole-of-government approach to target energy sources they ideologically oppose.

H.R. 1640, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act, which we are debating today, would prohibit the Secretary of Energy from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the recently proposed rule. It would also prohibit the Department of Energy from reissuing a rule that bans the use of natural gas.

Their goal is to end natural gas in this country. Natural gas is what got us down to the carbon emissions levels that we have achieved. If you want to approach it from the climate change standpoint, the carbon emissions standpoint has been because of natural gas.

It would also prohibit the Department of Energy from reissuing a rule. It would clarify that DOE does not have the authority to remove cooking products from the market simply because of the fuel product that the appliance consumes.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, and I thank Congresswoman LESKO for her leadership on this and for introducing this bill.

Americans should be free to choose the cooking products they use in their homes and their businesses, and this bill ensures that. Households that use

natural gas for heating, cooking, and clothes drying save an average of \$1,068 per year compared to homes that use electricity for those appliances.

The rush to green and mass electrification efforts pursued by the Biden administration are costing Americans and making everyday life more expensive, all for \$1 per year savings.

It is gas stoves today. It will be gas furnaces tomorrow. They are already talking about gas hot water heaters and then dryers. They are coming after your natural gas appliances because they hate natural gas.

The bottom line is that, on day one, President Biden said that we are going to end the use of fossil fuels. He wanted to ban fracking, offshore production, and onshore production.

That is the real reason we are debating this. It is not about the appliance. It is about the war on energy and American-produced energy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that is in front of us today which prioritizes American energy affordability and reliability and that puts the American people first and gives them choices.

Let the market determine which choice they can have, and let the consumer choose which one best meets their needs for their family, for their households, and for their businesses as they look at the bottom line in their budgets because the intention of the proposed rule only saves American families \$1 a year. Give me a break.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1640.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who is a member of the committee.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Today, we are arguing about a proposed Department of Energy efficiency standard for stoves, not just gas stoves, but every sort of kitchen stove.

Let me be clear about what this proposed rule is and what it is not. It is not a ban on any type of appliance. Let me repeat that: It is not a ban on any type of appliance. Instead, it is a well-reasoned proposal to help us save energy and reach our environmental goals, two very important objectives that we need to undertake here in the United States Congress.

Since the Energy Policy and Conservation Act was passed in 1975—so this is not something that came out of the ether; it has been around a long time—it has been the Department of Energy's job to put forth efficiency standards for kitchen ranges and ovens and to update them once every 6 years. This is what the Department has done here.

In its detailed proposal, the Department of Energy examined its statutory ability to implement the standard, consider its economic impact on manufacturers and on consumers, and calculated the potential energy savings.

Our job in Congress, as Congressman PALLONE said, is not to be subject matter experts on stoves and cooktop efficiency. Hopefully, we have other things to focus on. Instead, our job is to tell the agencies what their jobs are and set forth the standards by which they should do them.

We have done that here, and the scientific and other experts at the Department of Energy have done their jobs that we have given them in issuing a commonsense, easy-to-implement proposed rulemaking.

Now, rather than debating this CRA, we should be allowing the Department to finish its job and finalize this rulemaking.

We know that energy conservation is actually very popular with Americans. They want us to pursue this. They want the agencies to have responsibility to step up and do that job. The vast majority of Americans understand the gravity of the climate crisis we face.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my Republican colleagues to work with us to improve our energy security and efficiency and to join us in doing the meaningful legislating that the American people sent us here to do.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for hosting us here today.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1640 because, yet again, House Republicans are on the front lines of stopping President Biden's executive overreaching. Last week, it was trucks, and this week, it is gas stoves.

This bill will prevent the Department of Energy from telling the American people which stoves they can use in their own homes. According to the Department of Energy, these new rules would eliminate 50 percent of the current stovetops on the market.

I am honestly astounded that we even need to pass a bill letting people have the freedom to choose the surface they cook on for their families. The President and his army of unelected bureaucrats will not stop meddling in the personal lives of the American people.

I, along with 187 million Americans, use gas stoves every day because it is more affordable and reliable than electric stovetops. My constituents who use gas stoves in their homes save over \$1,000 a year compared to all-electric homes.

To justify this overreach, the Biden administration is using a study from the Rocky Mountain Institute, which so happens to also be a partner with the Chinese Government.

For an administration dead set on forcing a radical climate agenda on the American people, I find it odd that they would take aim at an appliance that emits 22 percent less carbon dioxide than a comparable electric model.

This is bigger than just stoves, though. Since the beginning of his ad-

ministration, Joe Biden has had it out for natural gas, a cheap, clean, American source of energy, not to mention that over 4 million Americans are also connected to the natural gas industry in some way.

Today, we stand against the Biden administration and say, no, you cannot govern unilaterally from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to voting "yes" on the bill, and I urge my friends in the Senate to take up its consideration.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, when I first heard of the Save Our Gas Stoves Act, I thought it was a joke. It turns out the joke is on me because here I am on the floor debating this.

Of course, I planned to speak on this bill last week, but Republicans imploded in their dysfunction and prevented Congress from working.

American families want answers to the high prices they see in the grocery stores. They want answers to why their children are being shot and killed in their places of worship and at graduations. They want answers to why Republicans are targeting their LGBTQ family members and loved ones.

Republicans are responding to these pressing issues by talking about what stove you can own.

For a party that touts freedom, there seems to be some confusion about what that word actually means because some people might want the freedom to purchase an energy-efficient stove that actually helps the environment.

Let's get into it. This legislation would prohibit the Department of Energy from moving forward with a congressionally mandated efficiency standard, a standard, by the way, that would help people with their energy bills, and a Department of Energy, by the way, that doesn't have the authority to ban your gas stoves.

If this is the Republican messaging bill, then what is the message? That Republicans can't govern? That they are not in tune with the American people? That they don't care about the real issues?

I would give them some credit if Republicans talked about the issues of the day, like the fact that the frontrunner for the Republican Party already found liable of sexual assault was arraigned today on 37 counts of Federal criminal charges, including violating the Espionage Act, which is reserved for enemies of the state. A stove is not an enemy of the state. Or if they talked about the fact that we had more mass shootings than days in the year, and we just passed a bill to make handguns more dangerous.

Do you want to keep people safe? Then regulate guns, not stoves. Convict criminals, not cooktops, because stoves are not killing people. Stoves are not accelerating homelessness. Stoves are not exacerbating crime. We

could be talking about any number of pressing issues of substantive things to legislate, but stoves?

I actually told folks in my district that Republicans care more about how you cook your cupcakes than how to keep your children alive.

If this is an example of Republican messaging, then we have a real problem.

I will say it again: The American people want us to focus on issues like immigration, climate change, gun violence, the right to have an abortion, the questionable ethics of SCOTUS Justices, the need to regain competitive status with global allies, bringing home U.S. hostages, rebuilding our infrastructure, getting people out of poverty, feeding children, protecting caregivers who take care of our children and our elderly, protecting firefighters from toxic chemicals, and fighting against gender violence at home and abroad.

These are real issues where America can lead, not how you cook with your stove.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I will say it again: I have seen it all, and I am here to tell you Republicans: The emperor has no clothes.

We should be talking about the pressing issues of the day. China is not coming after us because of our stoves.

Mr. Chair, I ask for a “no” vote on this legislation.

The CHAIR. The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1845

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I agree with my Democratic colleague, we should be talking about the issues that are important to Americans today, like securing our border, lowering our crime rates, lowering the cost of living.

We have crisis after crisis in our country, and you know what the Department of Energy does under the Biden administration? They go after our gas stoves. That is why I had to bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chair, would that the other side of the aisle cared as much about unborn babies and worried about their safety as well.

Mr. Chair, let's get this right. First, the Biden administration decides to come after the cars that Americans drive, then it is how Americans heat their homes, and now they want to determine how Americans cook their food? For what?

All in the name of climate change? Oh, this ought to help, making sure that Americans can only use stoves that they think they ought to use.

Mr. Chair, I am not sure what dimension—or might I say dementia—that

the Biden administration is living in, but the American people do not want out-of-touch bureaucrats to control what stoves they use in their houses.

I might add that folks in my great State of Texas have a slogan, “Don't Mess with Texas.” My message to the Biden administration is, don't mess with our gas stoves.

House Republicans, Mr. Chair, are tired of the blatant overreach, and that is why I am proud to cosponsor the Save Our Gas Stoves Act, and I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Once we get this bill passed, then we can say, now we are cooking with gas.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. MCCLELLAN).

Mrs. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition today to H.R. 1640, the so-called Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

After weeks of holding the American economy hostage to their ransom note of devastating cuts and policy changes that would impact American families, State budgets, and our economic recovery, after a temper tantrum that brought this body to gridlock last week, we are now debating a bill that is nothing more than a political stunt to peddle the lie that the Biden administration is attempting to ban gas stoves.

The American people can rest easy knowing that the Department of Energy cannot ban gas stoves, but the Department of Energy is proceeding with a congressionally mandated efficiency standard that will save the American people money, reduce harmful indoor air pollution that disproportionately and adversely impacts the health of low-income communities, communities of color, and our children.

House Republicans are using this bill as a guise to prioritize the fossil fuel industry and raise utility costs for Americans while misrepresenting data from the Department of Energy. Ultimately, H.R. 1640 is nothing more than a desperate attempt to weaken the Department's ability to issue energy efficiency standards.

This is astoundingly disappointing. We should be addressing the issues that matter to my constituents, like reducing the gun violence that killed an 18-year-old 20 minutes after he received his diploma last week, increasing access to affordable healthcare and affordable childcare, addressing the mental health needs of our veterans and our servicemen and -women, the farm bill, and addressing the maternal health crisis instead of this bill.

I find it interesting that the party that thinks it can insert itself into healthcare decisions of pregnant people now is accusing the Biden administration of inserting itself into the decisions of buying appliances.

Instead of dealing with the issues that my constituents sent me here to deal with, we are having to deal with a ridiculous political stunt, delayed votes, and nonsensical bills.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill, and I encourage my Republican colleagues to stop the fear-mongering and infighting so we can get back to governing and solving the problems that our constituents are actually asking us to address.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I agree, we need to focus on important issues, so may I suggest to my Democratic colleagues that they talk to President Biden and say stop going after our gas stoves, so we don't have to talk about this?

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640. The Save Our Gas Stoves Act is a bipartisan bill that was introduced by Energy and Commerce Committee member DEBBIE LESKO, and it will stop the Department of Energy from finalizing its plans to ban the majority of natural gas-fueled cooking stoves on the market today.

H.R. 1640 was considered through regular order in committee, where it received hearings and markups and was favorably reported with a strong bipartisan vote.

Congress must intervene to stop the war that President Biden and Democrats are waging on reliable, affordable energy and the choices people make to provide for their families.

On day one in office, President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, imposed a moratorium on fossil energy development on Federal lands, and directed agencies across the Federal Government to issue punitive regulations and delay permits for energy projects. This agenda is raising costs across the board and making life more difficult for hardworking Americans across this country.

Now the Biden administration is coming for their appliances, like natural gas stoves. H.R. 1640 will stop the Department of Energy from finalizing the terribly misguided and legally vulnerable proposal to ban gas stoves.

H.R. 1640 is necessary because the administration doesn't have any regard for the will of the American people, or the laws passed by Congress.

Despite a statement from the White House that “the President does not support banning gas stoves,” the Department of Energy and radical environmental activists are abusing an obscure law called the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to mandate a backdoor regulatory ban on gas stoves.

They are pursuing this agenda to control the home appliance market despite DOE's own evidence that its proposed standard would pull more than half the gas stoves off the market and save people \$1.08 over the life of the product.

This is completely out of touch. One dollar of savings over the life of the product is not worth the up-front expense of ripping out gas lines and installing new electrical service. One dollar of savings does not bring peace of

mind if you need to heat your water or feed your family during an electricity blackout. One dollar of savings means nothing when people are paying record prices to buy food and fill up their gas tanks.

The American people are strongly opposed to regulations to ban natural gas appliances. In fact, we recently polled the citizens in my district as to whether they support a ban on natural gas stoves in their homes. An overwhelming 87 percent of them responded "no." H.R. 1640 addresses their concerns and their freedom to choose an affordable stove that is right for them.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1640 and look forward to working with the Senate to send this bipartisan bill to the President's desk.

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

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle love to claim that they support lower energy costs, but the fact is that this bill will increase costs for consumers. As a result of appliance efficiency standards in effect today, the average American household saves roughly \$500 annually on utility bills, and this bill blocks an efficiency standard that will save consumers up to \$1.7 billion. This will specifically impact low- and moderate-income households that spend more of their money on energy bills.

I also think it is ironic that Republicans have cited the American Gas Association's strong support for this bill. AGA is an association of gas utilities that make more money when consumers use more gas. Should we be surprised that they oppose a standard that makes gas stoves more efficient and affordable?

This bill is nothing but a handout to the fossil fuel industry, and that would drive prices higher for Americans. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, my colleague said, oh, this is going to save money. May I remind him that, according to the DOE, only \$21.89 over 14½ years will be saved. That is 12 cents a month.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1640, Representative LESKO's Save Our Gas Stoves Act. In my wildest imagination, I never thought I would be standing here defending my wife's gas stove.

In nearly 40 percent of households across the country, including mine, the use of natural gas stoves are the preferred appliance to prepare family meals because it is affordable, reliable, and, I might add, very stylish. Consumers deserve choice and the right to decide what goes in their dadgum kitchen.

However, the Biden Department of Energy has issued a proposed rule that would impose more stringent standards on the use of a conventional cooking product such as a natural gas stove.

This is ridiculous. This harmful proposed rule is yet another attempt by the Biden administration to push its radical climate agenda on the American people. I am going to tell you, the American people are getting sick of this, the high gas prices and all the other things, like the cost of natural gas today—you can't build pipelines—and this time in the form of mandating what kitchen appliances families can and cannot use.

Mr. Chair, 96 percent of the stove models that the Department of Energy tested failed to meet the proposed standard. If they implemented this rulemaking, it would impact the majority of gas stoves on the market.

Not only would this cause significant market distortions, which is a problem the Biden administration has caused across the entire economic front, but implementing this proposed rule would also increase costs for consumers.

Why, at a time when Americans are facing hyperinflation, would this administration propose a rule that would push consumers to a more expensive option?

That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Save Our Gas Stoves Act, which will ensure that the Secretary of Energy does not implement an energy standard on cooking appliances that would reduce consumer choice. This bill also stops overreach by the Department of Energy.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, here we are on the House floor talking about gas stoves. No, it wasn't the Republicans who are bringing this issue up. It is our friends in the administration who are making moves to try to eliminate a very reliable, efficient source of cooking energy.

I rise in opposition to the Biden administration's efforts to limit consumer choice. Gas stoves are the preferred cooktop appliance of nearly 40 percent of American households. They are affordable, reliable, and easy to use.

If the administration succeeds in banning gas stoves, it will force millions of Americans to switch to more expensive and less efficient electric stoves. This will impact jobs and the economy. More than 4.1 million jobs are connected to the gas industry.

House Republicans have taken a stance against this policy by introducing the Save Our Gas Stoves Act and the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act. This was not our initiative. This was brought on us because of a very unrealistic, very ill-advised attempt by the administration.

At a time when our Nation faces a confluence of crises, my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that ban-

ning appliances is somehow a matter of national concern. I reject that.

This week, we will vote to protect Americans' choices, their wallets, their time, and their jobs.

□ 1900

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

Mr. Chairman, I take a moment to draw attention to a fundamental difference between the Democrats and our friends across the aisle.

Over the last few years, Democrats enacted \$4.5 billion to help Americans with their home energy bills and replace appliances, \$4.5 billion for energy efficiency retrofits, and historic funding for weatherization and low-income energy assistance, including a record \$6 billion for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program in last year's omnibus spending bill.

All this funding goes to Americans' pocket to help them lower their energy bills during a time of increasing climate threats, turbulent fossil fuel prices, and economic challenges caused by the pandemic and the war in Ukraine.

Democrats have worked hard to help Americans pay the energy bills. Republicans, on the other hand, are working hard for their fossil fuel friends.

While Democrats advocate the energy efficient standards that lower bills, Republicans try to chip away at the Department of Energy's conservation work. While Democrats defend families and try to ensure indoor appliances don't emit harmful pollutants, Republicans push bills endorsed by the American Gas Association, bills that ensure gas stoves use more energy than they really need.

So let me be clear. Democrats are advocating for everyday Americans, and Republicans are advocating for their fossil fuel friends.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, it is the height of insanity that Congress must pass legislation to keep unelected agency bureaucrats from taking away our ability and right to use gas stoves, which would surely be followed by cutting off gas to our homes completely.

In fact, that is ultimately the plan.

H.R. 1640, however, will protect our right to make dinner for our families without Big Government forcing their subpar cooking mandates on the American public. We are a free people after all—or at least we used to be.

This bill will stop the Biden administration from intentionally increasing the cost of cooking and energy and will prevent this absurd government overreach from taking away even more of our rights.

Natural gas stoves are the preferred cooktop of almost 40 percent of households in our country used by nearly 187 million people. They are more efficient

and three times cheaper than their electric counterparts, so, of course, this administration would want to ban them.

Look, energy poverty is not just an esoteric concept. It is this administration's goal.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Energy poverty is this administration's goal. I will repeat that.

Their policies are actually designed to increase the cost of food, energy, and housing, and their effort to ban gas stoves is just one more step in that direction.

Vote to end this madness. Support passage of the STOVE Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know, why are my Republican colleagues opposed to energy efficiency standards that will save homeowners money? Why?

Energy conservation used to be bipartisan. Over the years under Democratic and Republican administrations, the Department of Energy has updated efficiency standards for light bulbs, dishwashers, refrigerators, washing machines, and dozens more appliances.

The first efficiency rules were signed into law in 1987 by Ronald Reagan, and they included gas stoves. No one argued back then that the government was taking away your light bulbs or your refrigerator or your stove because it would have been nonsense, and it is nonsense here today.

Many of our appliances use less energy today than they did decades ago, and it is because of energy efficiency standards that help drive those improvements.

This saves Americans money after they buy a home appliance. Let me say that again. Energy efficiency saves Americans money. New efficiency standards for stoves are long overdue. They were delayed by several years by the previous administration. It is time to update them, not to delay it further.

The fear-mongering over efficiency standards for stoves is Republicans playing politics. Democrats are focused on saving money for American households on their energy bill. We are focused on the climate crisis. When household appliances use less energy, they will cause less pollution. We will not be distracted.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. We will not be distracted by this political stunt. The Re-

publicans' bill peddles the lie that the administration or the Democrats are attempting to ban gas stoves. That is just not true. The Department of Energy cannot ban gas stoves. The Department of Energy is simply proceeding with the congressionally mandated efficiency standard.

So let's not be distracted about what this is. This has been a bipartisan issue. There is no need to peddle lies about anybody taking away gas stoves.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to support energy conservation standards to save Americans money. Let's save Americans money.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 12 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, about 1 out of 3 Wisconsinites have a gas stove, and about 40 percent nationwide do. There is some name-calling over there as far as what the parties stand for.

The gas stove is about three times cheaper than the electric stove. The Republican Party is the party of the working class. The party that pays attention to what their energy bill is. There is another class of people out there: The rich Hollywood types, the high-tech billionaires, the well-paid college professors who don't have to worry how much they pay for electricity.

As a result, that side feels very good when a bill is passed where they restrict what the hoi polloi can do. Also, they don't have to worry about the welfare class because they will give stuff perhaps to the welfare class to make up the difference. But they won't help the middle class. And that is who the Republican Party tries to look out for. The average guy who knows exactly what he is paying in his energy bill.

Mr. Chair, I ask that we leave the working class alone.

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

Mr. Chair, I would just take a moment to bring us back to the real world. Earlier this week, the administration issued its statement of administration policy, that is the Biden administration's official views on this bill, and I have to report that the administration does not view this bill favorably.

Despite what our Republican colleagues are saying today, the administration makes clear that in the real world, this bill would "deny the American people the savings that come with having more efficient, new appliances on the market."

The administration is right. This bill is not about freedom. I keep hearing

that a lot on the other side. It is not about choice—they keep mentioning that—or about saving gas stoves, because we are not banning it. It is about taking away the freedom of Americans to save money to buy new, efficient appliances.

The bill's authors do not believe in the essentially American innovation that has brought consumers a cumulative \$2 trillion in savings since DOE first issued efficiency standards.

Now, let me say, our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, prides ourselves on being the committee of innovation, of invention, of doing things better. I come from a district in Menlo Park and in Edison, New Jersey, where Thomas Edison invented the light bulb, the motion picture, and so many different things.

We should be proud of the fact that we are trying to do things differently, more efficiently, more innovatively. I listen to my colleagues on the other side. For a Republican Party that claims that it wants to let Americans make their own individual choices, this doesn't seem like much of a choice at all.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. In closing, let me just say that this is the second bill that came up today dealing with gas stoves. If there is one message that I really want to give to my colleagues, and urge them to vote against this bill, as well as the previous one, is that we are not banning gas stoves. I don't know how many times I can say that. The administration, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Department of Energy, all of them had made clear over and over again that we are not banning gas stoves.

What we are doing in this case with this bill is to try to provide more energy efficiency, which has been something that the Department of Energy has done for years. We have given them the authority and urged them to deal with and come up with more efficient appliances, whether it is gas stoves, electric stoves, cooktops, whatever it happens to be. So why not let them do that? Why keep saying that we are banning gas stoves when we are not? Why keep suggesting that somehow eliminating the Department of Energy's ability to adopt more efficiency standards for these appliances is not a good thing? It saves money. It makes sense.

I heard my colleagues on the other side talk about the middle class, about working people. Working people want to save money. They want more efficiency. Overwhelmingly, polls show that they believe that appliances should be more efficient.

I think that when people buy things and go to the appliance store or to the supermarket, or wherever they are

buying appliances, they not only expect that those appliances are safe and safe for themselves and for their kids, but they also think that the Federal Government is trying to do things to make things more efficient. There is no reason why we shouldn't.

For those reasons, I would ask my colleagues to vote to oppose this bill.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues keep saying we are not banning gas stoves, but what would they call it when the Department of Energy's own analysis says that of the gas stoves that they have tested, only 4 percent of the market share would qualify for their new proposed rule? That means about 96 percent won't. Then they revised it to say, well, almost 50 percent will qualify. Well, that means more than 50 percent won't.

I call that a ban. We are mixing words here.

The other things that my Democratic colleagues keep asking is: Why wouldn't we want to save money? It is only 12 cents a month. Who is going to give up the choice of what type of stove they want for 12 cents a month? Nobody. That is not a good exchange.

I would also say that if the Biden administration is not doing anything, why do all of these people support my bill? The National Association of Homebuilders, the American Restaurant Association, the American Gas Association, the American Home Appliance Manufacturers, numerous other energy companies.

Mr. Chairman, I would read a little bit from the National Restaurant Association, because it talks about why this bill is important. We didn't bring it. The Republicans didn't bring this on; it was the Biden administration. With all these crises going on in our country, he has to pick on gas stoves. I don't understand why.

This is what the National Restaurant Association says:

Natural gas is a critical energy source for many sectors of the economy but none more than the restaurant industry. In fact, natural gas is the preferred cooking energy source for 76 percent of restaurants. Cooking with an open flame from natural gas is critical for a variety of dishes to ensure a responsive, consistent, and precise heat source that affects the quality of food served.

Natural gas also allows restaurants to use certain cooking techniques that cannot be replicated with an electric stove.

□ 1915

Finally, banning or overly restricting natural gas use could burden restaurant owners with higher operating costs, particularly local and independent restaurants. The cost to convert existing infrastructure to handle the power capacity needed to operate a commercial kitchen alone would be prohibitive for many locally owned restaurants.

I say the same is true for individual homeowners. They don't want to

change. They like the features on their gas stove. They don't want to give them up.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support my bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1640

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Save Our Gas Stoves Act".

SEC. 2. STANDARDS FOR KITCHEN RANGES AND OVENS.

Section 325(h) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard under this section for kitchen ranges or ovens is economically justified for purposes of subsection (c) unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in the unavailability in the United States of a type (or class) of product based on what type of fuel the product consumes."

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON RULEMAKING.

The Secretary of Energy may not finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Conventional Cooking Products" (88 Fed. Reg. 6818 (February 1, 2023)) or any substantially similar rule.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part D of House Report 118-108.

Each such amendment offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 118-108.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, beginning on line 8, strike "unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in the unavailability in the United States of a type (or class) of product based on what type of fuel the product consumes." and insert "unless—".

Page 2, line 12, strike the closing quotation mark and the final period.

Page 2, after line 12, insert the following:

"(A) the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in the unavailability in the United States of a type (or class) of prod-

uct based on what type of fuel the product consumes; and

"(B) the Secretary discloses all stakeholder meetings with entities that—

"(i) have ties to the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party;

"(ii) have produced studies regarding, or advocated for, regulations or policy to limit, restrict, or ban the use of any type of energy; and

"(iii) have applied for or received Federal funds."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 495, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to require the Secretary of Energy to disclose certain stakeholder meetings with any entity that has: one, ties to the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party; two, has produced studies regarding or has advocated for policies to limit, restrict, or ban the use of any type of energy; and, three, has applied for or received Federal funds.

We have recently seen concerning examples of anti-energy, China-connected entities receiving not just elevated access to the White House and Federal agencies but granting of funds, as well. Literally, we have been using U.S. taxpayer dollars to help fund them.

I introduced this amendment because the Biden administration has not been transparent about who it has been meeting with, and frankly, I believe this administration has not been honest with the American people about its desire to ban gas stoves.

In February of this year, it was widely reported that a government watchdog group obtained information through the Freedom of Information Act revealing a private meeting between the Secretary of Energy and a group that would be covered by this amendment. In particular, this group has been on the forefront of the effort to ban gas stoves.

Unsurprisingly, when I sent a letter to Secretary Granholm in February, inquiring whether she was aware of this group's ties to China and the extent of their influence on the Department, I received a letter back that was completely ignoring my questions and concerns.

I have to give you a little bit of perspective, Mr. Chairman. My family has been involved in construction for over three generations, and I fully understand the needs that people have at various levels in their homes and their businesses.

I mean, we are talking about gas stoves today. Don't get me wrong. There is nothing inherently wrong with electric stoves. That oftentimes fits very nicely—same thing with electric base heat or water heaters, et cetera.

There are certain regions of the country, like in Michigan and the upper Midwest, where we are very dependent on propane and natural gas.

We don't have the electric grid to support an expansion of that.

I know the other side will say that nobody is going to pull your stove out of your house—yet. Nobody is doing anything other than just stoves—yet.

We know that places like California, New York, and even in Michigan, the city of Ann Arbor, have gone in and literally banned the addition of and use of gas stoves. They are looking to expand that. They have talked about that.

The real rub here, Mr. Chairman, is that we have a major problem with questionable groups with established connections to China. They have those established connections, but we are not sure what their unanswered intentions might be.

They are succeeding in influencing policy to limit affordable appliance options for Americans. When President Biden or Senate Majority Leader SCHUMER are telling the American people that no one is going after their stoves, they may be technically correct today, Mr. Chairman. In the broader picture, we know that that may be coming.

I have to say that it is one thing for elected officials to be going after a particular appliance or source of energy, but we have a real problem when Washington bureaucrats, unelected bureaucrats, aren't being honest about their end goal, and they are the ones making the rules and regulations.

A ban on gas stoves is going to cost the taxpayers. It is going to cost hard-working, honest Americans more when they are already in an inflationary heightened situation.

That is why I wanted to bring this amendment. I appreciate the author's acceptance of this and understanding of where we are trying to go with this.

At the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simply to bring an added dose of transparency, expose connections to the CCP, which I truly, honestly believe that both sides of the aisle have concerns about the tentacles of the CCP and the Chinese Government and the influence that it has gained here in the United States.

That is why, on the Financial Services Committee that I serve on, we have done CFIUS reviews, which is making sure that it is property and technology and other things that we are protecting from our adversaries like China.

Why would we hand over the keys to this particular kingdom? I don't understand.

We need to let the American people know who is truly influencing our government and that exposure is there.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am happy to see that the

gentleman from Michigan admits that the Department of Energy is not banning gas stoves. I keep saying it, but he did say that they are not banning them, at least not yet, he said.

I want to stress that the efficiency standards in the Department of Energy rule, again, don't go into effect until 3 years after the rule is finalized. Even though my colleagues keep saying that we are banning gas stoves and talk about the efficiency standards and how they have to get rid of them with this legislation, keep in mind that these efficiency standards don't even go into effect for another 3 years after the rule is adopted.

Again, we are not banning gas stoves, just talking about efficiency standards.

There is also the claim that has been put out there by the Republicans that 96 percent of gas stoves on the market today don't meet the proposed DOE standard, and that is just not true. The statistic that is mentioned by our colleagues on the other side is a specific test of high-end models that the Department of Energy anticipated would not meet the standard, meaning one of the tests conducted by DOE was deliberately designed to focus on models that would need upgrades to meet the standard. This test was not designed to represent the whole market.

According to DOE, and you can look at what they have put out, about half of the market already meets the proposed energy conservation standard, including all entry-level models at this time.

Again, you can keep your gas stove. We are talking about efficiency standards in 3 years, not now.

As to the amendment before us, which I oppose, it amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with vague language that would likely be impossible to implement.

Additionally, this amendment is clearly designed to target environmental and clean energy groups. If this amendment is adopted, and if H.R. 1640 becomes law, it would slow down the Department of Energy rulemaking process and create additional burdens to adopting energy conservation standards.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to recognize that this amendment is pure Republican messaging and would hinder climate action. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 118-108.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike "The Secretary" and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary

Page 2, after line 18, insert the following:

(b) ENERGY SECURITY EXEMPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not take effect unless and until the Secretary of Energy certifies that the absence of new or amended energy conservation standards described in the proposed rule described in subsection (a) (or any substantially similar rule) will not adversely affect the energy security of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 495, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1640, which would add an important provision to ensure that nothing in this bill would harm U.S. energy security.

Before I share with my colleagues why this amendment is necessary, I want to take a minute to say what an exercise in absurdity this week in the House has been.

With everything going on in the world, we are considering nonsense bills about imaginary threats. That is the best that this Republican majority could muster, bills that are written so poorly they wouldn't even fake solve the fake problems they are making up to scare people.

In the case of H.R. 1640, this bill could do real damage. The Biden administration is not trying to ban gas stoves, period, but instead of just acknowledging that and moving on, my Republican friends are pretending that the administration is trying to ban them through an energy efficiency proposal that would save consumers money and improve America's energy security.

Consumers and experts recognize that energy efficiency is a key component of energy security. It is simple. If you can cook the same exact way with less gas, that means we are more energy secure.

I have heard for years from Republicans that they care about energy security. This vote is an opportunity for them to prove it.

This amendment contains a "do no harm" provision, which says that the bill should not take effect until the Secretary of Energy certifies that it would not have a negative impact on U.S. energy security.

This is simple. This amendment is a chance to affirm, in a bipartisan way, that Congress should be strengthening our energy security, not weakening it.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I rise in opposition to this amendment, which is nothing more than an attempt to delay implementation of the underlying bill.

Secretary Granholm could simply say that my bill affects energy security, even though it doesn't.

The Biden administration's ban on gas stoves is the result of the Democrats' war on natural gas. They want to force a transition away from affordable and reliable energy by banning the products that Americans use every day.

The Department of Energy's gas stove ban is actually an energy security threat. Because it is not economically justified, it will not result in a significant savings of energy, and it will reduce consumer choice for natural gas kitchen ranges and ovens. Its goal is to eliminate the use of natural gas, which is used to support America's energy security.

Natural gas kitchen ranges and ovens are currently the preferred choice of 40 percent of American households. Nearly 187 million Americans use natural gas because it is affordable and reliable.

According to industry estimates, homes with natural gas appliances save up to \$1,068 per year, compared to all electric homes.

Natural gas stoves are affordable, reliable, and widely popular. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

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

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

If energy security is as important to Republicans as they say it is, this should be a no-brainer, because why would they bring a bill to the floor that could possibly weaken our energy security?

I suspect there might be something else at play here.

It is possible that the majority knows exactly what this bill would actually do, and they are eager to steamroll U.S. energy security and make consumers pay through the nose.

Why do I think that? Because that is exactly what Big Oil and the fossil fuel lobby wants. Follow the money. Google their donations.

If Republicans really care about energy security, they wouldn't all have voted against the Inflation Reduction Act last year, the single most ambitious bill on energy security that Congress has ever considered.

If Republicans really care about energy security, they wouldn't have voted against millions of new clean energy jobs that will make us truly energy independent.

With this vote, let's see what my Republican colleagues care more about, America's energy security or helping

Big Oil and gas billionaires rake in more profits on the backs of our constituents.

I am sure my Republican friends will be generously compensated for their efforts here today. How sad. How pathetic.

I urge everybody to follow the money. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, again, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. Even my Democratic colleagues admit that the Department of Energy is now saying that less than 50 percent of gas stoves would qualify for the new proposed rule, so more than 50 percent of the existing models of gas stoves would be banned.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 118-108.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 2.

Page 2, line 18, strike "or any substantially similar rule".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 495, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

There are many problems with the Save Our Gas Stoves Act. One of the biggest issues, in my opinion, is that this bill not only prevents the Department of Energy from finalizing a commonsense proposed efficiency standard, but it also limits future DOE rulemaking.

H.R. 1640 includes Congressional Review Act style language blocking "any substantially similar rule." This is designed to ensnare future related rules in a messy legal and linguistic trap.

This language provides no clarity on what a substantially similar rule means and could hamstring the Department of Energy on future cooktop and stove efficiency standards.

The bill also amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to limit and complicate future Department of Energy rulemaking on cooktops and gas stoves. The bill imposes an additional hurdle in the DOE rulemaking process and could impact future cooktop standards, regardless of fuel type.

If this bill becomes law, it will negatively impact the Department of Energy's ability to issue effective energy conservation standards related to cooktops and stoves going forward. This would also significantly impact DOE's ability to reduce energy bills and slash carbon emissions.

My amendment to H.R. 1640 strikes these harmful and open-ended provisions from the bill and limits the application of the bill only to the current proposed Department of Energy standard.

While I still strongly oppose blocking the current rule, it is critical that we not impede future Department of Energy action.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized.

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

This amendment strikes the language preventing the Department of Energy from implementing any substantially similar rule. Removing this language would allow the Department of Energy to just reissue another gas stove ban after my bill becomes law.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, which strikes important language in the underlying bill. That language would prevent the Department of Energy from reissuing a nearly identical rule to ban gas stoves.

H.R. 1640 allows the Department of Energy to issue energy efficiency standards that are cost effective and that have a significant amount of energy for consumers.

This is the current standard under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and H.R. 1640 does nothing to change that.

The Biden administration's politically motivated proposal to ban a majority of gas stoves violates the statutory requirements of EPCA because it fails to save consumers money or energy and because it removes products from the market simply because they use natural gas.

The Energy and Commerce Committee held hearings on this and conducted oversight. The facts are clear that the Department of Energy should withdraw this misguided rule, and DOE should be prohibited from reissuing a substantially similar rule.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just say I find it incredible that the Republicans want to just take away all ability of the Department of Energy to deal with efficiency standards not only for gas stoves, for electric stoves—remember, that this rule doesn't just apply to gas stoves or cooktops. It applies to electric stoves, as well.

Any fair reading of this legislation makes it clear, in my opinion, that not only are they banning and overturning this bill but overturning anything else that is within the sphere of efficiency for cooktops, whether they be gas stoves or electric stoves or anything of that nature.

Again, I think it is a huge overreach. I, of course, oppose the underlying bill as well, but it is a huge overreach to say that the Department of Energy can't deal with this efficiency issue when it comes to stoves of whatever type in the future because that is what their job is—to deal with these efficiency standards, and they have been doing it very effectively to save money and to be innovative.

Mr. Chairman, for those reasons, I would ask for support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, yes, indeed, the energy efficiency standards deal with both gas and electric stoves.

The problem is that it disproportionately would ban the majority of gas stoves, not electric stoves. That takes away consumer choice.

That is why I brought this bill to the floor, and that is why I oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2023

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 277.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 495 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 277.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) as Chair of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1943

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. MOYLAN (Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

□ 1945

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

Even before America declared its independence, John Adams emphasized that a republic is a government of laws and not of men. That is what we are here to debate tonight.

Are we a government of laws or a government of the executive branch? Are we going to allow the executive branch to write the laws? Are we going to turn our Constitution on its head? Have we gone too far already? I would argue we have, and that is why we need the REINS Act, Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny. It provides that every major regulation that the administration seeks to promulgate has to come to Congress first, has to be passed by concurrent majorities in the House and the Senate and signed by the President. This is exactly what

our Founders prescribed. This is a bill about who makes the laws in our country, and it is about reclaiming our legislative power from the administrative state.

I think it is appropriate to read from our Constitution at this point. Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution says: "All legislative powers . . ." not some legislative powers.

"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 it shall consist of a bureaucracy? It does not. All legislative powers are vested here and in the Senate. That is why we need to stop letting the executive branch make law.

Are they merely tweaking regulations? Are they determining the amount of sulfur dioxide that is acceptable to release from a power plant with civil infractions imposed if a company doesn't comply? No, they are making laws that put people in prison over in the administrative branch, and we are doing nothing about it.

We have atrophied. The power of Congress has atrophied. We are almost like ombudsmen to the executive branch now. This needs to change.

In the words of James Madison: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands . . . may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

I am afraid that is what we have come to. Too many of our laws, civil and criminal, are now being written by the executive branch.

Here is what the REINS Act does, and here is why it is important. If a regulation that is passed by the executive branch or suggested by the executive branch has more than \$100 million of impact—that is a pretty high threshold. I would argue if it has any impact, we should be legislating it, but this is a compromise. If it has more than \$100 million of impact, it has to come here if it is going to become a law.

They do not get to write the laws, and so that is why we need the REINS Act.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 31, 2023.

Hon. JODEY ARRINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARRINGTON: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on the Judiciary and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 277, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2023, so that the measure may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.