

This is a table in the Federal Register, and it says it is a 16-year payback for dishwashers. I said 12. I apologize for misspeaking because it is really 16 years. This is not just words. These are in the Federal Register.

Americans know that these standards will lessen the efficiency of appliances, will cost them more in upfront costs, and ultimately cost them more in inconvenience, in multiple run cycles, in cost over the lifetime when you have a 16-year payback.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right piece of legislation to push back against the administrative overreach, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7700, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

Mr. CASTEN. 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:

Mr. Casten of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7700 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. Casten moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7700 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits to Congress a certification that the implementation of this Act will not result in increasing energy costs for consumers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

□ 1500

REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1341, I call up the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-

effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7637

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 "Refrigerator Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. PRESCRIBING AND ENFORCING ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR REFRIGERATORS, REFRIGERATOR-FREEZERS, AND FREEZERS.

(a) TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE AND ECONOMICALLY JUSTIFIED.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer under such section unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard is technologically feasible and economically justified; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard is not technologically feasible or economically justified.

(b) PROHIBITION ON INCREASED COSTS TO CONSUMERS.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer under such section unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and 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; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer if the Secretary of Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard is 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.

(c) SIGNIFICANT ENERGY SAVINGS REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subsections (m), (n), and (o) of section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295), the Secretary of Energy may not—

(1) prescribe a new or an amended energy conservation standard for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer under such section if the Secretary of Energy determines that the prescription and imposition of such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of energy; or

(2) enforce an energy conservation standard prescribed under such section for a covered product that is a refrigerator, a refrigerator-freezer, or a freezer if the Secretary of

Energy determines that enforcement of or compliance with such energy conservation standard will not result in significant conservation of energy.

(d) COVERED PRODUCT; ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARD.—In this section, the terms "covered product" and "energy conservation standard" have the meanings given such terms in section 321 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7637.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, and I thank Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS for leading these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this Congress, the Energy and Commerce Committee has heard time after time how this administration has prioritized a radical climate agenda over the needs of everyday Americans.

If you listen to the last debate, you will see a lot of that. The fact is, the American people cannot afford President Biden's energy policies. They are expensive, they are unreliable, and they are diminishing the quality of life for folks across the country.

House Republicans are tired of this administration trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people. We are tired of them putting the interests of the climate lobby over those of hardworking Americans.

The Biden administration's obsession with rationing our abundant energy is reducing the quality of life for Americans. They are making it more difficult and more expensive for you to cook your food, heat your homes, and all the other things that we talked about over the last number of debates on these issues.

With record-high inflation, out-of-control utility bills, and unaffordable home prices, the Biden administration's efficiency regulations will make household appliances more expensive. That is just the bottom line.

The Department of Energy's proposed standards for refrigerators and freezers yield nearly nonexistent savings. The life cycle cost savings for these products is only 3 cents over the course of 9.3 years.

Thanks to the Biden administration, Americans will spend 34 percent more

on appliances today than they did just a decade ago. These appliances are not only more expensive, they are of lesser quality and include fewer features that Americans rely on, and they have a shorter lifespan.

These efficiency standards reflect just how out of touch the Biden administration is with everyday Americans who are struggling to make ends meet.

This legislation will prevent the DOE from enforcing standards for refrigerators and freezers unless they are: technologically feasible and economically justified; are not likely to result in additional cost to the consumer; and will result in a significant conservation of energy.

This bill will protect affordability, quality, and choice for Americans, for the refrigerators and freezers they buy. It puts the interests of Americans first.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, and I thank Representative MILLER-MEEKS for leading this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just like our debate on the last bill, there is no reason for the House to be debating this bill today.

It already passed as part of the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act in May, and yet House Republicans are wasting all of our time by bringing it up again, and it is just another example of why they can't govern.

We are here now to debate H.R. 7637, the Refrigerator Freedom Act. That is right. Republicans are fighting to give refrigerators freedom. You don't hear them fighting for the same thing for American women. In fact, Republicans are trying to strip away a woman's freedom when it comes to reproductive healthcare, pushing nationwide abortion bans.

Talk about misplaced priorities. I can't imagine a more misplaced priority than this bill today.

This bill, along with the other anti-efficiency bills pushed by Republicans, are bad for Americans. It robs Americans of savings on the monthly home energy bills and ignores that even the appliance manufacturing industry supports these efficiency standards.

I am going to repeat that. The industry supports these efficiency standards, so why are you trying to repeal them?

This bill will increase energy bills for American families. H.R. 7637 targets DOE's recently finalized refrigerator efficiency standards. The bill adds burdensome and vague language to the standard setting process and creates unattainable metrics for the enforcement of standards.

If this bill becomes law, the Department of Energy will be unable to enforce its recently finalized consensus-based efficiency standards.

When setting appliance standards, DOE already has to ensure that the standards are economically justifiable, technologically feasible, and result in

energy savings. That is required under the existing bipartisan law. Just like the last standard that Republicans targeted with dishwashers, the refrigerator standard is a result of a consensus agreement between the appliance manufacturing industry, efficiency advocates, and consumer advocates, meaning that everyone supports the standard except for the Republicans here today.

It is easy to understand why. Refrigerator standards haven't been updated in over a decade, so it was time to revisit them, and this new standard is projected to save Americans more than \$36 million over 30 years. That is a significant savings to American families, and yet House Republicans are so comfortable of robbing them of these savings.

Models that meet the new standards are already on the market, so the standards are certainly achievable. The problem with this bill is that it threatens the Department of Energy's ability to do its job. It enables future administrations to chip away at efficiency standards and muddies the process so much that implementation of new standards is threatened.

This bill includes the same harmful provision that prohibits DOE from enforcing new or existing standards if they increase upfront costs even marginally.

It totally disregards a significant savings associated with energy efficient appliances that Americans see firsthand on their monthly energy bills in the months and years after they purchase the new appliance. It also ignores the fact that the Department of Energy already has a robust process to evaluate cost and savings.

In the last debate, I mentioned Project 2025, this shadowy effort by Trump administration officials and those who would staff a second Trump administration to implement far-right policies.

A lot of Republicans claim that they don't know anything about Project 2025. I think even President Trump said that. They don't want to implement some of its ideas, they claim, but this bill on the floor today just shows how phony that claim is.

The fact of the matter is, these bills, along with the other energy bills that Republicans have passed this Congress, are Project 2025. House Republicans and their leader, Donald Trump, don't just know about Project 2025, they love it. They want to pass it. They have passed it already in many aspects. They are actively working right now as we debate this bill on this floor to make Project 2025 the law of the land.

This bill is part of an orchestrated campaign not just to make you pay more at the pump and on your electric bills, but to bring America back to not just the 20th century, but the 1800s, and I oppose that.

For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I have a company in my district that makes refrigerators. The R&D, research and development, that go into designing a refrigerator is mind-boggling to me.

I thought refrigeration was pretty simple, but they optimize where the milk is stored and where the meat goes and hot spots in the refrigerator to make sure that temperatures are consistent and foods remain fresh for a longer period of time, not because some government mandate said that that refrigerators need to be more efficient but because the market demands it.

If the market demands it and they can provide that to meet the market challenge, then they will end up with more market share. That means more units sold, and this company rolls a new refrigerator off the line every 4 seconds. It is crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and also chair of the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in support of the Representative from Iowa's bill, H.R. 7637. The Refrigerator Freedom Act will protect American consumers from unaffordable and unrealistic standards from the Department of Energy.

The Department of Energy efficiency standards for home appliances have long reached the point of overregulation and now cause more harm than good for consumers.

According to testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee, most major home appliances have been subjected to four, five, or even six rounds of successively tighter DOE efficiency standards over the decades.

We have long reached the point of diminishing our negative returns for consumers, yet DOE continues to wage a war against the American consumer. Instead of doubling down on failing climate policy pursuits, we should reexamine the existing standards that are not in the best interest of consumers with little to no so-called climate benefits.

The Refrigerator Freedom Act will stop DOE from prescribing or enforcing these arbitrary standards that are not helping consumers at all, and worse, increasing costs without added benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill on behalf of the American consumer and true efficiency.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time and for his leadership and clarity on what is truly important and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Republican's national appliance

protection day and this specific bill, the Refrigerator Freedom Act.

That is right. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are using their majority and our precious floor time to protect kitchen appliances.

They are not trying to protect women's reproductive freedom. No. They are actually trying to take away a woman's freedom to control her own body.

They are not trying to protect voting rights so that every eligible voter can vote. No. This week we actually will also be voting on a bill that is trying to make it more difficult for poor and rural Americans to vote.

They are not trying to protect Americans' freedom to be who they want to be and marry whomever they want. No. Their Project 2025 platform intends to erase marriage equality for all Americans.

They are not trying to protect our children from their new leading cause of death in this country, guns. Nope. They are trying to protect every Americans' right to turn a semiautomatic weapon of war into an even deadlier automatic weapon of war.

That is right. Instead of reproductive freedom, Republicans are focused on refrigerator freedom.

In closing, I do want to give my friends on the other side of the aisle credit for one thing: They are certainly consistent. Just as they want to take our country back to the 1950s where White Christian men were in complete control, they also want to take our appliance technology back to the 1950s, as well.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, some things never change.

I woke up today and thanked God the sky was blue. There was traffic, lots of traffic, in Washington, D.C., and once again, Democrats are trying to take away appliances from hardworking Americans.

They want to take away the things that hardworking Americans do want and shove on hardworking Americans the things they don't want.

This government's out-of-control spending by Democrats has already made everyone's life hell. Americans can hardly afford to stock their refrigerators with food, and now Democrats want to take the damn refrigerator away, as well.

The state of this country's energy infrastructure is already alarming. Gas prices are above \$3.50 a gallon. Our electrical grid, sorry to say, still remains vulnerable to cyberattacks. We are draining our strategic stockpiles and relying on foreign sources for energy.

These are serious national concerns. Yet, what is President Biden and the Department of Energy focused on? Taking away the basic appliances that Americans want.

Terrorists are crossing our borders daily, China continues to grow more

emboldened, and violent crime continues to plague our streets, but if you didn't know any better, if you thought about it, you would think that refrigerators and dishwashers and stoves were the greatest enemies of the United States of America. Maybe they are in the eyes of our Democratic colleagues.

□ 1515

Let's focus on the real threats this country faces. Democrats continue their war on the American consumer in the name of some Green New Deal agenda. If enacted, these supposed energy efficiency standards by the DOE would increase costs for every single American and would take more than a decade to pay back those costs.

It is not going to stop climate change. If the left were serious about climate change, they would be better served focusing on nuclear energy and modular power plants. They would be better focusing on any other means to save energy other than taking it away from the American public, sort of like solar panels. They make sense.

The kitchen is for the family, for memories, for gatherings, for good times. It is not time to have these folks meddling in your lives to further micromanage their families. Let's leave the appliance decisions, the appliances that men and women want to buy in this country—it is a basic principle—to those who use them, not to those who wish once again to overregulate them and force things down their throats they just don't want.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support these bills.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7637. It is a Republican bill that is going to raise costs for hardworking American families. It is very emblematic of what they call this unfortunate session of Congress, the do-nothing Congress, the least productive Congress in modern times.

Like the dishwasher bill we debated before the refrigerator bill, Republicans seek to throw a wrench into the cost savings for American families. In doing so, they are not siding with the people, with the folks we represent back home, but siding with corporate special interests, the big utility companies, and the big oil companies because they make more money when you use more energy, when your refrigerator isn't as efficient, when your air-conditioner isn't as efficient.

Part of the focus of Democrats in the last Congress was putting money back into your pocket to provide new incentives for cost-saving, energy efficient upgrades to homes, more insulation for homes.

I used my time in the last debate for a public service announcement. If you

go to energy.gov/save, there is a whole host of ways to put money back into your pockets at a time when you need it.

We are about 2 years from passage of the Inflation Reduction Act, and I know a lot of folks said that they are still getting pinched by the affordability crisis, but that is the historic bill passed by a Democratic-led Congress and signed by President Biden that finally put a cap on insulin at \$35 per month. It was the first time that we beat Big Pharma by directing Medicare to negotiate drug prices. It puts a \$2,000 cap on out-of-pocket expenses for seniors who rely on prescription drugs.

It also was the law that provided these important cost savings to American families for energy efficient appliances. I know that Big Oil and the utility companies don't like it, and I know that the Republicans are closely aligned with them, but this is very important in this day and age when we have to use cleaner, cheaper appliances and cut pollution.

American families want these innovative, efficient appliances for one reason. They save money.

Take the refrigerator. Compared to refrigerators of the 1970s when the first efficiency standards were proposed, refrigerators today are cheaper. They are cheaper upfront, and they do a better job of keeping our groceries cold. Critically, they use about 75 percent less energy, and they save American families hundreds of dollars a year on their electricity bills.

This is all thanks to industry innovation that was spurred by direction of Congress to appliance manufacturers to do better over time. In fact, when the Department of Energy announced at the end of last year the updated standards for our refrigerators and freezers, they said the efficiency standards being adopted today have not been updated in over a decade.

They align with the recommendations from a diverse set of stakeholders, including manufacturers, the manufacturer trade association, environmental groups, energy groups, and consumer advocates. Compliance will be required by 2029 or 2030, depending on the year, make, and model.

DOE and the Biden administration have been laser focused in developing these strong energy efficiency standards to build on the historical success and capture even more cost savings for American families who need it right now.

As has been discussed by Ranking Member PALLONE, the Department of Energy works very closely with manufacturers. They develop a consensus during this rulemaking process on what is technically feasible and what can help save folks money. They actually estimate that these new standards will save Americans over a trillion dollars on household energy bills over the next 30 years.

Americans deserve a Congress that is going to stand up for them and their

cost savings and serve the people, not serve the bottom line of electricity companies and Big Oil and Gas companies.

This is quite a contrast. They call it the do-nothing Congress. It started out in a session where they decided the Speaker of the House should not continue to serve. There were shutdowns and showdowns here where they doubled down on some very extremist policies.

This is such a stark contrast to when Democrats controlled the House of Representatives. We didn't squander time debating dishwashers and refrigerators.

We passed the historic PACT Act to make sure that veterans who were exposed to toxic burn pits, Agent Orange, and other toxic substances would get the care and the benefits they earned. The historic PACT Act was passed by Democrats and signed by President Biden.

We passed a historic infrastructure law that is repairing our roads and bridges, delivering clean and safe water to communities across the country, cleaning up pollution, and expanding access to high-speed internet.

Two weeks ago, I was able to announce a \$25 million grant for a neighborhood in the city of Tampa that has not gotten the investment it has deserved for decades. Thanks to the infrastructure law, we are going to make ADA-compliant sidewalks, make the streets—

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the additional time.

That neighborhood needs this investment. Have we debated any way to help the neighborhoods during this Republican-led Congress? No, we haven't.

Today, we are able to announce a \$24 million grant for my local transit agency back in St. Petersburg and Pinellas County that is going to upgrade their buses, expand service, and create workforce development initiatives to train people who are interested in these good-paying jobs.

The Democratic-led Congress passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act in a country now where death by firearm is the leading cause of death for children aged 0–18.

We also passed the historic Inflation Reduction Act, the historic law that, yes, capped the price of insulin at \$35 if you are on Medicare and finally directed Medicare to negotiate drug prices, standing up to Big Pharma for a change.

It is estimated that over 106,000 of my neighbors will save over \$500 if they rely on the Affordable Care Act for their health insurance. That was also a part of the Inflation Reduction Act.

I wanted to call out the contrasts of refrigerators and dishwashers, squan-

dering time, and wasting time with my colleagues who are really here for the people, to fight for lower costs, and to put money back into our families.

I think Mr. GOLDMAN had it right when he said it is time for this House to get serious. Instead of refrigerator freedom, how about the freedom for women to make their own healthcare decisions rather than our bodies being controlled by politicians here in Washington, D.C., or back home? These are decisions that should be between a woman, her doctor, and her family.

Refrigerator freedom? How about we get back to working on reproductive freedom, lowering costs for families, working on safer communities, good-paying jobs, and delivering for people rather than the special interests that have all too much influence here in Washington, D.C. Please vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the funny thing is, if manufacturers wanted to make a more efficient appliance, they could, and I would tell them to go for it. The manufacturing alliance and all the trade groups that were mentioned don't need something from the government to tell them to do something more efficient. If they think there is a market for it or they think that they have some desire to be more efficient, they can do it. They don't need the government to tell them to do it.

The way government operates around here, especially under a Democratic administration, is that they are coming up with a solution that is looking for a problem. If a problem doesn't exist, they create one, and they create a regulation to manage it and grow government.

Ronald Reagan, talking about Democratic government, said that their solution is: "I am from the government, and I am here to help."

Democrats continue to want to throw more money at problems that they see. The gentlewoman from Florida went through a whole litany of things the Democrats would focus on, but do you know what, America? She left the border out of that. Over 16 million people have crossed the border. That wasn't on her list.

She wasn't talking about lowering interest rates on mortgages so people can actually buy their first home. Right now, they can't because it is out of reach. It is unaffordable.

She didn't talk about lowering prices at the grocery store or Walmart or anywhere else you shop because the Biden administration's inflationary practices have driven up costs everywhere on everything since day one of the administration, from energy costs to food and other items that you purchase.

I kind of chuckled at her little sign there, but I am reminded of Will Rogers. He was talking about government spending, I think, but he said that really the only time the taxpayer is safe is when Congress isn't in session because Congress seems to muck it up by grow-

ing government and wanting to tax to get money to feed that growing government. Will Rogers was probably right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), the author of this legislation.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding me time.

As I am listening to this debate, it is astounding to hear about the \$17 a year that I may save so that I can perhaps stop at the local convenience store to get a coffee once a month when the reason why prices are high right now is the Biden-Harris administration and the last Congress have made prices higher. Inflation is over 20 percent.

First, it was tackling America's energy independence and restricting consumer choice. They started imposing draconian rules such as the tailpipe emission rule, not leasing for oil and gas drilling on Federal lands or public lands, and forcing automakers to have less efficient vehicles that Americans do not want and even vehicles that can't hold a charge in the winter such as in a State like Iowa.

Prices are up everywhere in the United States. Energy prices are up. They are up at the gas pump. Electricity prices are up. That relates to food prices, which are also up.

At a time when record-high inflation and gas prices are hurting families, the Biden-Harris administration again pushes policies that restrict imports of liquefied natural gas that would have provided a much-needed boost to the economy and helped our allies around the world.

Now, because of dismantling American energy production, undermining our national security, and restricting what cars people can drive wasn't enough, this administration has decided to dictate what home appliances Americans can have in their homes.

When I go to look for an appliance, I look at the little sticker, and I determine if saving \$12 a month or \$30 a month is worth the increased cost for an appliance that doesn't have the life of the refrigerator or the appliance that I have now. In addition, are any efficiencies based on the energy prices that we are now paying? The Biden-Harris administration has increased energy prices across the board, and they will continue to increase them because of their ill-founded policies that are benefiting their allies as well, their special interest groups.

□ 1530

On January 17, the Biden-Harris administration issued a final rule to regulate refrigerators and freezers. It is interesting that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said this is already in the rule. Why on Earth would you be here arguing about a bill if it is already implemented in a rule, if the agency is already following it?

We want to codify what it is that they are doing. If it truly is feasible, if it is economically justified, if it is

technologically feasible, and if it helps to lower emissions and lead to a better environment, they already have the authority to do that. Why would you oppose codifying it into law if the agency is already doing it?

The reality is they are not doing it. Their practices are egregious and overreaching, and they want to force themselves into every aspect of our lives and dictate.

It is interesting. I thought about this as I was sitting here listening to this debate. One of the things that would help the energy efficiency of refrigerators is not to open and close the door so much. Maybe the EPA and the DOE should issue a rule mandating how often you—oh, I better not say that because they may, in fact, do it.

The Department of Energy argues that these energy mandates will save consumers money, but according to DOE's own supporting documentation, the payback period could take over 10 years.

Refrigerator and freezer appliances have an average 14- to 15-year lifespan, and those numbers are drawn from existing appliances, not hypothetical future appliances that meet the Department's new standards.

Further, any cost savings realized to consumers over time are likely to be offset, as we have already said, by rising electric bills that are facing households across the country.

This rule marks another way of manipulating the market to push an environmental agenda and eliminate consumer choice. My bill, the Refrigerator Freedom Act, prohibits the Department of Energy from enforcing unrealistic energy standards for refrigerators that are not energy efficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, which I enthusiastically support.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. STRICKLAND).

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, the majority has decided to protect household appliances. That is the most important thing we can focus on in this House in 2024, the year of our Lord, with so much happening. Instead of doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, we are protecting household appliances.

In 2022, we saw the Supreme Court end a woman's right to reproductive choice, and 21 States have followed suit with even greater attempts to limit women's reproductive healthcare.

This bill, which I introduced with my colleagues, Representatives Fletcher and Raskin, would make sure that individuals crossing State lines are constitutionally protected when seeking

safe and legal reproductive healthcare, or those traveling with them are protected from receiving criminal punishment.

Impeding a woman's right to travel for healthcare is an assault on her freedom. Criminalizing women for crossing State lines to get reproductive care is a violation of the 14th Amendment.

Being denied an abortion disproportionately affects women of color, especially Black women. Black women in the U.S. are more likely to die from pregnancy or childbirth than women in any other racial group. Women deserve to be prioritized over household appliances.

It is well past time for Congress to pass real legislation to protect real people, not household appliances.

I urge you to pass my motion to recommit and do the real work that the American people sent us here to do.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would bring up H.R. 782, the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional Members on our side of the aisle, and I am ready to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, we have had a number of arguments that have been made today on the other side of the aisle, but one that is really infuriating to me, and it should be to everyone, in my opinion, is this Republican argument for freedom of appliance choice.

Let the people choose. This is what the Republicans say. They want choice when it comes to refrigerators and dishwashers. Let the people choose what goes into their homes and keep the government's hands off it.

That Republican argument of freedom of choice with refrigerators and dishwashers doesn't hold when it comes to more important issues, life or death issues, like women's reproductive rights.

Choice goes out the window for them when we talk about women's reproductive rights. Small government goes out the window. The right to decide and do what is best for you simply goes out the window.

With the repeal of Roe v. Wade, the systematic dismantling of women's reproductive rights across the country and the attacks on IVF show that Re-

publicans are only serious about choice when it comes to things like appliances. This bill shows us where Republican priorities really are.

I mentioned several times today Project 2025. President Trump says it is not his idea, it is The Heritage Foundation, but the reality is that what the Republicans are trying to do today is implement Project 2025 when it comes to efficiency standards for appliances, which is in Project 2025.

Let me tell you some of the other things that are in Project 2025: A complete ban on abortions without exceptions, a ban on contraceptives, additional tax breaks for corporations, elimination of unions and worker protections, raise the retirement age, cut Social Security, cut Medicare, end the Affordable Care Act, raise prescription drug prices, eliminate the Department of Education, end climate protection, end marriage equality, defund the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security, and most importantly, because it relates to what they are doing today, eliminate Federal agencies like the FDA, the EPA, NOAA, and many, many more.

Now, one of the most important aspects of Project 2025 is to gut any consumer protections and let the large corporations do whatever they want. I said that Project 2025 takes us back to the 1800s. If you go back to the 1800s, there were no protections for food or for drugs. Consumer be damned. We don't care. We will sell whatever, fake medicine, fake food that is going to kill you. It doesn't matter. That is not the Federal Government's role.

That is what the advocates of Project 2025 believe. They don't believe there should be any standards, any regulation for anything, for that matter. Consumer be damned.

Now, there are a lot of misleading statements that were made today about the refrigerator efficiency standards just as there were about the dishwasher standards earlier.

I just want to set the record straight before I conclude. DOE finalized refrigerator standards. The ones that they finalized will result in life cycle savings ranging from \$50 to \$140, depending on the product.

The payback periods for these savings range from 1.6 years to 5.6 years, again, depending on the actual product. The average lifetime of a refrigerator is about 14½ years. That means that those who buy new models will save significantly more on utility bills than any increase in purchase price.

I think the Republicans are clearly distorting the facts in order to make it sound like the new standards will result in increased costs and limited savings when in reality, the opposite is true.

I can't say I am surprised by this tactic. This bill is about gutting agencies and deregulating everything. It is just an example of the larger Project 2025 that would just gut agencies, deregulate everything, and let corporations

do whatever they want. Adulterated food, bad drugs, doesn't matter. We don't need an FDA. We don't need an EPA. We don't need any kind of consumer protection agency.

I want my colleagues to understand what this is really about. This isn't just about refrigerators and dishwashers. This is about letting large corporations do whatever they want and not caring at all about the consumer and whether they drink clean water or they breathe clean air or they eat food that they can depend on or drugs that they can depend on that will actually help them.

For all those reasons, I reject this bill, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

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

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

I will say it again. Enacted in 1975, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act provides specific criteria for DOE to follow in order to propose a new appliance efficiency standard. They may only propose a new standard if it results in a significant conservation of energy, is technologically feasible, and is economically justified.

The new regulations are not economically justified, they are not necessarily technologically feasible, and there is not a significant conservation of energy.

The Biden administration has consistently ignored these requirements by proposing and finalizing standards that violate this statute.

The gentleman from New Jersey is younger than I am, but I grew up during the seventies' energy crisis. I was being flattering. I don't know how old Frank is, but we both grew up during the seventies' energy crisis, and we did some things around the house that my dad mandated. They weren't government mandates.

When you left the house in the summertime, you turned the thermostat up so the air wouldn't run at whatever temperature you wanted it, 72, 70, whatever, when nobody was home.

We combined trips to the store so that you would go by the gas station and by the grocery store and other stops and make one trip versus going in and out.

He ingrained in me to cut the lights off, much to the chagrin of my children and what I have tried to teach them. When you leave the room, you flip the switch off, so the lights weren't on when you weren't there.

I will say this: The agencies in Washington, D.C., could learn a lesson from that. When I ride down Independence Avenue at night, all the lights are on at the Department of Energy, and I know most of the employees are gone.

In the wintertime, we turned the thermostat down, and we put something warmer on.

I grew up poor. Not poor poor; we lived on a mill hill, a textile community, when I was little. These were dad

mandates. These weren't government mandates.

Now we see the government really becoming Big Brother. There are State governments, in most instances, which tell you where you can set your thermostat, when you can water your yard, and when you can charge your EV.

Big Brother is telling you to do more and more things, telling you what kind of car you can drive by really pushing EV mandates down on America when the consumer choice isn't that. We are seeing that kind of reverse trend in this country and the demand rise for traditional gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles.

Here again, we see a government mandate telling manufacturers you have to create an appliance that is inefficient. It is going to cost the consumer more money on the front end, and it will take them a lot longer to pay it back for an appliance that is usually worn out before they have gotten the repayment back.

My dad taught us not to stand there with the refrigerator door open. In fact, smart refrigerators, I think, ding now if you hold the door open too long because it loses that coolness. It creates inefficiency. I don't think that was a government mandate either. I think that was technology the industry came up with.

We don't need more Big Government. We don't need more government regulation like this. It is going to cost the consumers more money and affect their quality of life.

This is simple legislation just to push back against this administration and the mandates that the American public does not need and will lower their quality of life, their standard of living, cost them more money, and will not yield the cost savings that will be mandated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1341, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

Ms. STRICKLAND. 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:

Ms. Strickland of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7637 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Ms. Strickland moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7637 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 and 2 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1620

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama) at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to recommit H.R. 7637;

Passage of H.R. 7637, if ordered;

Motion to recommit H.R. 7700; and

Passage of H.R. 7700, if ordered.

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

REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy

conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. STRICKLAND), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 188, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

YEAS—186

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Adams | Golden (ME) | Pascarell |
| Allred | Goldman (NY) | Pelosi |
| Amo | Gomez | Perez |
| Auchincloss | Gonzalez, | Peters |
| Balint | Vicente | Pettersen |
| Barragán | Gottheimer | Phillips |
| Beatty | Green, Al (TX) | Pingree |
| Bera | Hayes | Porter |
| Beyer | Himes | Pressley |
| Blumenauer | Horsford | Ramirez |
| Blunt Rochester | Houlahan | Raskin |
| Bonamici | Hoyle (OR) | Ross |
| Bowman | Huffman | Ruiz |
| Boyle (PA) | Ivey | Ruppersberger |
| Brown | Jackson (IL) | Ryan |
| Brownley | Jackson (NC) | Salinas |
| Budzinski | Jacobs | Sarbanes |
| Bush | Jayapal | Scanlon |
| Caraveo | Jeffries | Schakowsky |
| Carbajal | Johnson (GA) | Schiff |
| Cárdenas | Kamlager-Dove | Schneider |
| Carl | Kelly (IL) | Scholten |
| Carson | Kennedy | Schrier |
| Carter (LA) | Khanna | Scott (VA) |
| Cartwright | Kildee | Scott, David |
| Casar | Kilmer | Sewell |
| Casten | Kim (NJ) | Sherman |
| Castor (FL) | Krishnamoorthi | Sherrill |
| Castro (TX) | Kuster | Simpson |
| Chu | Landsman | Slotkin |
| Clark (MA) | Larsen (WA) | Smith (WA) |
| Clarke (NY) | Larson (CT) | Sorensen |
| Cleaver | Lee (PA) | Soto |
| Clyburn | Leger Fernandez | Spanberger |
| Cohen | Levin | Stansbury |
| Correa | Lieu | Stanton |
| Costa | Lofgren | Stevens |
| Courtney | Lynch | Strickland |
| Craig | Magaziner | Suozzi |
| Crockett | Manning | Swalwell |
| Crow | Matsui | Sykes |
| Cuellar | McBath | Takano |
| Davids (KS) | McClellan | Thanedar |
| Davis (NC) | McCollum | Thompson (CA) |
| Dean (PA) | McGarvey | Thompson (MS) |
| DeGette | McGovern | Titus |
| DelBene | Meeks | Tlaib |
| Deluzio | Menendez | Tokuda |
| DeSaulnier | Meng | Tonko |
| Dingell | Mfume | Torres (CA) |
| Doggett | Moulton | Torres (NY) |
| Escobar | Mrvan | Torres |
| Eshoo | Mullin | Trahan |
| Espallat | Nadler | Trone |
| Fletcher | Napolitano | Vargas |
| Foster | Neal | Vasquez |
| Foushee | Neguse | Veasey |
| Frankel, Lois | Nickel | Velázquez |
| Frost | Ocasio-Cortez | Waters |
| Gallego | Omar | Wild |
| Garcia (IL) | Pallone | Williams (GA) |
| Garcia (TX) | Panetta | Wilson (FL) |
| García, Robert | Pappas | |

NAYS—188

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| Aderholt | Bean (FL) | Burlison |
| Alford | Bentz | Calvert |
| Allen | Bergman | Cammack |
| Amodei | Biggs | Carey |
| Armstrong | Bilirakis | Carter (GA) |
| Arrington | Bishop (NC) | Carter (TX) |
| Babin | Boebert | Chavez-DeRemer |
| Bacon | Bost | Cline |
| Baird | Buchanan | Comer |
| Balderson | Bucshon | Crane |
| Banks | Burchett | Crawford |
| Barr | Burgess | Curtis |

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| D'Esposito | Kean (NJ) | Pence |
| De La Cruz | Keating | Perry |
| DesJarlais | Kelly (MS) | Pluger |
| Duarte | Kelly (PA) | Posey |
| Duncan | Kiggans (VA) | Reschenthaler |
| Dunn (FL) | Kiley | Rodgers (WA) |
| Edwards | Kim (CA) | Rogers (AL) |
| Emmer | Kustoff | Rose |
| Estes | LaHood | Rosendale |
| Ezell | LaLota | Rouzer |
| Fallon | LaMalfa | Roy |
| Feenstra | Lamborn | Rulli |
| Ferguson | Langworthy | Scalise |
| Finstad | Latta | Schweikert |
| Fischbach | Lawler | Scott, Austin |
| Fitzgerald | Lee (FL) | Self |
| Fitzpatrick | Lesko | Sessions |
| Fleischmann | Lopez | Smith (MO) |
| Flood | Loudermilk | Smith (NE) |
| Fong | Lucas | Smith (NJ) |
| Foxx | Luetkemeyer | Smucker |
| Franklin, Scott | Luna | Spartz |
| Fry | Luttrell | Staubert |
| Fulcher | Mace | Steel |
| Gaetz | Malliotakis | Stefanik |
| Garcia, Mike | Maloy | Steil |
| Good (VA) | Mann | Steube |
| Gooden (TX) | McCaul | Strong |
| Gosar | McClain | Tenney |
| Graves (LA) | McClintock | Thompson (PA) |
| Graves (MO) | McCormick | Tiffany |
| Green (TN) | Meuser | Timmons |
| Greene (GA) | Miller (IL) | Valadao |
| Grothman | Miller (OH) | Van Drew |
| Guthrie | Miller (WV) | Van Dyne |
| Hageman | Miller-Meeks | Van Orden |
| Harshbarger | Mills | Wagner |
| Hern | Molinaro | Walberg |
| Higgins (LA) | Moolenaar | Waltz |
| Hill | Mooney | Weber (TX) |
| Hinson | Moore (AL) | Webster (FL) |
| Houchin | Moore (UT) | Wenstrup |
| Hudson | Moran | Westerman |
| Huizenga | Murphy | Williams (NY) |
| Issa | Nehls | Williams (TX) |
| Jackson (TX) | Norman | Wilson (SC) |
| James | Nunn (IA) | Wittman |
| Johnson (LA) | Oberholte | Womack |
| Johnson (SD) | Ogles | Yakym |
| Jordan | Owens | Zinke |
| Joyce (PA) | Palmer | |

NOT VOTING—59

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Aguilar | Garamendi | McHenry |
| Bice | Garbarino | Moore (WI) |
| Bishop (GA) | Gimenez | Morelle |
| Brecheen | Gonzales, Tony | Moskowitz |
| Case | Granger | Newhouse |
| Cherfilus | Griffith | Norcross |
| McCormick | Grijalva | Peltola |
| Ciscomani | Guest | Pocan |
| Cloud | Harder (CA) | Quigley |
| Clyde | Harris | Rogers (KY) |
| Cole | Hoyer | Rutherford |
| Collins | Hunt | Salazar |
| Connolly | Jackson Lee | Sánchez |
| Crenshaw | Joyce (OH) | Turner |
| Davidson | Kaptur | Underwood |
| Davis (IL) | LaTurner | Wasserman |
| DeLauro | Lee (CA) | Schultz |
| Diaz-Balart | Lee (NV) | Watson Coleman |
| Donalds | Letlow | Wexton |
| Ellzey | Massie | |
| Evans | Mast | |

□ 1644

Messrs. LOPEZ, CARTER of Georgia, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Messrs. NEHLS, LAHOOD, LANGWORTHY, NUNN of Iowa, MCCLINTOCK, and WITTMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. BLUNT ROCHESTER, TLAIB, Messrs. TAKANO, and VARGAS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, due to official committee business, I was unable to vote at the start of the series. Had I