

We talked about the credit being downgraded. It is unprecedented in the country, twice to have our credit downgraded during this President's time in office.

The previous President had record job growth and a roaring economy until the pandemic hit. Under this President, of course, some of the jobs that were lost in the pandemic have been recovered, but not all of them.

Again, we have a record-low labor participation rate, meaning the percentage of those able-bodied, working-age Americans who are working is at an all-time low. We don't count those individuals who aren't looking for work in the unemployment numbers. They don't count. You have an artificially low so-called unemployment rate because there are record numbers of Americans on Federal assistance, as we have stripped away all the work requirements for cash welfare, for food stamps, and for housing assistance.

While we on this side measure success by how many people we get off of government assistance, the other side measures success by how many people are on government assistance programs as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to try to grow the amount of people who are paid not to work, which further causes economic harm.

We cannot just cut our spending on our way to prosperity. Again, in this country, we have to grow our way by going back to pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, in testimony before our committee on this issue, the president of the International Franchise Association said: The rule would make franchisees merely employers of and/or co-employers with their franchisor. This will significantly diminish the value of the business that they have spent their entire careers building.

We know his statement is true because we have seen this policy play out before. Years ago, when President Obama's NLRB advanced a similar rule, the International Franchise Association conducted a study on its impact, and research showed that the indirect control standard cost the industry, as my friend from Michigan said, as much as \$33 billion annually, killed almost 400,000 jobs, and, once again, increased lawsuits against franchise businesses by 93 percent.

The franchise model represents an opportunity to pursue the American Dream. Congress must stand up for the 9 million franchise workers across the country and override President Biden's veto.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HANDS OFF OUR HOME APPLIANCES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6192.

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 1194 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. 6192.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1450

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. 6192) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOYLAN 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 gentlewoman 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. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Biden administration has waged a war on American energy, and this war has made its way into Americans' homes.

President Biden and the Department of Energy's Secretary Granholm have sacrificed appliance affordability and reliability in their pursuit of a radical rush-to-green agenda. In the name of energy efficiency, the Biden administration has issued rules on home appliances that would drive up costs and make these popular products less reliable and available to the American families.

The Biden administration's new rules do not save a significant amount of energy and are not cost effective. The

Biden administration's rules discourage the use of natural gas in favor of the electrification of appliances, regardless of the cost, reliability, or availability. Just look how the minority tried to ban gas stoves before my Save Our Gas Stoves legislation and public outcry dialed it back.

House Republicans are leading to protect Americans from Federal mandates that increase costs, fail to result in significant energy savings, are not practical, and eliminate the performance features of product choices.

My legislation, H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, fights back against the Biden administration's radical agenda and will preserve the affordability, availability, and quality of the household appliances Americans rely on every day.

Enacted in 1975, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, also called EPCA, provides specific criteria the Department of Energy must follow in order to propose a new appliance efficiency standard. It is supposed to result in a significant conservation of energy, be technologically feasible, and economically justified.

The problem is that current law doesn't define the parameters for these criteria, so the Biden administration has ignored these critical consumer protections by proposing and finalizing standards that violate the statute.

My bill will define how much energy or water has to be saved. My bill will define that any additional upfront costs to install a new appliance that has new mandated energy efficiency standards will be recuperated within a reasonable period of time.

H.R. 6192 will protect affordability by requiring the Department of Energy to consider the full lifecycle cost of appliances when determining if the new standard is economically justified. The bill requires a 3-year or less payback to the consumer and requires consideration of the cost for low-income households.

No longer will the Biden administration be able to say a savings of 12 cents per month is economically justified, as they have done before, and no longer will a customer have to hold onto their appliance for 8 to 10 or longer years just before they see any cost savings.

The bill establishes a minimum threshold for energy or water savings that must be achieved before imposing new standards. The bill requires that any new standard must achieve at least a 10 percent reduction in energy or water usage. The bill prohibits the Secretary of Energy from banning products based on what type of fuel the product uses so there can be no more natural gas bans.

The bill requires that any new standard cannot affect the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product or the lifespan of the products. Americans want their appliances to work. The bill will allow the Department of Energy to amend or revoke prior standards if they don't save the

consumers money and if the appliance doesn't work.

Last week, I asked Secretary Granholm in committee some very basic questions about the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that appliance regulations should be technologically feasible?

Secretary Granholm said: Yes.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that appliance regulations should not increase net cost for consumers?

Secretary Granholm said: Yes.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that appliance regulations should save a significant amount of energy?

Secretary Granholm said: Yes.

I stated to her: Efficiency mandates increase the upfront costs of appliances, which can really hurt low-income families and renters who do not have the luxury of waiting years for the energy savings to break even.

I asked her: Yes or no, do you agree that 3 years is a reasonable payback period for efficiency regulations?

You know what? Secretary Granholm said she thought the payback should be done within 1 year.

Thus, folks, Secretary Granholm is on record supporting every key element of my bill.

In January of this year, the Fifth Circuit Court found that the Department of Energy has abused the law. In their opinion, they said: Department of Energy "... failed to adequately consider appliance performance, substitution effects, and the ample record evidence that Department of Energy's conservation standards are causing Americans to use more energy and water rather than less."

It is time to reform the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. Like our laws set speed limits to determine at what speed we are breaking the law, it is time to define what economically justified and technologically feasible mean. It is time to fight back against the radical agenda set by the Biden administration. It is time for energy efficiency laws to actually save Americans money, actually save energy and water, and actually preserve Americans' consumer choice.

Mr. Chair, I ask both Republicans and Democrats to support my bill, H.R. 6192, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6192, legislation that actually should be titled the Republicans raising energy bills on American families act, because that is exactly what this bill does.

This bill is just the latest in the Republicans' polluters over people agenda that will drive up annual energy costs on hardworking American families.

Now, this bill is a blatant attempt by House Republicans to derail the successful and effective energy conserva-

tion program. Energy efficiency standards save Americans money on their energy bills, boost innovation by modernizing appliances for the future, and reduce greenhouse gas pollution in our ongoing efforts to combat the climate crisis.

American families, Mr. Chair, are already saving up to \$500 a year on utility bills thanks to the energy efficiency standards that are already in place. The Biden administration has been busy with additional actions that will collectively save Americans \$1 trillion over the next 30 years.

Setting energy efficiency standards is something that the Department of Energy is required by Congress to do. The Biden administration has been busy acting because the previous Trump administration refused to do its job and neglected to finalize 25 appliance efficiency standards.

H.R. 6192 takes an axe to energy conservation standards. It slows down the standard setting process. It allows future administrations to revoke existing standards and bans States from setting their own conservation standards.

If this bill were to become law, manufacturers will be faced with market uncertainty and a regulatory about-face every time the government changes hands. That is problematic for future innovation, particularly considering that many of the efficiency standards finalized by the Department of Energy were reached through consensus recommendations made by appliance manufacturers and efficiency advocates.

The Department of Energy has a robust process for setting efficiency standards, and this process works. All standards must be economically justified and technologically feasible.

Let me be clear—because we are likely to hear a lot of fear-mongering and misinformation today from my Republican colleagues—energy efficiency standards are not bans and they do not impact existing appliances in Americans' homes. This legislation is nothing more than an attempt to scare consumers so Republicans can protect their polluter friends.

Now, instead of legislating on important, pressing issues, Republicans today are pushing a bill that will increase energy prices for American families. This Republican Congress is the least productive of any Congress since the Great Depression. This bill is only being brought to the floor because Republicans can't assemble the votes to actually accomplish anything for the American people. They talk about freedom for appliances but refuse to consider any legislation that would give women freedom over their reproductive health.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation because it will raise energy costs on American families, stifle American innovation, and exacerbate the climate crisis. It is time that Republicans stop wasting our time on partisan messaging bills that have no chance of becoming law.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who is the chair of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, and I thank Congresswoman LESKO for leading this effort and many others in this Congress.

Throughout hearings in this Congress, the House Energy and Commerce Committee has heard countless times how the Biden administration's energy policy puts special interests over affordability and reliability for Americans.

Through the Department of Energy's appliance standard program, the Biden administration has abused their authority by setting aggressive standards on a variety of home appliances.

Mr. Chair, I don't want Americans to be fooled about this. This effort by the Biden administration isn't about saving American consumers' money, it is solely about ending American's use of natural gas, period.

They started with gas stoves and now they have announced plans to impose burdensome regulations that will raise the cost and reduce the performance of dishwashers, air conditioners, refrigerators, clothes washers and dryers, and several other products that Americans rely on every day.

This is part of their whole-of-government approach to pursuing climate policy over all else.

Secretary Granholm said in our DOE budget hearing just last week: We are obsessed with reducing the amount of energy Americans use. This administration hates fossil fuels and anything that uses fossil fuels.

Their solution is to reduce emissions and preserve energy reliability. Instead of harnessing the abundant resources we have in this country, they want to reduce the quality of life for Americans by telling them how to cook their food and wash their clothes, how much water they can use, and what type of car they can drive.

Congresswoman LESKO's bill puts energy affordability and reliability ahead of the dark money climate lobby this administration is beholden to. This bill reforms the Department of Energy's appliance standard setting process to clarify the DOE's regulatory authority and prohibits new standards that are not cost effective or technologically feasible.

Because of this administration's reckless spending and regulatory agenda, the cost of everything is increasing in the United States of America.

The last thing they should be doing is making the home appliances that Americans rely on even more expensive.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense bill and thank Congresswoman LESKO, again, for leading this important effort.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding the time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6192, a Republican bill that will burden American families with higher costs.

This is not a serious bill, Mr. Chair, but it is emblematic of the least productive Congress in modern times. Rather than focus on improving the lives of our neighbors back home and lowering costs, MAGA extremists have been embroiled in shutdowns and showdowns, a tiresome soap opera, so they bring an unserious bill like this to distract from their dysfunction.

I have heard Members on the other side of the aisle make excuses for not getting anything done. They say that this is a closely divided Congress, but, Mr. Chair, that was true in the last Congress when the Democrats were in control, and we passed a host of important new laws that solved problems and cut costs for the folks we represent back home. We focused on bringing down the cost of living and putting more money back into the pockets of working families by passing the PACT Act that expands VA healthcare and benefits for veterans exposed to burn pits, Agent Orange, and other toxic substances, to provide generations of veterans and their survivors with the care and the benefits that they have earned. About 4,000 veterans in my district alone have filed claims.

We passed the American Rescue Plan to help America boost back and build the strongest economy in the world after the pandemic.

We passed a historic infrastructure law that is rebuilding our roads and bridges, delivering clean water, cleaning up pollution, and expanding access to high-speed internet. We passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and we passed the very important historic Inflation Reduction Act that truly is putting money back into the pockets of families back home. Remember, that is the law that capped insulin at \$35 a month. I have 74,000 people in my district with diabetes, and thousands of my neighbors are saving about \$440 per month.

More people have affordable health insurance because of the tax credits in the Inflation Reduction Act. Over 100,000 of my neighbors will save about \$520 in premiums this year under the ACA. That is the law that now allows Medicare to negotiate drug prices for the highest drugs. It caps out-of-pocket costs for our older neighbors who rely on Medicare. It is a godsend.

The IRA is also lowering the cost of energy and reducing pollution to unleash a major clean energy manufacturing boom across America. Over 500 new clean energy projects all across the country, creating well over 250,000 new jobs.

The key to delivering all of these cost savings to the American people is putting people over politics. Instead, MAGA extremists keep America stuck in the politics of chaos all the time where nothing gets done, so the GOP defaults to another bill that helps the oil and gas industry. That is what this is all about because energy efficiency standards are popular. Three out of five Americans support making them stronger.

American families want innovative, efficient appliances. Why? Because they save money, and they save energy. Take the refrigerator, for example. Compared to refrigerators of the 1970s, when the first efficiency standard was proposed, refrigerators today are cheaper up front and they do a better job of keeping groceries cold, and they use about 75 percent less energy. Plus, they save American families hundreds of dollars a year on their electricity bills thanks to the innovation spurred by energy efficiency standards.

The Department of Energy and the Biden administration have collaborated with industry to develop strong energy efficiency standards as Congress already has directed. This means huge cost savings for American families, money back into their pockets at a time when they really need it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to side with the people and their pocketbooks rather than politics or the polluters' best interest. Please vote "no" on this Republican bill and let's get back to work.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 6192.

Mr. Chair, I will start off by thanking the sponsor, Mrs. DEBBIE LESKO of Arizona, and the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee for advancing this bill through regular order.

The United States is blessed with tremendous natural resources. We have the cleanest oil and gas in the world, emissions-free nuclear, hydropower, and renewables.

We also have the world's best workforce and an innovative spirit that has contributed to technological breakthroughs that have changed the world.

For centuries, American innovation has led to new technologies that have improved people's lives from the lightbulb and the home refrigerator to air-conditioning, the washing machine, and the dishwasher.

These inventions are engrained in modern life, and they were not the result of some aggressive government regulation or mandate, but of American ingenuity.

Sadly, the Biden administration's war on American energy is now reaching inside American's homes. Through sue and settle agreements with radical environmental activists, the Department of Energy has reached backroom

deals to impose new regulations on dozens of appliances that Americans rely on every single day.

Last year, the Biden administration attempted to ban gas stoves. Thankfully, DOE changed course after bipartisan opposition and an overwhelming vote by Congress to reverse the ban.

These new mandates are forcing people to spend more on less reliable options. This comes at a time when Americans are already being crushed by rising costs thanks to Bidenflation.

By continuing to double down on policies like this, the Biden administration is showing just how out of touch they are with the financial struggle the vast majority of Americans are feeling. Americans simply cannot afford President Biden's rush-to-green agenda.

The bill led by Mrs. LESKO seeks to protect Americans from Federal mandates that result in minimal energy savings while significantly driving up costs for consumers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. It ensures that DOE is only allowed to adopt efficiency regulations on home appliances that are cost effective, technologically feasible, and save a significant amount of energy.

This is going to benefit Americans across the country. It should be a bipartisan issue, and that is why I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in sending a strong message to the Biden administration.

In closing, I will, again, thank Mrs. LESKO for her hard work on the bill.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), the chair of the Democratic Policy and Communications Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to these partisan energy appliance bills.

Time and time again in this Congress, Republicans have brought and continue to bring partisan messaging bills to the floor that are just meant to rile up people and get their base upset while continuing to put off the work that the American people sent us here to do: to work together to really solve some of America's problems.

H.R. 6192 isn't the first anti-efficiency bill we have seen on the House floor. My Republican colleagues are obstructing the work that we have been sent here to do. We have a lot of serious problems, like reducing the cost of prescription drugs and helping everybody have access to healthcare.

The Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, along with the other anti-efficiency bills out there, like very serious bills—Liberty in Laundry Act, Refrigerator Freedom Act, Clothes Dryers Reliability Act—are just bills with

names to get your attention, but all they do is delay and weaken popular energy efficiency programs, courting favors with polluters.

Unfortunately, they show that I have colleagues who don't want to save American consumers money on their energy bills. They keep peddling these blatant lies that the Biden administration is going after Americans' household appliances. They are not, nor did they try to take away our gas stoves last year. There is a lot of drama out there not based in truth.

I have a brand-new gas stove. Actually, it is a year old, and I have yet to use it. That is how often we get to cook. Nobody is going to take it away from me, and I bought it in the midst of that whole debate. Secretary Granholm has said that she owns a gas stove and that nobody is going to take it away from her.

The fear-mongering is nothing more than political—I don't know what word I want to use because I love my friends—but it is designed to scare consumers and is not based on facts.

The American people sent us here to work together in a bipartisan manner to find commonsense solutions, like working together to extend funding for the Affordable Connectivity Program that expires this month and helps millions of Americans have access to and afford broadband. We saw what happened during COVID when so many people didn't have access to the internet.

Instead of doing something that will help everyday working Americans, we are focused on partisan messaging bills. Instead of working on the real issues facing the American people, we are choosing, yet again, to waste our time debating appliances.

Mr. Chair, we need to stop playing games, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

President Biden's tenure in office has been largely defined by this administration's self-inflicted crises, including an energy crisis that has crept its way into the homes of American families.

The Biden administration's war on American energy has not only led to higher prices at the pump, but now families' home appliances are on the chopping block—yes, their home appliances.

Under the guise of energy efficiency, the Department of Energy has issued burdensome standards on household appliances that would drive up costs and reduce availability for these in-demand products, and we don't even know if they work.

I cannot fathom why the Federal Government would tilt the scales of what appliances Americans should and should not buy. That should be a free-market decision.

Common sense tells us demand should be consumer and market-driven, not government-manufactured. Nonetheless, in this administration's pursuit of a radical, rush-to-Green New Deal agenda, common sense has taken a back seat.

H.R. 6192 will preserve the affordability, availability, and quality of household appliances and protect Americans from Federal standards that increase costs, fail to result in significant energy savings, and are not practical.

When I came to Congress, never in my wildest imagination would I have thought that I would stand here on the House floor to defend my constituents' appliances and gas stoves, but this is where we are under this administration.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), our Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of New Jersey for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chair, the House of Representatives, of course, is the institution the Framers designed to be the closest to the American people. The first institution mentioned in the United States Constitution is the people's House, the place where President Abraham Lincoln declared that America is "the last best hope of Earth," the place where FDR made clear the importance of defending democracy against the tyranny of Nazi fascism. It is the place where President Lyndon Baines Johnson talked about the importance of the Voting Rights Act and made clear to America that we shall overcome.

The House of Representatives is a special place.

Earlier today, I was told you need to get to the House floor to deal with a signature piece of legislation from the extreme MAGA Republicans in this 118th Congress. I wondered to myself, is it going to be about inflation, lower costs, housing affordability, public safety, dealing with the challenges at the border, Social Security, Medicare? What is it going to be about?

It turns out the signature piece of legislation for the extreme MAGA Republicans this week, this month, this year is the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act. This is what we are dealing with on this magical House floor, with all the challenges that the American people are confronting. Liberty for laundry, defending the dignity of dishwashers, fighting for freedom of refrigerators is what we are doing? You can't make it up. You can't make it up.

As House Democrats, we are going to defend democracy. Extreme MAGA Republicans are working on defending the dignity of dishwashers.

As House Democrats, we are going to protect and strengthen Social Security. Extreme MAGA Republicans apparently are interested in protecting gas stoves against phony accusations of oppression.

House Democrats are going to defend reproductive freedom. Extreme MAGA Republicans are focused on the freedom for refrigerators.

We believe in a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions, period, full stop. We believe in women's healthcare, in protecting the women of America against extreme MAGA Republican overreach. Instead of leaning into the protection of reproductive freedom, instead of trying to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, my Republican colleagues want to criminalize abortion care and impose a nationwide ban and then waste time on the House floor as it relates to the liberty of laundry. You can't make this up.

Mr. Chair, I urge my Republican colleagues to partner with us. If they want to push back against overreach, then push back against the pro-Putin extreme overreach on their side of the aisle that doesn't want to defend democracy and freedom here and abroad. It is undermining it.

We extend the hand of partnership, as we have repeatedly done, to solve real problems for the American people, but those problems have nothing to do with the dignity of dishwashers, the freedom of refrigerators, or the liberty of laundry.

Let's get back to doing the real business of the American people. Vote "no" against this legislation.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Chair, over the past 3 years, the Biden administration has fought to enact a far-left energy agenda that stifles innovation, raises prices, and halts economic growth. Burdensome regulations that fail to decrease energy usage and cost consumers more to buy appliances should not be enacted.

This legislation would put a stop to the Department of Energy's continued crackdown on American-made appliances and implement minimal thresholds for energy or water savings that would need to be met before any new regulations could be created.

The Biden administration's war on energy is reaching into the American home, and it is closing the door to your refrigerator and draining your dishwasher. Ultimately, it would cost American families more money.

Further, this bill would ensure that the Secretary of Energy cannot unilaterally ban products because of the type of fuel that they use.

In order to lower prices and to protect our energy independence, it is vital that we continue to utilize energy resources like natural gas that is underneath the feet of my constituents in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6192, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act.

With everything going on in our world and in our country today, I, like Leader Jeffries, am disappointed that the precious time we have on this House floor to move legislation is dedicated to unnecessary, unhelpful, and unasked-for bills about home appliances.

Rights for refrigerators, liberty for laundry, dignity for dishwashers—how about instead we turn our attention to the rights, liberty, and dignity of women in America?

In my home State of Texas and across the country, women's rights to make their own decisions about their bodies, their families, and their futures are being stripped away by State legislatures and local governments. Why is it that this majority does nothing for them?

For example, as States ban abortion and limit access to reproductive healthcare, more and more Americans have been forced to travel, sometimes long distances and oftentimes to other States, to get the reproductive healthcare that they need.

In response to the exercise of this constitutional right to travel, one of the chief privileges and immunities for citizens in the Constitution, lawmakers are trying to take away this right, too.

□ 1530

Multiple cities in Texas have enacted ordinances to prohibit anyone from traveling on their roads or through their towns if the purpose is to get somewhere else to get an abortion.

In Alabama, the attorney general wants to prosecute groups that help women obtain abortions out of State.

Just last week, a man in Texas took legal action to investigate his former partner who had traveled to a State where abortion is legal.

These things are happening in the United States today, as we sit here today. This unconstitutional interference with our rights and our liberty and our dignity is what this body should be considering. That is what this body should be concerned about.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would strike the current bill text and replace it with the text of my bill, H.R. 782, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act. This amendment reaffirms the fundamental constitutional right to travel across State lines for the purpose of obtaining reproductive healthcare as well as for healthcare providers providing care to out-of-

State residents and those assisting people traveling for this purpose.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

Mrs. Fletcher moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6192 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike sections 1 through 3 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE ABORTION SERVICES PROHIBITED.

(a) INTERFERENCE PROHIBITED.—No person acting under color of State law, including any person who, by operation of a provision of State law, is permitted to implement or enforce State law, may prevent, restrict, or impede, or retaliate against, in any manner—

(1) a health care provider's ability to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State;

(2) any person or entity's ability to assist a health care provider to provide, initiate, or otherwise enable an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided to a patient who does not reside in that State, if such assistance does not violate the law of that State;

(3) any person's ability to travel across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided;

(4) any person's or entity's ability to assist another person traveling across a State line for the purpose of obtaining an abortion service that is lawful in the State in which the service is to be provided; or

(5) the movement in interstate commerce, in accordance with Federal law or regulation, of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief, and for such compensatory damages as the court determines appropriate, including for economic losses and for emotional pain and suffering. The court may, in addition, award reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action to a prevailing plaintiff.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "abortion service" means—

(A) an abortion, including the use of any drug approved or licensed by the Food and Drug Administration for the termination of a pregnancy; and

(B) any health care service related to or provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) The term "health care provider" means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, physician's assistant, or pharmacist) that is—

(A) engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) licensed or certified to perform such service under applicable State law.

(3) The term "drug" has the meaning given such term in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, each Indian tribe, and each territory or possession of the United States.

(e) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the fundamental right to travel within the United States, including the District of Columbia, Tribal lands, and the territories of the United States, nor to limit any existing enforcement authority of the Attorney General or any existing remedies available to address a violation of such right.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Chair, I would like to go over some of the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have accused this bill of mine of doing.

First, Mr. PALLONE, who I respect, said this bill will raise energy bills. Absolutely not. In fact, if you read the bill, it couldn't be clearer because the text states: The Secretary cannot issue a new standard if the energy efficiency standard results in additional cost to consumers. It is very clear. In fact, the whole goal of this bill is to save consumers money and also make sure that their appliances actually work.

My fellow colleague, Representative CASTOR, said: We need to side with the people. Well, that is exactly what my bill does. I will tell you why. Let me give you some examples of what our current Department of Energy is doing and why this isn't a waste of time to be talking about because this is for the people. This is for every household in America that has to pay more money because of these crazy Department of Energy regulations.

Let me give you some examples: For clothes washers, the Department of Energy estimates that its standard could save as little as \$9 for certain models over the average lifetime for the appliance, which is estimated to be 13.4 years, \$9 over 13.4 years. Wow.

For dishwashers, the analysis by the Department of Energy under Biden finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront cost by 28 percent, and it could take consumers 12 years to pay back the increased cost on a product that may only last 7 to 12 years.

My bill is for the people.

Here is another DOE rule under the Biden administration: For refrigerators and freezers, the Department of Energy's own analysis finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront cost to replace that refrigerator or freezer by 25 percent, and it could take

consumers 10 years to pay back the increased cost for a product that may only last 14 to 15 years.

Here is another example: For air conditioners, the Department of Energy's own analysis finds that efficiency mandates could increase the upfront cost by 30 percent, and it could take consumers 4 years to pay back the increased cost for a product that may only last 9 years.

Here is another one: For clothes dryers, Biden's Department of Energy's own analysis—I am talking about their analysis, not mine—shows that it would take between 6 years and 46 years to pay back the increased cost, depending on the type of dryer and the product features.

The payback periods for many of these appliances are uneconomical. For example, under Biden's Department of Energy, the payback periods for proposed clothes dryer standards are 6 years for electric, 18 years for electric compact, 20 years for vented electric compact, 5 years for vented gas, 11 years for ventless electric compact, and 46 years for ventless electric combination washer/dryer.

With all due respect to my Democratic colleagues, who say this is a waste of time—we are wasting time, we should be talking about all of their priorities. No. Republicans are here. We are standing up for the average, commonsense, everyday American who can't afford groceries anymore, let alone these crazy, radical standards that the Biden administration is pushing through that will increase their costs.

That is why I am doing this bill. We want appliances that not only work, but we don't want to bankrupt the American people with all these crazy, radical, Biden rush-to-green energy policies.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. PALLONE for his leadership.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the House Republicans' ridiculous Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, which would strip away commonsense energy efficiency standards that will save our constituents hundreds of dollars every year on their utility bills and save \$1 trillion and cut greenhouse gas pollution by over 2.5 billion metric tons over the next 30 years.

However, House Republicans want to put polluters over people by stoking fear that someone is coming after their household appliances. News flash: No one is coming after anyone's household appliances.

We should be focused on the issues that the American people want us to focus on. Indeed, none of my constituents nor a majority of the American people are clamoring for Congress to protect their household appliances.

Do you know what they are clamoring for? They are clamoring for Con-

gress to do something about the fact that they have lost reproductive freedom and the ability to make healthcare decisions without interference from politicians since the Supreme Court gutted *Roe v. Wade*. Now over 40 percent of women of reproductive age live in a State with an abortion ban or extreme restrictions.

They want us to do something about the fact that barriers to their exercise of the right to vote have been put in place since the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act.

They want us to do something about the fact that the impacts of climate change such as, sea level rise, increased temperatures, major storms increasing, and pollution is having an impact on their health, their businesses, their communities, and even our military readiness, as we heard from the Secretary of the Navy last week.

Democrats are fighting to put people over politics and address these issues that actually matter to the American people. I urge my Republican colleagues to do the same. Vote "no" on this bill, and let's get back to work.

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

Mr. Chair, my colleagues keep saying: Do something that the people really care about. This is something that the American people really care about.

Let me show you a Wall Street Journal article from today. It is from today. It is titled, "Biden is Coming for Your Air Conditioner." It says: "Your next new home air conditioner could set you back \$12,000 or more, with Federal regulators contributing to the rising cost of staying cool."

I am from Arizona. We need air conditioners. People are just trying to get by right now because of the inflation under Biden. Biden's economics—Bidenomics, as he calls it—is costing people money.

The Energy Department in January 2023 issued a new efficiency standard for residential air-conditioning systems. It necessitated a major redesign that increased costs by \$1,000 to \$1,500 per air conditioner.

It isn't clear that consumers will ever earn back in long-term energy savings the steeper upfront costs they are paying.

Next up is an Environmental Protection Agency regulation scheduled to take effect in 2025. It will require air-conditioning equipment makers to use new refrigerants deemed sufficiently climate friendly. The only refrigerants being used by manufacturers that meet the EPA's new green standards are classified as mildly flammable.

Manufacturers in earnings conference calls have estimated that the price of compliant equipment will increase the price of the air conditioner at least 10 percent. The switch to flammable systems will also require additional technician training and extra installation steps that are likely to increase labor costs for installations and repairs.

I wish that I didn't have to sponsor this bill. I mean, if you asked me a

number of years ago would I sponsor this, I would have thought it wasn't necessary. However, under the Biden administration, they have just gone crazy. I don't know if radical environmentalists are bending the ear of President Biden or what is going on because, as I have demonstrated, this isn't helping Americans. This is a radical agenda that is increasing the prices on everyday Americans, and we can't afford it. That is why this bill is necessary.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, Republicans have spent the last year and a half attacking all of the Biden administration's efforts to lower energy costs for American consumers.

Rebates for energy efficient appliances to lower energy bills; Republicans are furious.

Incentives to spur investment in clean energy to drive down bills; Republicans attack that.

Efforts to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower gas prices for Americans; Republicans were incensed.

Forgive me, Mr. Chairman, but I just find it all too much, especially because not a single colleague of mine on the other side of the aisle has made as much as a peep since the Federal Trade Commission last week revealed that the CEO of the largest American independent producer of crude oil was colluding with OPEC to keep oil prices high.

That is the real scandal, Mr. Chairman: The CEO of an American company working together with representatives of the Saudi Government to raise prices for Americans. Even worse, he tried to persuade his competitors to do the same and drive the price of crude oil up to \$200 per barrel in a display of naked greed.

If my Republican colleagues were serious about wanting to lower energy costs for Americans, they would hold hearings. They are in charge. They are in the majority. They should hold hearings and put legislation on the floor to deal with this scandal instead of standing here debating the freedom of appliances.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans claim they want to lower energy costs, but their actions speak louder than their words. They are beyond furious if you try to use technology to lower the energy consumption of household appliances and save Americans money, but a Big Oil CEO colluding with OPEC nations to pick American pockets, you would be hard pressed to get Republicans to care about that.

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

□ 1545

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call out the problems that I have heard on the floor today from the other side of the aisle.

Republicans have claimed that they care about energy costs. They keep saying over and over again that they care about energy costs, but their actions and their vote shows that that is just not true.

The Biden administration's efficiency standards are estimated to save consumers \$1 trillion over 30 years. That is \$1 trillion.

Water heater standards will save American households \$7.6 billion, refrigerator standards will save Americans \$36 billion, and clothes washer and dryer standards will save Americans a combined \$39 billion.

The bottom line is Republicans don't want Americans to realize those savings. They want Americans to be stuck with older, energy-guzzling appliances that cost more money every time you turn them on. I think it is ridiculous, and so should everyone else in this Chamber.

Republicans claim they are concerned about the higher upfront costs of these appliances, but 2 years ago when the Inflation Reduction Act was passed, which contained \$9 billion in rebates and other investments in lowering the cost of energy-efficient appliances, well, Republicans all voted "no," every one of them.

Let's review. The Republicans don't want to make positive economic investments because they are concerned about the up-front costs, but then they also refuse to take action to lower those up-front costs.

If you brought this mentality to the private sector, you would probably be fired in a heartbeat. That is the orthodoxy in today's Republican Party.

Lowering energy costs for consumers via efficiency gains used to be a bipartisan issue. These efficiency standards and the process for achieving them have been around for 50 years, and every so often, we have the Department of Energy both under Democrats and Republicans coming forward with efficiency standards.

We made real progress on this in 1992 and again in 2005, but somewhere along the way, Republicans decided to become the party of higher energy costs rather than the ones fighting for the American homeowners, and it is a real shame.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. This bill is going to raise energy costs. This bill is going to stifle innovation. This bill is going to do nothing, obviously, to address the climate crisis.

It is just going nowhere, and we are wasting our time when we could be doing things that are more important than addressing affordability for the American people.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, sometimes I feel like it is *deja vu*. I remember

standing here and talking about my Save Our Gas Stoves bill.

My Democrat colleagues—not all of them because some of them voted with me on my bill—said the same arguments. This is a waste of time. We are not banning stoves. The Americans don't care about this.

Well, guess what? That bill passed the U.S. House of Representatives with bipartisan support, and then guess what? It worked because the Department of Energy dialed it back.

Originally, according to their own analysis, they were going to effectively ban 96 percent of all the current models of gas stoves. Now, it is only 3 percent. We won. The American people won. That is why I am doing this bill.

When my friend, Mr. PALLONE, says, well, these energy efficiency standards will save all kinds of money, what he is not saying is all of the money that it is going to cost extra up front for these new, revised standards, and that is if the thing even works well.

Let me remind my colleagues what this bill actually does and why it is needed. It is a commonsense bill. It will protect affordability by requiring the Department of Energy to consider the full life cycle cost of appliances when determining if the new standard is economically justified.

The bill requires a 3-year payback. The Secretary of Energy said, oh, it should only be 1 year, so there shouldn't be any problems with my bill.

The bill establishes minimum thresholds for energy or water savings that must be achieved before imposing new standards.

My Democrat colleagues say they want to save energy and water. So do I. Let's put it in the bill. Let's say, okay, it has to save 10 percent.

The bill prohibits the Secretary of Energy from banning products based on what type of fuel the product uses, just like they were trying to do with the gas stoves.

The bill requires that any new standard cannot affect the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product or the life span of the product.

You know why? Because Americans, when they buy new appliances, want them to work as good as the ones that they have now.

The bill will allow the Department of Energy to amend or revoke prior standards if they don't save consumers money and they don't work.

This is a commonsense bill. It should be a bipartisan bill. I don't know why my Democrat colleagues are fighting it so hard because it says it has to save the consumers money.

It is all about helping the American homeowner who is struggling with Bidenomics right now. I am telling you: People in my district, they complain about the prices of groceries. They are complaining about the price of gas.

When their air conditioner, when their water heater, when their dish-

washer starts to fail, and they have to buy a new one, they don't want to pay a whole bunch more, and they want it to work as well as their current one has done for years.

That is the purpose of my bill. That is why I ask my Democratic colleagues and my Republican 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6192

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 "Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act".

SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 325(m)(1) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, for any product, publish a notice of proposed rulemaking including new proposed standards for such product based on the criteria established under subsection (c) and the procedures established under subsection (p)."

(2) AMENDMENT OF STANDARD.—Section 325(m)(3) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(m)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) AMENDMENT OF STANDARD.—Not later than 2 years after a notice is issued under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish a final rule amending the standard for the product."

(b) PETITION FOR AMENDED STANDARD.—Section 325(n) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(n)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "AN AMENDED STANDARD" and inserting "AMENDMENT OR REVOCATION OF STANDARD";

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting "or revoked" after "should be amended";

(3) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall grant a petition to determine if energy conservation standards for a covered product should be amended or revoked if the Secretary finds that such petition contains evidence, assuming no other evidence were considered, that such standards—

"(A) result in additional costs to consumers;

"(B) do not result in significant conservation of energy or water;

"(C) are not technologically feasible; and

"(D) result in such covered product not being commercially available in the United States to all consumers."; and

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking "NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS" and inserting "NEW, AMENDED, OR REVOKED STANDARDS";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively (and by conforming the margins accordingly);

(C) by striking “Not later than 3 years” and inserting the following:

“(A) Not later than 3 years”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Not later than 180 days after the date of granting a petition to revoke standards, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

“(i) a final rule revoking the standards; or

“(ii) a determination that it is not necessary to revoke the standards.

“(C) The grant of a petition by the Secretary under this subsection creates no presumption with respect to the Secretary’s determination of any of the criteria in a rule-making under this section.

“(D) Standards that have been revoked pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be considered to be in effect for purposes of section 327.”.

(c) **CRITERIA.**—Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 325(o) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)) are amended to read as follows:

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **DESIGN.**—Any new or amended energy conservation standard prescribed by the Secretary under this section for any type (or class) of covered product shall be designed to achieve the maximum improvement in energy efficiency, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water efficiency, which the Secretary determines is technologically feasible and economically justified.

“(B) **TEST PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product if a test procedure has not been prescribed pursuant to section 323 with respect to that type (or class) of product.

“(C) **SIGNIFICANT CONSERVATION.**—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product if the Secretary determines that the establishment and imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of—

“(i) energy; or

“(ii) in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water.

“(D) **TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE AND ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED.**—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary determines that the establishment and imposition of such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified.

“(3) **FACTORS FOR DETERMINATION.**—

“(A) **ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.**—Prior to prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for any type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary shall conduct a quantitative economic impact analysis of imposition of the energy conservation standard that determines the predicted—

“(i) effects of imposition of the energy conservation standard on costs and monetary benefits to consumers of the products subject to such energy conservation standard, including—

“(I) costs to low-income households; and

“(II) variations in costs to consumers based on differences in regions, including climatic differences;

“(ii) effects of imposition of the energy conservation standard on employment; and

“(iii) lifecycle costs for the covered product, including costs associated with the pur-

chase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

“(B) **PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL COSTS TO THE CONSUMER.**—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary, based on an economic analysis under subparagraph (A), determines that—

“(i) imposition of such energy conservation standard is not likely to result in additional net costs to the consumer, including any increase in net costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product; and

“(ii) the monetary value of the energy savings and, as applicable, water savings, that the consumer will receive as a result of such energy conservation standard during the first 3 years after purchasing and installing a covered product complying with such energy conservation standard, as calculated under the applicable test procedure, will be greater than any increased costs to the consumer of the covered product due to imposition of such energy conservation standard, including increased costs associated with the purchase, installation, maintenance, disposal, and replacement of the covered product.

“(C) **REQUIRED ENERGY OR WATER SAVINGS.**—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that compliance with such energy conservation standard will result in—

“(i) a reduction of at least 0.3 quads of site energy over 30 years; or

“(ii) at least a 10 percent reduction in energy or water use of the covered product.

“(D) **CRITERIA RELATED TO PERFORMANCE.**—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in any lessening of the utility or the performance of the applicable covered product, taking into consideration the effects of such energy conservation standard on—

“(i) the compatibility of the covered product with existing systems;

“(ii) the life span of the covered product;

“(iii) the operating conditions of the covered product;

“(iv) the duty cycle, charging time, and run time of the covered product, as applicable;

“(v) the maintenance requirements of the covered product; and

“(vi) the replacement and disposal requirements for the covered product.

“(E) **CRITERIA RELATED TO MARKET COMPETITION AND PRICE DISCRIMINATION.**—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified unless the Secretary determines that imposition of the energy conservation standard is not likely to result in—

“(i) any lessening of market competition; or

“(ii) price discrimination.

“(F) **TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION.**—The Secretary may not determine that imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified 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 products based on what type of fuel the product consumes.

“(G) **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining whether imposition of an energy conservation standard is economically justified, the Secretary—

“(i) shall prioritize the interests of consumers;

“(ii) may not consider estimates of the social costs or social benefits associated with incremental greenhouse gas emissions; and

“(iii) shall consider—

“(I) the economic impact of the standard on the manufacturers and on the consumers of the products subject to such standard;

“(II) the savings in operating costs throughout the estimated average life of the covered product in the type (or class) compared to any increase in the price of, or in the initial charges for, or maintenance expenses of, the covered products which are likely to result from the imposition of the standard;

“(III) the total projected amount of energy, or as applicable, water, savings likely to result directly from the imposition of the standard;

“(IV) the need for national energy and water conservation; and

“(V) other factors the Secretary considers relevant.

“(H) **REGULATORY REVIEW.**—

“(i) **EVALUATION.**—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of any final rule prescribing a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for any type (or class) of covered product, the Secretary shall evaluate the rule to determine whether such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified and whether the regulatory impact analysis for such rule remains accurate.

“(ii) **EFFECT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, if the Secretary determines, based on an evaluation under clause (i), that an energy conservation standard is not technologically feasible or economically justified—

“(I) the Secretary shall publish such determination and such energy conservation standard shall have no force or effect (except that such energy conservation standard shall be considered to be in effect for purposes of section 327); and

“(II) the Secretary may publish a final rule amending the energy conservation standard for the type (or class) of covered product to be technologically feasible and economically justified in accordance with this subsection, which amendment shall apply to such a product that is manufactured after the date that is 2 years after publication of such final rule.”.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **REGIONAL STANDARDS.**—Section 325(o)(6)(D)(i)(II) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(o)(6)(D)(i)(II)) is amended by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “this subsection”.

(b) **PROCEDURE FOR PRESCRIBING NEW OR AMENDED STANDARDS.**—Section 325(p)(2)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(p)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “taking into account those factors which the Secretary must consider under subsection (o)(2)” and inserting “as determined in accordance with subsection (o)”.

(c) **ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR HIGH-INTENSITY DISCHARGE LAMPS, DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS, AND SMALL ELECTRIC MOTORS.**—Section 346 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6317) is amended by striking subsection (c).

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 118-487. 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 of division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONY GONZALES OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-487.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. 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 8, line 7, strike “climatic differences” and insert “rural populations, cost of living comparisons, and climatic differences”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment. I grew up in rural Texas. This amendment is simple. It ensures that whenever the Biden administration proposes or amends an energy conservation standard, the needs of rural communities are taken into consideration.

For too long, the needs of people in rural communities, including those I represent in south and west Texas, have been ignored in order to support the left's rush-to-green agenda.

In my district, many people rely on gas-powered appliances to cook their meals, maintain their lawn care, and power and heat their homes in times of electric failures.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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. Chair, first, as I have already said, the Department of Energy must already ensure that energy conservation standards are economically justified, so this amendment is totally unnecessary.

Instead of being helpful, this amendment adds duplicative processes to a bill that already adds burdensome steps to the energy conservation program. It is all just messaging and designed to slow down rulemaking.

Also, it is interesting to me that we are even considering this amendment. The gentleman seems very confident that there will be any new or amended energy conservations; however, under this bill, I am not even sure that we will ever see any new standards.

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

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. STEUBE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-487.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGGA), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 13, insert the following:

“(E) DISCLOSURE.—The Secretary may not prescribe a new or amended energy conservation standard under this section for a type (or class) of covered product unless the Secretary, not later than the date on which the standard is prescribed, publicly discloses each meeting held by the Secretary, during the 5-year period preceding such date, with any entity that—

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

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

“(iii) has applied for or received Federal funds.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment originally sponsored by Congressman HUIZENGGA that requires the Secretary of Energy to disclose certain stakeholder meetings with any entity that meets the following criteria:

First, the entity must have ties to the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party.

Second, it must have produced studies regarding or has advocated for policies to limit, restrict, or ban the use of any type of energy.

Third, the entity must have applied for or received Federal funds.

In June of last year, nearly the same amendment was offered to Save Our Gas Stove Act, and it passed by a voice vote—because this is a solid policy prescription for a serious problem. The problem is that China-connected groups seem to have fast-pass access to the White House and our Federal agencies.

The entities I am concerned with are not only tied to the Chinese Communist Party, but they are peddling anti-energy policies that raise costs on American families and businesses—like gas stove bans. In addition to access, they often receive your tax dollars as well, in the form of grant funding.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has not been transparent about who it is meeting with, let alone their plans to ban gas-powered appliances.

Last year, a government watchdog group revealed a private meeting between the Secretary of Energy and one of these types of groups. We have since found this has not been an uncommon practice.

Over the past few years, we have faced a litany of burdensome regulations from the Biden administration targeting appliances.

As the underlying bill reflects, it is not just gas stoves—it is your washer, your dryer, your dishwasher, and much more.

We have a major problem if groups with known connections to China are able to successfully influence the executive branch in ways that undermine cost-effective appliance options that meet Americans' daily needs.

This amendment would inject critical transparency, curb the influence of the CCP-connected groups, and responsibly expose to America who has the ear of our regulators.

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

□ 1600

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, the amendment 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. 6192 becomes law, it would slow down the Department of Energy rulemaking process and create additional hurdles to adopting energy conservation standards. It would overburden the Department of Energy staff, who would be tasked with identifying covered parties to ensure compliance. It creates loads of needless paperwork and is an unfunded mandate.

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

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, this bill would provide transparency to who the Department is meeting with and who is influencing their decisions.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-487.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. 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:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS.

The final rule titled “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for

Distribution Transformers” (signed on April 3, 2024; Docket No. EERE-2019-BT-STD-0018) shall not take effect.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I offered this amendment with Representative HUDSON and Representative BALDERSON to stop the wrong-headed rule that the Department of Energy finalized which threatens the use of grain-oriented electrical steel in our distribution transformers.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What Biden administration bureaucrats fail to realize is that poorly designed rules made here in Washington can have devastating consequences for Pennsylvania communities. From south central to southwestern Pennsylvania, Gettysburg to Johnstown, Altoona to Bedford, Chambersburg to Lewistown, this impact will be felt.

This rule from the Department of Energy would only serve to worsen the crippling shortages of transformers already faced by American manufacturers.

Just recently, I spoke to a business in Pennsylvania that had been forced to wait 18 months for transformers to open their new business. These shortages are leading to costly delays that ultimately cost jobs, cost livelihoods, and cost the American public.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, apparently, Republicans don't realize that sometimes things can be a win-win.

Back in April, the Department of Energy finalized efficiency standards for distribution transformers, critical components for the electric grid. Because they are so ubiquitous, any improvements in efficiency from these transformers can translate to massive energy and cost savings.

Before the Department of Energy finalized the standard, it spent 15 months listening to everyone from steel and transformer manufacturers to utilities to homebuilders to everyday Americans and everyone in between. The Department of Energy took that feedback very seriously and produced a standard that met the criteria under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act: technologically feasible and economically justified. The final product they put out worked for everyone.

Don't take my word for it. Take the word of UAW Local 3303, which says

that this final rule “ensures a viable pathway for UAW-made steel to supply the transformer market long into the future.” Talk to the United Auto Workers Region 9 director, who thanked the Department of Energy “for listening to the voices of our members in Butler, Pennsylvania, and having a willingness to learn from our subject matter experts who actually make these products.”

You don't have to just listen to labor leaders on this, either. Listen to Cleveland-Cliffs, the manufacturer of the electrical steel that goes into transformers. They praised the rule and said they expect it to actually increase demand for their product, opening the possibility of future investments and plant expansion. Listen to the president of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, who thanked the Department of Energy for the flexibility that the final rule provided. Listen to the utilities that say this final rule provides stability and certainty while moving us toward vital efficiency goals.

The sponsors of this amendment should just turn around and listen to the Republican chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, my esteemed colleague from Washington State, who called the final rule encouraging.

Mr. Chair, you can go to one of the sponsors, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), who just two weeks ago appeared at an event with the Secretary of Energy at Cleveland-Cliffs—again, a manufacturer of grain-oriented electrical steel—and celebrated the final rule and the jobs at Cleveland-Cliffs that the final rule will save. The press release from my colleague's office called the final rule on distribution transformers efficiency “the right thing.”

I couldn't agree more, Mr. Chair. I am just not sure what made my colleagues change their minds in the last 2 weeks.

My point is, there is broad support behind this rule from all corners. If Republicans really cared about the transformer shortages utilities across the Nation are still suffering from, they would work with us to provide the necessary funding for the President's invocation of the Defense Production Act for transformers because that is something, unlike this amendment, that would really make a positive difference.

I really don't understand why this amendment is being offered. It makes no sense.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am not sure where he gathered that information, but it is totally false, which is normal here.

The sole remaining domestic producer of grain-oriented electrical steel is in my hometown of Butler, Pennsyl-

vania, and it is represented by 1,300 union workers from UAW 3303, which my colleague has referenced. He should have been in Butler with me when almost 500 of them showed up to protest what was happening with the elimination of grain-oriented electrical steel.

This rule threatens the long-term viability of the mill. The mill in Butler produces grain-oriented electrical steel for distribution transformers, and I brought a picture of it because most people don't know what we are talking about. Mr. Chair, if you are driving down the road and see a telephone pole with this gray canister on it, that is a distribution transformer. Inside it is a product called grain-oriented electrical steel.

That product, by the way, works at 98-percent efficiency. The other side would like to replace it with something called amorphous steel, which if you compare the two, only one is actually steel. Grain-oriented electrical steel is actually steel. Amorphous looks like tinfoil.

Our product is 98-percent efficient. If you transfer over to amorphous steel, you are looking at a load capacity of 80 percent, which is dangerous, while a traditional GOES transformer can run with a 120 percent load capacity.

The market for these transformers is at an all-time high. Why in the world would we go away from something that is domestically produced in Butler, Pennsylvania, for a product that is not produced in America, cannot serve the needs that are there, and cannot meet the market demands for some type of a wrongheaded idea that we must go with this new product.

Listen to fact versus fiction. This transformer with grain-oriented electrical steel, domestic steel, is produced in Butler, Pennsylvania, by 1,300 union workers, with each union job supporting an estimated seven local jobs in my hometown. The elimination of this product would eliminate that town.

Have we not learned enough over the years that when we turn away from a domestic-produced product and rely on a foreign source for it, that somehow in the end we don't have the product and capacity that we need.

We have dumb-headed rule after dumb-headed rule in some type of a made-up, fantasy world where somehow this is better. It is not better.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Let me say, Mr. Chair, again, the standards that have been established by the Department of Energy have broad support. The rule has broad support from all corners. I just don't understand how my Republican colleagues can say all of a sudden now that they are opposed to it.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, here we are again in a situation where it is “he said, she said,” or “you said, I said.” I challenge anybody who has not been to a mill and actually watched the production of steel to sit on this floor and say they have a better product because they say it is a better product.

The distribution of electricity is critical in our homes, businesses, and towns across the Nation. The last remaining domestic producer of grain-oriented electrical steel, which is the product inside all of these transformers, is made in one mill in one town in America, not in some strange place across the oceans that says we will provide you with this if we can.

Why do we keep turning away from domestic production and thinking that somehow, someplace, somewhere, somebody else is going to provide it for us? That is wrongheaded and just makes absolutely no sense.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to please go in these mills, look at these canisters that are on the telephone poles, and understand that is how we push electricity from one point to the next. This isn't fantasy. This is the truth of what is going on.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to take down the rule that is there now and vote for this amendment. It is the only way we can save electrical transformers in America. Please vote for American products.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 199, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

AYES—208

Aderholt	Calvert	Duarte
Alford	Cammack	Duncan
Allen	Carey	Dunn (FL)
Amodei	Carl	Edwards
Armstrong	Carter (GA)	Ellzey
Arrington	Chavez-DeRemer	Emmer
Babin	Ciscomani	Estes
Bacon	Cline	Ezell
Balderson	Cloud	Fallon
Barr	Clyde	Feenstra
Bean (FL)	Cole	Finstad
Bentz	Collins	Fischbach
Bergman	Comer	Fitzgerald
Bice	Crane	Fitzpatrick
Biggs	Crawford	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Flood
Bishop (NC)	Cuellar	Foxx
Boebert	Curtis	Franklin, Scott
Bost	D'Esposito	Fry
Brecheen	Davidson	Fulcher
Buchanan	Davis (NC)	Gaetz
Bucshon	De La Cruz	Garbarino
Burchett	DesJarlais	Garcia, Mike
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Gimenez
Burlison	Donalds	Gonzales, Tony

Gonzalez,	Lesko	Rose
Vicente	Letlow	Rosendale
Good (VA)	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Gooden (TX)	Lucas	Roy
Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford
Granger	Luna	Salazar
Graves (LA)	Luttrell	Scalise
Graves (MO)	Mace	Schweikert
Green (TN)	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin
Greene (GA)	Maloy	Self
Griffith	Mann	Simpson
Grothman	Masse	Smith (MO)
Guest	Mast	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Harris	McClain	Smucker
Harshbarger	McClintock	Stauber
Hern	McCormick	Steel
Higgins (LA)	Miller (IL)	Stefanik
Hill	Miller (OH)	Steil
Hinson	Miller (WV)	Steube
Houchin	Miller-Meeks	Strong
Hudson	Mills	Tenney
Huizenga	Molinaro	Thompson (PA)
Hunt	Moolenaar	Tiffany
Issa	Moore (AL)	Timmons
Jackson (TX)	Moore (UT)	Turner
James	Moran	Valadao
Johnson (SD)	Moylan	Van Drew
Jordan	Murphy	Van Dwyne
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Van Orden
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Wagner
Kean (NJ)	Norman	Walberg
Kelly (MS)	Nunn (IA)	Waltz
Kelly (PA)	Obermole	Weber (TX)
Kiggans (VA)	Ogles	Webster (FL)
Kiley	Owens	Wenstrup
Kim (CA)	Palmer	Westerman
Kustoff	Perez	Williams (NY)
LaHood	Perry	Williams (TX)
LaLota	Pfluger	Wilson (SC)
Lamborn	Posey	Wittman
Latta	Reschenthaler	Womack
LaTurner	Rodgers (WA)	Yakym
Lawler	Rogers (AL)	Zinke
Lee (FL)	Rogers (KY)	

NOES—199

Adams	Dingell	Lynch
Aguilar	Doggett	Manning
Alfred	Escobar	Matsui
Amo	Eshoo	McBath
Auchincloss	Espallat	McClellan
Balint	Evans	McCollum
Barragán	Fletcher	McGarvey
Beatty	Foster	McGovern
Bera	Frankel, Lois	Meeks
Beyer	Frost	Menendez
Bishop (GA)	Galleo	Meng
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Mfume
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (IL)	Moore (WI)
Bonamici	Garcia (TX)	Morelle
Bowman	Garcia, Robert	Moskowitz
Boyle (PA)	Golden (ME)	Moulton
Brown	Goldman (NY)	Mrvan
Brownley	Gomez	Mullin
Budzinski	Gottheimer	Nadler
Bush	Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano
Caraveo	Harder (CA)	Neguse
Carbajal	Hayes	Nickel
Cárdenas	Himes	Norcross
Carter (LA)	Horsford	Norton
Cartwright	Houlahan	Ocasio-Cortez
Casas	Hoyer	Omar
Case	Hoyle (OR)	Pallone
Casten	Ivey	Panetta
Castor (FL)	Jackson (NC)	Pappas
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Pascrell
Cherfilus-	Jeffries	Pelosi
McCormick	Johnson (GA)	Peltola
Chu	Kamlager-Dove	Peters
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Pettersen
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Pingree
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Plaskett
Cohen	Kennedy	Pocan
Connolly	Khanna	Porter
Correa	Kildee	Pressley
Costa	Kilmer	Quigley
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Ramirez
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
Crockett	Kuster	Ross
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
David (KS)	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Dean (PA)	Lee (NV)	Sablan
DeGette	Lee (PA)	Salinas
DeLauro	Leger Fernandez	Sánchez
DeBene	Levin	Sarbanes
Deluzio	Lieu	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—28

Baird	Huffman	Mooney
Banks	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Carson	Jackson Lee	Pence
Carter (TX)	Jacobs	Phillips
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Radewagen
Ferguson	Landsman	Sessions
Foushee	Langworthy	Spartz
González-Colón	Magaziner	Trone
Grijalva	McHenry	
Hageman	Meuser	

□ 1641

Messrs. TAKANO and FOSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROUZER). There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROUZER, 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. 6192) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Fletcher of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6192 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Blunt Rochester	Houlihan	Pingree
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pocan
Bowman	Hoyle (OR)	Porter
Boyle (PA)	Ivey	Pressley
Brown	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Brownley	Jackson (NC)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Jayapal	Raskin
Bush	Jeffries	Ross
Caraveo	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Kamlager-Dove	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Keating	Salinas
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Casar	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Case	Khanna	Scanlon
Casten	Kildee	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Scholten
McCormick	Kuster	Schrier
Chu	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Sherrill
Connolly	Leger Fernandez	Slotkin
Correa	Levin	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lieu	Sorensen
Courtney	Lofgren	Soto
Craig	Lynch	Spanberger
Crockett	Manning	Stansbury
Crow	Matsui	Stanton
Davids (KS)	McBath	Stevens
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Strickland
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Suozi
DeGette	McGarvey	Swalwell
DeLauro	McGovern	Sykes
DelBene	Meeks	Takano
Deluzio	Menendez	Thanedar
DeSaulnier	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Mfume	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Moore (WI)	Titus
Escobar	Morelle	Tlaib
Eshoo	Moskowitz	Tokuda
Espallat	Moulton	Tonko
Evans	Mrvan	Torres (CA)
Fletcher	Mullin	Torres (NY)
Foster	Nadler	Trahan
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Underwood
Frost	Neal	Vargas
Garamendi	Neguse	Vasquez
Garcia (IL)	Nickel	Veasey
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Velázquez
Garcia, Robert	Ocasio-Cortez	Wasserman
Goldman (NY)	Omar	Schultz
Gomez	Pallone	Waters
Gottheimer	Panetta	Watson Coleman
Green, Al (TX)	Pappas	Wexton
Harder (CA)	Pascrell	Wild
Hayes	Pelosi	Williams (GA)
Himes	Peters	Wilson (FL)
Horsford	Pettersen	

NOT VOTING—23

Baird	Hageman	Mooney
Banks	Huffman	Pence
Carson	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Carter (TX)	Jacobs	Schweikert
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Sessions
Ferguson	Landsman	Spartz
Foushee	Magaziner	Trone
Grijalva	McHenry	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1657

Ms. CARAVEO changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RELATING TO “STANDARD FOR DETERMINING JOINT EMPLOYER STATUS”—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question of whether the House, on reconsideration, will pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 98) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to “Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status”, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

In accord with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 191, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Ellzey	LaHood
Alford	Emmer	LaLota
Allen	Eshoo	Lamborn
Amodei	Estes	Langworthy
Armstrong	Ezell	Latta
Arrington	Fallon	LaTurner
Babin	Feenstra	Lawler
Bacon	Finstad	Lee (FL)
Balderson	Fischbach	Lesko
Barr	Fitzgerald	Letlow
Bean (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk
Bentz	Fleischmann	Lucas
Bera	Flood	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Foxx	Luna
Bice	Franklin, Scott	Luttrell
Biggs	Fry	Mace
Blirakis	Fulcher	Malliotakis
Bishop (NC)	Gaetz	Maloy
Boebert	Garbarino	Mann
Bost	Garcia, Mike	Massie
Brecheen	Gimenez	Mast
Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	McCaull
Bucshon	Good (VA)	McClain
Burchett	Gooden (TX)	McClintock
Burgess	Gosar	McCormick
Burlison	Granger	Meuser
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Miller (IL)
Cammack	Graves (MO)	Miller (OH)
Carey	Green (TN)	Miller (WV)
Carl	Greene (GA)	Miller-Meeks
Carter (GA)	Griffith	Mills
Case	Grothman	Molinaro
Chavez-DeRemer	Guest	Moolenaar
Ciscomani	Guthrie	Moore (AL)
Cline	Harris	Moore (UT)
Cloud	Harshbarger	Moran
Clyde	Hern	Murphy
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Nehls
Collins	Hill	Newhouse
Comer	Hinson	Norman
Correa	Houchin	Nunn (IA)
Costa	Hudson	Oberholte
Crane	Huizenga	Ogles
Crawford	Hunt	Owens
Crenshaw	Issa	Palmer
Cuellar	Jackson (TX)	Perry
Curtis	James	Peters
D'Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Pfleger
Davidson	Jordan	Posey
Davis (NC)	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
De La Cruz	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
DesJarlais	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Donalds	Kelly (PA)	Rose
Duarte	Kiggans (VA)	Rosendale
Duncan	Kiley	Rouzer
Dunn (FL)	Kim (CA)	Roy
Edwards	Kustoff	Rutherford

Salazar	Steil	Waltz
Scalise	Steube	Weber (TX)
Scholten	Strong	Webster (FL)
Schweikert	Tenney	Wenstrup
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Self	Tiffany	Williams (NY)
Simpson	Timmons	Williams (TX)
Smith (MO)	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Wittman
Smith (NJ)	Van Drew	Womack
Smucker	Van Dwyne	Yakym
Stauber	Van Orden	Zinke
Steel	Wagner	
Stefanik	Walberg	

NAYS—191

Adams	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Aguilar	Green, Al (TX)	Peltola
Allred	Harder (CA)	Perez
Amo	Hayes	Pettersen
Auchincloss	Himes	Pingree
Balint	Horsford	Pocan
Barragán	Houlihan	Porter
Beatty	Hoyer	Pressley
Beyer	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Ivey	Ramirez
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Raskin
Blunt Rochester	Jackson (NC)	Ross
Bonamici	Jayapal	Ruiz
Bowman	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Boyle (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Brown	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Brownley	Kaptur	Sánchez
Budzinski	Keating	Sarbanes
Bush	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Caraveo	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Carbajal	Khanna	Schiff
Carter (LA)	Kildee	Schneider
Cartwright	Kilmer	Schrier
Casar	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)
Casten	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Castor (FL)	Kuster	Sewell
Castro (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cherfilus-	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
McCormick	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Chu	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Clyburn	Levin	Spanberger
Cohen	Lieu	Stansbury
Connolly	Lofgren	Stanton
Courtney	Lynch	Stevens
Craig	Manning	Strickland
Crockett	Matsui	Suozi
Crow	McBath	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	McClellan	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McColum	Takano
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Thanedar
DeGette	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Menendez	Titus
Deluzio	Meng	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Tokuda
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Escobar	Morelle	Torres (CA)
Espallat	Moskowitz	Torres (NY)
Evans	Moulton	Trahan
Fletcher	Mrvan	Underwood
Foster	Mullin	Vargas
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Vasquez
Frost	Napolitano	Veasey
Gallego	Neal	Velázquez
Garamendi	Neguse	Wasserman
Garcia (IL)	Nickel	Schultz
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Waters
Garcia, Robert	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Golden (ME)	Omar	Wexton
Goldman (NY)	Pallone	Wild
Gomez	Panetta	Williams (GA)
Gonzalez,	Pappas	Wilson (FL)
Vicente	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—24

Baird	Foushee	Magaziner
Banks	Grijalva	McHenry
Cárdenas	Hageman	Mooney
Carson	Huffman	Pence
Carter (TX)	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Cleaver	Jacobs	Sessions
Doggett	LaMalfa	Spartz
Ferguson	Landsman	Trone

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.