

a country relies too much on unreliable renewables. Meanwhile, China profits off of our bad policies, selling us solar panels and electric vehicles while expanding its own coal production and power plants.

We cannot let the left's green welfare agenda weaken our energy security while boosting our biggest adversary any longer.

Full repeal means saving taxpayers \$1 trillion in wasteful spending, easing inflation and lowering costs for families and small businesses, and restoring energy security by stabilizing our grid. Reconciliation is the way forward.

□ 0915

TAKING A KNEE VERSUS BENDING A KNEE

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

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify something for some of my colleagues and for leaders across this country because there seems to be some confusion. There is a big difference between taking a knee and bending a knee.

Taking a knee shows that you can hold many truths at once, you can love our country and believe that there is still more work to do. It shows that you are willing to do that work and to live up to our country's ideals.

However, bending a knee is something quite different. Bending a knee is capitulation. It is what you do when you have given up, when you have lost your fight, when you have lost your way, when you are not willing to show courage, to show up, or to speak up.

Taking a knee, you have got skin in the game. Bending a knee, you have given in, you have lost your self-respect.

We were not elected to be obedient, to submit, to cower. We were not sent here to worship one man. We have no kings in America. We were sent here to work on behalf of the people. If you are not risking anything, you are not being brave. Show some grit and stand up for your people.

CONGRATULATING ANAHEIM HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' WATER POLO TEAM

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Anaheim High School girls' water polo team that just won the CIF Division 6 championship.

This victory represents hard work, determination, and perseverance on behalf of the players and their coaches, and they did that the whole season.

As an Anaheim High School alumnus myself, I congratulate our student athletes, parents, coaches, and teachers. Again, they have made us proud.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in celebrating this great victory for the

Anaheim High School girls' water polo team.

Remember, once a Colonist, always a Colonist.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR WALK-IN COOLERS AND WALK-IN FREEZERS"

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 242, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 24) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers" (89 Fed. Reg. 104616 (December 23, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution 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 Texas (Mr. WEBER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBER of Texas. 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.J. Res. 24.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on December 23, 2024, as American households and businesses were in the process of preparing for the holidays, the Biden-Harris Department of Energy finalized burdensome and unnecessary energy efficiency standards for walk-in coolers and walk-in freezers.

These products are staples—they are necessary—in businesses and restaurants across the country, and they play an essential role in providing consumers with safe and fresh food as well as drinks.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Biden-Harris administration's final rule jeopardizes those very same small and independent retailers' ability to serve the communities that rely on them.

This final rule will force stores like small grocers and convenience stores to incur significant major up-front costs for new equipment. I know because I operated an air-conditioning business for 35 years. They will incur significant, major up-front costs on equipment while reckoning with associated operational disruptions and supply chain challenges. The Biden-Harris DOE itself estimated that the cost of these standards, which were last updated just a handful of years ago, to be almost \$1 billion, with a b.

However, the real cost, Mr. Speaker, is likely much higher, as DOE ignored other costs businesses will be forced to absorb. An example of added costs is any structural changes needed to accommodate a new walk-in cooler or freezer in order to comply with their final rule.

Unfortunately, this final rule will disproportionately affect rural communities and small businesses. In many areas across the country, Mr. Speaker, including in my district in Texas, there are communities with limited food and drink retail options. It is not uncommon for a convenience store to bridge that gap in providing food to American families.

These same small businesses, which are often owned and operated by a single family or an individual, cannot afford the new equipment mandated by these unreasonable standards. In fact, 90 percent of food and drink retailers are categorized as small businesses and operate with a 1 to 3 percent margin. That is how slim their margin is.

The result will be significant costs being passed down to consumers and, in the worst case scenario, the shuttering of businesses, those mom-and-pop businesses that we all like. They may be shuttered, prevented from providing essential services to the very communities that they grew up in.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, the House is considering H.J. Res. 24, introduced by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE) to repeal this disastrous final rule.

Over the last 4 years, small businesses have endured supply chain challenges, an inflationary environment, and regulatory uncertainty, just to name a few. Congress has the opportunity today to chart a new path for the small and independent retailers and grocers that feed American families by repealing this final rule.

I thank the gentlewoman from Oklahoma for her leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in

supporting H.J. Res. 24. Once again, I am going to urge all my colleagues' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 24, the fourth Republican resolution this Congress to dismantle energy conservation standards for appliances. This harmful resolution guts a Department of Energy efficiency rule for walk-in coolers and freezers, which will increase energy costs for businesses and consumers. Let me stress that again. If this rule is repealed, businesses and consumers will have increased energy costs. Since it is a Congressional Review Act resolution, it prevents the Department of Energy from ever issuing substantially similar standards in the future.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, at a time when Americans are struggling to make ends meet and facing the reality that Republicans may soon strip them and their families of healthcare, it is shocking that House Republicans are spending another day here on the floor focusing on repealing commonsense energy efficiency standards that save businesses and consumers money.

This whole Congress has been a revolving door of resolution after resolution attacking conservation standards for different appliances. In fact, I should point out, we were on the floor just yesterday afternoon debating an effort to repeal another energy efficiency standard for commercial refrigerators and freezers.

Instead of investigating—which is what they should be doing—the shocking and unprecedented breach of security and leaked military strikes from top Trump national security officials, which threatens our national security and our defense, we are here once again wasting valuable floor time debating energy efficiency standards.

Maybe we should be taking action to protect Social Security from the Trump administration's funding cuts that could stop seniors from getting the benefits they earned through a lifetime of work. My constituents are already telling me they can't even call the Social Security office anymore. There is nobody there. They have cut the staff. They have cut the phone service. They can't even access the Social Security Administration anymore under the Trump administration.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, we should be reversing the Trump administration's actions to close the Department of Education and rip away funding from students, teachers, and schools.

House Republicans are not likely to take on any of these actions that I suggested because they refuse to take on President Trump, even when he is breaking the law. It is clear that my Republican colleagues do not have their priorities in order. In fact, it seems to me their only priority is securing giant tax breaks for their bil-

lionaire buddies at the expense of American families and businesses. H.J. Res. 24 fits right into the Republican agenda of raising costs on hardworking Americans.

Now, I would be remiss if I didn't point out the irony of this resolution. President Trump and Republicans ran on a promise to cut energy costs in half in his first year. Yet, here we are once again wasting precious time on the floor with a resolution that would raise energy costs for American businesses by wasting more energy.

The energy efficiency standards under threat today for walk-in refrigerators and freezers will save American businesses up to \$6.5 billion on utility bills over the next 30 years. These businesses include restaurants, convenience stores, and supermarkets across the country, and Republicans' anti-efficiency agenda will rob them of these cost savings.

This is especially concerning at a time when we are hearing more and more stories about the damaging impacts of Trump's extreme tariffs, the rising cost of groceries, and the chaos and uncertainty that Trump is bringing every day to our economy.

People are concerned about a Trump recession. That is what they are worried about today. That is what I hear when I go home. However, Republicans don't care about everyday Americans. They only care about doing the bidding of their billionaire corporate buddies at the expense of consumers and working families.

Energy efficiency standards for appliances are designed to reduce energy use and climate pollution while also saving consumers and businesses money. Reducing an appliance's energy use also helps decrease stress on the electric grid.

The resolution today is proof that my Republican colleagues' concern about grid stress—we had a hearing yesterday on that—and the increased load growth from data centers and American manufacturing are hollow and merely lip service. If Republicans truly cared about reducing stress on the electric grid, which is what they said yesterday at the hearing, they would stop dismantling energy efficiency standards designed to ease strain on future electric grid capacity.

The true intent of this anti-efficiency resolution is not to help American businesses, but to line the pockets of their billionaire cronies and oil and gas friends. You guessed it, less efficient appliances means more profits for Big Oil and Gas.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure how to respond to that. I don't know if some of our colleagues have been drinking this early or not.

That notwithstanding, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise, obviously, in strong support of H.J. Res. 24, legislation that I authored which uses the Congressional Review Act to overturn regulations by the Biden administration.

I was extremely excited this morning to be notified that I have a Statement of Administration Policy from President Trump on this legislation, which I include in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 24—JOINT RESOLUTION, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR WALK-IN COOLERS AND WALK-IN FREEZERS"—REP. BICE, R-OK, AND 10 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports passage of H.J. Res. 24, a joint resolution to disapprove the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers." The December 23, 2024 rule adopts amended energy conservation standards for walk-in coolers and walk-in freezers impacting commercial vendors who store food, beverages, flowers, and other goods that require chilling at low temperatures.

The rule, issued in the final days of the previous Administration, imposes complex energy conservation standards for walk-in coolers and freezers, leading to unnecessary costs on small businesses and everyday Americans.

If H.J. Res. 24 were presented to the President in its current form, his senior advisors would recommend that he sign it into law.

Mrs. BICE. In December of 2024, the Department of Energy enacted new energy efficiency standards for walk-in coolers and freezers, equipment vital to pharmacies, convenience stores, food processing facilities, food banks, restaurants, and many other establishments nationwide.

These regulations will impose significant financial burdens on small businesses, which will have to absorb major upgrade costs to meet these new aggressive standards. At a time when our focus should be on lowering the cost of living for our constituents, it is clear most of these expenses will be borne by consumers in the form of increased prices.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, they threaten significant operational disruption for many enterprises that rely on this equipment. We have heard from many businesses in rural areas which will have to go through extensive structural and electrical upgrades to accommodate the new equipment. These same businesses have reported that getting the refrigerators and freezers repaired is a process which is already taking too long and is expensive and will become even more so.

For businesses looking to enter underserved markets, this will be another barrier in doing so. For businesses operating on a narrow profit margin, this could be what sends them under.

Recognizing these detrimental impacts, I fought against the adoption of this rule and expressed my disapproval last year during the public comment period. Like many of the rules handed down by the Biden administration, this effort will have a harsh economic impact while failing to achieve its own stated goal.

DOE estimates that the rule would carry a minimum price tag of nearly \$1 billion with minimal energy usage reduction. My colleague mentioned that it would be a savings of \$6 billion over 30 years. What he didn't mention is the cost of replacement equipment with these new energy efficiency standards could be tens of thousands of dollars, adding up to billions and billions of dollars that are going to be borne by these businesses.

I am grateful President Trump has taken the decisive action to halt these rules by having the Department of Energy postpone the effective date of these standards, providing breathing room for businesses. However, more work needs to be done; and Congress has a role to play.

My resolution seeks to ensure that these overreaching regulations are permanently overturned. By doing so, we will protect small businesses from unnecessary compliance costs and preserve the diversity of choice available to consumers.

This action aligns with our broader commitment to roll back burdensome regulations that stifle economic growth and infringe upon individual freedoms. In fact, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, in 2022, the total cost of regulations is estimated at over \$3 trillion.

We cannot continue to allow burdensome regulations on every aspect of our lives and our businesses. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 24, legislation that will reduce burdens on businesses and serve the best interests of the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MULLIN), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose H.J. Res. 24. It is baffling to me that amidst skyrocketing electricity costs, the highest they have been since the 1990s, we are talking about overturning commonsense energy efficiency standards.

Economists predict these standards would save American taxpayers billions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, you don't need to be an economist to know that a better fridge or freezer will mean lower costs on your utility bill. For families going to their local grocery, these standards would lower prices and reduce financial strain. For small businesses, it means less overhead and more profitability.

These benefits are why the Department of Energy has set energy efficiency standards for decades, across Republican and Democratic administrations, with broad support and little controversy.

America should be leading the world in creating and adopting innovative technologies, especially ones that reduce costs and help the environment. Unfortunately, this was just another empty campaign promise by candidate Trump that electricity costs would be reduced.

Let me just emphasize that Democrats believe in an economy that works for all people. Under the last administration, we passed legislation that created nearly half a million new jobs in just 2 years. The Federal Government set standards that will save money.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that Americans will save \$1 trillion on their energy bills over the next 30 years under the previous policies. That is \$1 trillion. We will continue to fight for commonsense policies for everyday people, and that is why I oppose H.J. Res. 24.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK).

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 24, legislation led by my friend Representative STEPHANIE BICE. This reverses yet another burdensome Biden administration mandate that will add senseless costs for families and small businesses for no real benefit.

The Biden Department of Energy's rule on walk-in refrigerator equipment is a textbook example of government overreach. This rule imposes sweeping, unrealistic energy standards that demand massive energy reductions, but this isn't just about energy policy. It is about the reality facing restaurant owners, grocery stores, and convenience stores in North Dakota and across the country.

These businesses have battled through 4 years of inflation, supply chain disruptions, and workforce challenges. Washington bureaucrats are now telling them to replace perfectly good refrigeration equipment at a nationwide cost of nearly \$1 billion just to meet an arbitrary, one-size-fits-all efficiency target.

To comply with these standards, manufacturers will have to increase prices on already expensive equipment. These costs will land squarely on the businesses and, ultimately, the American people. Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the food and drink retailers impacted by this rule are small businesses. These are businesses that are critical to the U.S. economy, employing millions of Americans and contributing more than \$200 billion annually.

This rule is not economically justified. It is Washington at its worst. It is no wonder that before President Trump took office, 75 percent of the country thought that we were headed in the wrong direction. It is rules just like this that they know about.

This is a bad rule. It is bad for business, and it is bad for customers. Let's stop this misguided regulation before it does more real damage to the small businesses that drive our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put common sense over bureaucratic overreach and support H.J. Res. 24.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Energy.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Republican bill that requires businessowners to spend more money and use more energy.

Mr. Speaker, here we are at the end of March. It is the 83rd day since the Congress convened under the Republican majority, and Republicans haven't brought one bill to the floor of the House to help lower costs or tackle the cost of living for our neighbors back home.

Instead, Republicans have been singularly focused on crafting a massive tax giveaway for billionaires like Elon Musk that is paid for by ripping away health coverage from the people we love the most: kids, our parents, our neighbors who rely on skilled nursing, and people with disabilities who especially rely on Medicaid. It is wrong, and it makes life harder for people back home. It makes their lives more expensive.

People want answers, but Republicans have refused to hold townhalls. Many of them will not even answer the phone. At my townhall last week in St. Petersburg, people wanted to know why the administration and Republicans want to make it more difficult to receive Social Security rather than strengthen Social Security.

Instead of a wasteful, time-consuming, silly bill like this, why don't we work together and bring to the floor a bill that will strengthen Social Security? That would be a help to our neighbors back home.

I think what it comes down to is Republicans in Congress are out of touch with hardworking people. They are out of touch with their struggles. They want lower costs. They don't want bills like this that say you will pay more and our Big Oil friends are going to make more on their bottom line.

People are tired of being ripped off by the special interests and politicians who all have too much power here in Washington, D.C. This bill is another example of that. Republicans want to make it harder for businessowners to save money through energy efficient appliances.

Energy efficiency saves people money. It is pretty straightforward. It cuts costs. It cuts pollution. It encourages innovation. Specifically, electric bills for walk-in refrigerators and freezers are a huge line item for restaurants and grocery stores. Taking those savings away will increase costs for businesses, and these are costs that will be passed on to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to think about that the next time you are in the

frozen food aisle of your grocery store. This is not right.

Overall, when the Department of Energy goes in and works with manufacturers and consumer advocates, they come up, they look at the latest technology, and then move forward on adopting a standard that will be in effect years from now. They look particularly at the cost savings overall, and the savings they estimate here are huge. It is \$6.5 billion in utility bill savings over the next 30 years.

This also hits home in my community because many of the businesses and many of my neighbors are rebuilding from Hurricanes Helene and Milton. They were flooded out. They lost their appliances. Many businesses went on the fritz. It would be particularly helpful to know that they are going to save money over time as they make these major investments.

This is exactly what Congress intended when we passed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. It was passed in 1975. We directed the Department of Energy to set and regularly update these standards.

Energy efficiency standards also incentivize innovation, and American manufacturers have traditionally led the way in innovation due to updated standards. By weakening these rules, we open our markets up to countries like China that manufacture low-efficiency products at the expense of American companies and American families.

The Department of Energy followed the law. They collaborated with manufacturers to ensure that the standards work. After all of this hard work, Republicans now want to swoop in and repeal these standards on coolers and freezers. They are, in essence, walking out on the cost savings at a time our neighbors really expect us to work together to lower the cost of living.

There is a larger issue here, and it is the fact that Republicans are ignoring the affordability squeeze. When Democrats were in charge, we did everything we could to help lower the cost of living. We passed a cap on insulin at \$35 per month. We required Medicare to negotiate lower drug prices. We gave help on health insurance bills. We provided tax rebates and savings for appliances on electric bills.

This has led to a major manufacturing boom across the country of over 750 clean-energy projects and over 400,000 new jobs created all across America, many in Republican districts.

Since the Trump administration came in and started these illegal shutdowns and threatened new taxes through tariffs, the economy has stalled. Has anyone looked at their 401(k) lately? People are very uncertain.

Let's get back to business, standing up for hardworking Americans, standing up for businesses. Let's make sure we guard their pocketbooks and tackle the affordability squeeze together, rather than serve the special interests

that all have too much power. Republican billionaires and Big Oil companies are the real winners when resolutions like this are passed and savings are ripped away from American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, let's stand up for the people for a change and not the powerful special interests. Let's stand up for their pocketbooks and vote "no" on this resolution.

□ 0945

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting for me to hear my colleagues across the aisle as an owner of an air-conditioning company that dealt with not just air-conditioning but convenience stores that had walk-in coolers, furnaces, and air-conditioners. I get that they speak from inexperience. I will give them that. What they don't realize is that when something like this is mandated, first of all, those businesses usually operate on a very, very thin margin. It could be 1.5 to 2, maybe sometimes almost 3 percent profit, which I know from experience.

When something like this has to be done, even a small walk-in cooler—let's just pick some figures. Let's say it costs \$5,000 to \$6,000, but the plumbing, electrical, carpentry, permits, and everything costs \$10,000 to \$12,000.

Now, they have a choice. They are either going to pass that on to their consumers in higher food prices, or they are going to continue to pay an extra \$10 or \$20 a month in electricity.

That is what is going to happen that they don't realize, that what they are wanting to do is mandate that businesses have to increase their expenses at the expense of the consumers because they are the ones that are going to pay for that.

I have watched this for a long time. I realize that they speak from inexperience. I will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker, for the time being, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise in opposition to this resolution. Republicans make it sound like no one supports these standards, like they came out of nowhere and are an incredible government overreach. Of course, that is not true.

Manufacturers support these efficiency standards. They provide clarity to industry. Manufacturers support the Department of Energy's rule because it provides clear guidance. If this rule is revoked, it creates regulatory uncertainty for manufacturers.

The Department of Energy worked with manufacturers and advocates to ensure that these standards were feasible and justifiable. Unlike my colleagues across the aisle, the Department of Energy went through a prolonged process that engaged extensively with experts and worked to address their concerns.

In fact, in recently submitted comments regarding the delay and the ef-

fective date for the standards, the Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, a trade group that represents many of the manufacturers of these walk-in coolers, asserted strong support for proceeding with the standards as published in the Federal Register in December of last year.

Lennox, a manufacturer of these walk-in systems, also submitted comments asserting support for proceeding with the standards as finalized. Lennox's comments also state: "The final rule provides regulatory predictability regarding . . . energy conservation standards through 2031, providing a stable planning horizon."

These comments are an important reminder that regulatory uncertainty from killing a standard, as the resolution before us today would do, costs businesses money. My colleagues across the aisle are more concerned with slashing any and every regulation they can find than with engaging in thoughtful and well-reasoned policy.

This is politics at its worst, so I oppose this resolution.

I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues across the aisle keep talking about the costs of these standards to businesses, but I think it is important to get the facts straight. The new standards for walk-in coolers don't go into effect until 2027 for some products and 2028 for others. This means that if a business needs to replace these units anytime in the next couple of years, the products on the market now will be available to them. They don't have to get rid of the refrigerators they want. It is when they buy a new one.

Whenever a business does need to replace the units, the products on the market will save them money. Specifically, these standards will save, as I mentioned, \$6.5 billion in utility bills over 30 years. DOE estimates the payback period for these products is 3 years for refrigerator systems and 1.6 years for non-display doors. After those 3 years or, in the other case, 1.6 years, you are actually saving money every year.

This means that after the first couple of years of ownership, these products start saving businesses a lot of money. This is real money.

The Republicans talked about upfront costs. There may be some upfront costs, but over the period of time after those first couple of years, businesses are saving money.

If Republicans are actually concerned about the small businesses in their communities, and if they are really concerned about costs being passed down to consumers, they would be standing up to the Trump administration and pushing back on tariffs.

I am mentioning the tariffs today because the President, again, is starting to impose new tariffs. The last one was on automobiles. Large appliances such as refrigerators and washing machines rely, in part, on steel, making them extremely vulnerable to price increases

from Trump's tariffs on steel, which are already in place.

In the aftermath of steel and aluminum tariffs during Trump's first term, talking about the first term now, not the new one, major appliances showed price increases of between 5 and 10 percent.

If my colleagues are concerned about the prices, they should be speaking out against what Trump is doing with these tariffs, not to mention the fact that the tariffs impose additional costs on consumers. Again, the uncertainty—the back and forth, put the tariffs on, take the tariffs off—is the reason that the stock market has been so volatile. People don't know with certainty what is going on with this administration.

We are facing policies from the Trump administration that will increase everyday costs for households and businesses. Instead of trying to fight these increases, Republicans are more concerned with the upfront costs of walk-in coolers in 2028. I don't know what to say except that it is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make it short and sweet. I urge everybody to vote for H.J. Res. 24. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBERNOLTE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of Rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of H.J. Res. 75.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 182, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—203

Aderholt	Biggs (AZ)	Carter (GA)
Allen	Biggs (SC)	Carter (TX)
Babin	Boebert	Ciscomani
Bacon	Bost	Cline
Baird	Brecheen	Cloud
Balderson	Bresnahan	Clyde
Barrett	Buchanan	Cole
Baumgartner	Burchett	Collins
Bean (FL)	Burlison	Comer
Begich	Calvert	Crane
Bentz	Cammack	Crank
Bice	Carey	Crawford

Cuellar	Huizenga
Davidson	Hunt
Davis (NC)	Hurd (CO)
De La Cruz	Jack
DesJarlais	James
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)
Donalds	Jordan
Downing	Joyce (OH)
Dunn (FL)	Joyce (PA)
Edwards	Kean
Elizey	Kelly (MS)
Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Estes	Kennedy (UT)
Evans (CO)	Kiley (CA)
Ezell	Kim
Fallon	Kustoff
Fedorchak	LaHood
Feenstra	LaLota
Finstad	LaMalfa
Fischbach	Langworthy
Fitzgerald	Latta
Fitzpatrick	Lawler
Fleischmann	Lee (FL)
Flood	Letlow
Fox	Loudermilk
Franklin, Scott	Lucas
Fry	Luna
Fulcher	Luttrell
Garbarino	Mace
Gill (TX)	Mackenzie
Gimenez	Malliotakis
Golden (ME)	Maloy
Goldman (TX)	Mann
Gonzales, Tony	Massie
Gonzalez, V.	Mast
Gooden	McClain
Gosar	McClintock
Graves	McCormick
Gray	McDowell
Green (TN)	McGuire
Greene (GA)	Messmer
Griffith	Meuser
Grothman	Miller (IL)
Guest	Miller (WV)
Guthrie	Miller-Meeks
Hageman	Mills
Hamadeh (AZ)	Moolenaar
Harrigan	Moore (AL)
Harris (MD)	Moore (NC)
Harris (NC)	Moore (UT)
Harshbarger	Moore (WV)
Hern (OK)	Moran
Higgins (LA)	Murphy
Hinson	Nehls
Houchin	Newhouse
Hudson	Norman

NAYS—182

Adams	Dean (PA)	Keating
Aguilar	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Amo	DeLauro	Kennedy (NY)
Auchincloss	DelBene	Khanna
Balint	Deluzio	Krishnamoorthi
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Landman
Bell	Dexter	Larsen (WA)
Bera	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Beyer	Doggett	Latimer
Bishop	Elfreth	Lee (NV)
Bonamici	Escobar	Lee (PA)
Boyle (PA)	Españillat	Levin
Brown	Evans (PA)	Liccardo
Budzinski	Fields	Lieu
Bynum	Figures	Lofgren
Carbajal	Fletcher	Lynch
Carson	Foster	Magaziner
Carter (LA)	Foushee	Mannion
Casar	Frankel, Lois	Matsui
Case	Friedman	McBride
Casten	Frost	McClain Delaney
Castor (FL)	Garcia (IL)	McClellan
Castro (TX)	Garcia (TX)	McCollum
Cherfilus-	Gillen	McDonald Rivet
McCormick	Goldman (NY)	McGarvey
Chu	Goodlander	McGovern
Cisneros	Gottheimer	McIver
Clark (MA)	Green, Al (TX)	Meeks
Clarke (NY)	Harder (CA)	Menendez
Cleaver	Hayes	Meng
Cohen	Himes	Mfume
Conaway	Horsford	Min
Connolly	Houlahan	Moore (WI)
Correa	Hoyle (OR)	Morelle
Costa	Huffman	Moskowitz
Courtney	Ivey	Moulton
Craig	Jackson (IL)	Mrvan
Crockett	Jacobs	Mullin
Crow	Jeffries	Nadler
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Neguse
Davis (IL)	Kamlager-Dove	Norcross

Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier	Tokuda
Olszewski	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Pallone	Scott, David	Torres (CA)
Panetta	Sewell	Torres (NY)
Pappas	Sherman	Trahan
Pocan	Simon	Tran
Pou	Smith (WA)	Underwood
Quigley	Sorensen	Vargas
Ramirez	Soto	Vasquez
Randall	Stanton	Veasey
Raskin	Stevens	Velázquez
Riley (NY)	Strickland	Vindman
Rivas	Subramanyam	Wasserman
Ross	Suoizzi	Schultz
Ruiz	Swalwell	Waters
Ryan	Sykes	Watson Coleman
Salinas	Takano	Whitesides
Sánchez	Thanedar	Williams (GA)
Scanlon	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	
Scholten	Tlaib	

NOT VOTING—45

Alford	Haridopolos	Neal
Amodei (NV)	Hill (AR)	Omar
Ansari	Hoyer	Pelosi
Arrington	Issa	Peters
Barr	Jackson (TX)	Pettersen
Barragán	Jayapal	Pingree
Bergman	Johnson (GA)	Pressley
Bilirakis	Kaptur	Salazar
Brownley	Kiggans (VA)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Knott	Sherrill
Crenshaw	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Fong	McBath	Stefanik
Garamendi	McCaul	Steube
Garcia (CA)	Miller (OH)	Thompson (PA)
Gomez	Morrison	Titus

□ 1016

Messrs. CLEAVER, VEASEY, DELUZZIO and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 77.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 77.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote because I was in a legislative meeting which ran over. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 77.

Stated against:

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor and the roll call vote on passage of H.J. Res. 24, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers.”

Had I been present, I would have voted: NAY on Roll Call vote no. 77, final passage of H.J. Res. 24.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was not recorded on roll call no. 77. Had I been present, I would have voted “NAY” on roll call vote no. 77.

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I did not vote on Roll Call No. 77. Had I been present, I would have voted “NAY” on Roll Call No. 77.

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 77.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS, FREEZERS, AND REFRIGERATOR-FREEZERS”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigerators, Freezers, and Refrigerator-Freezers”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 193, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Emmer	Johnson (SD)
Alford	Estes	Jordan
Allen	Evans (CO)	Joyce (OH)
Arrington	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Babin	Fallon	Kean
Bacon	Fedorchak	Kelly (MS)
Baird	Feenstra	Kelly (PA)
Balderson	Finstad	Kennedy (UT)
Barr	Fischbach	Kiggans (VA)
Barrett	Fitzgerald	Kiley (CA)
Baumgartner	Fitzpatrick	Kim
Bean (FL)	Fleischmann	Knott
Begich	Flood	Kustoff
Bentz	Foxx	LaHood
Bice	Franklin, Scott	LaLota
Biggs (AZ)	Fry	LaMalfa
Biggs (SC)	Fulcher	Langworthy
Bilirakis	Garbarino	Latta
Boebert	Gill (TX)	Lawler
Bost	Jimenez	Lee (FL)
Brecheen	Goldman (TX)	Letlow
Bresnahan	Gonzales, Tony	Loudermilk
Buchanan	Gonzalez, V.	Luna
Burchett	Gooden	Luttrell
Burlison	Gosar	Mace
Calvert	Graves	Mackenzie
Cammack	Gray	Malliotakis
Carey	Green (TN)	Mann
Carter (GA)	Greene (GA)	Massie
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Mast
Ciscomani	Grothman	McClain
Cline	Guest	McClintock
Cloud	Guthrie	McCormick
Clyde	Hageman	McDowell
Cole	Hamadeh (AZ)	McGuire
Collins	Haridopolos	Messmer
Comer	Harrigan	Meuser
Crane	Harris (MD)	Miller (IL)
Crank	Harris (NC)	Miller (OH)
Crawford	Harshbarger	Miller (WV)
Crenshaw	Hern (OK)	Miller-Meeks
Cuellar	Higgins (LA)	Mills
Davidson	Hill (AR)	Moolenaar
Davis (NC)	Hinson	Moore (AL)
De La Cruz	Houchin	Moore (NC)
DesJarlais	Hudson	Moore (UT)
Diaz-Balart	Huizenga	Moore (WV)
Donalds	Hunt	Moran
Downing	Hurd (CO)	Murphy
Dunn (FL)	Issa	Nehls
Edwards	Jack	Newhouse
Ellzey	James	Norman

Nunn (IA)	Schweikert	Timmons
Obernolte	Scott, Austin	Turner (OH)
Ogles	Self	Valadao
Onder	Sessions	Van Drew
Owens	Shreve	Van Dwyne
Palmer	Simpson	Van Orden
Perez	Smith (MO)	Wagner
Perry	Smith (NE)	Walberg
Pfluger	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Reschenthaler	Smucker	Webster (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Spartz	Westerman
Rogers (KY)	Stauber	Wied
Rose	Steil	Williams (TX)
Rouzer	Steube	Wilson (SC)
Roy	Strong	Wittman
Rulli	Stutzman	Womack
Rutherford	Taylor	Yakym
Salazar	Tenney	Zinke
Scalise	Thompson (PA)	
Schmidt	Tiffany	

NAYS—193

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gillen	Olzewski
Amo	Golden (ME)	Omar
Auchincloss	Goldman (NY)	Pallone
Balint	Gomez	Panetta
Beatty	Goodlander	Pappas
Bell	Gottheimer	Peters
Bera	Green, Al (TX)	Pocan
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pou
Bishop	Hayes	Pressley
Bonamici	Himes	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Horsford	Ramirez
Brown	Houlahan	Randall
Brownley	Hoyer	Raskin
Budzinski	Hoyle (OR)	Riley (NY)
Bynum	Huffman	Rivas
Carbajal	Ivey	Ross
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Carter (LA)	Jacobs	Ryan
Casas	Jayapal	Salinas
Case	Jeffries	Sanchez
Casten	Johnson (GA)	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Kamlager-Dove	Scholten
Cerfilus-	Kaptur	Schrier
McCormick	Keating	Scott (VA)
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Scott, David
Cisneros	Kennedy (NY)	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Simon
Cleaver	Landsman	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sorensen
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Soto
Conaway	Latimer	Stanton
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Stevens
Correa	Lee (PA)	Strickland
Costa	Levin	Subramanyam
Courtney	Liccardo	Suozi
Craig	Lieu	Swalwell
Crockett	Lofgren	Sykes
Crow	Lynch	Takano
Davids (KS)	Magaziner	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	Mannion	Thompson (CA)
Dean (PA)	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McBride	Titus
DeLauro	McClain Delaney	Tlaib
DeBene	McClellan	Tokuda
Deluzio	McCollum	Tonko
DeSaulnier	McDonald Rivet	Torres (CA)
Dexter	McGarvey	Torres (NY)
Dingell	McGovern	Trahan
Doggett	McIver	Tran
Elfreth	Menendez	Underwood
Escobar	Meng	Vargas
Espallat	Mfume	Vasquez
Evans (PA)	Moore (WI)	Veasey
Fields	Morelle	Velazquez
Figures	Morrison	Vindman
Fletcher	Moskowitz	Wasserman
Foster	Moulton	Schultz
Foushee	Mrvan	Waters
Frankel, Lois	Mullin	Watson Coleman
Friedman	Nadler	Whitesides
Frost	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Amodei (NV)	Leger Fernandez	Pelosi
Ansari	Lucas	Petterson
Barragán	Maloy	Pingree
Bergman	McBath	Schakowsky
Fong	McCaul	Sherrill
Garamendi	Meeks	Stansbury
Garcia (CA)	Min	Stefanik
Jackson (TX)	Neal	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1023

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 78.

DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM). Pursuant to House Resolution 242 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1048.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1026

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1048) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes, with Mr. OBERNOLTE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 119-38 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 119-38 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. SELF of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. TLAIB of Michigan.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. TLAIB of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3, printed in House Report 119-38, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT),