

Promises made, promises kept.

I thank all of those involved in bringing Marc home.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S CLEMENCY GRANTS

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, immediately after taking office, the current President granted sweeping pardons and commutations to over 1,500 insurrectionists who stormed the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

At least 174 police officers were injured while protecting the Capitol that day, and 5 officers who responded later died.

One of the people the President deemed fit to be released from prison shot a stun gun directly into the neck of an officer, causing him to suffer a heart attack and sustain a traumatic brain injury. Another attacked officers with bear spray. After being released for these crimes, he is now at large for allegedly soliciting a minor in 2016.

I was one of the last Members who was evacuated from this building on January 6. I have vivid memories, as many of us do, of the Capitol Police officers battered and exhausted but still defending us.

The decision to grant clemency to many violent and dangerous individuals is an affront to our democracy, our justice system, and the brave police officers who defended us that day and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members and Americans to reflect on this decision.

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 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1531

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUEST) at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 12, 2025, at 11:14 a.m.:

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe Finance Committee as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations to international conferences, meetings and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements Joint Committee on Taxation Washington's Farewell Address

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Clerk.

MIDNIGHT RULES RELIEF ACT

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 122, I call up the bill (H.R. 77) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", 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 122, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 77

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 "Midnight Rules Relief Act".

SEC. 2. EN BLOC CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL PERTAINING TO "MIDNIGHT RULES".

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 801(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) In applying section 802 to rules described under paragraph (1), a joint resolution of disapproval may contain one or more such rules if the report under subsection (a)(1)(A) for each such rule was submitted during the final year of a President's term."

(b) TEXT OF RESOLVING CLAUSE.—Section 802(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "resolving clause of which is" the following: "(except as otherwise provided in this subsection)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: "In the case of a joint resolution under section 801(d)(4), the matter after the resolving clause of such resolution shall be as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the following rules: the rule submitted by the ___ relating to ___; and the rule submitted by the ___ relating to ___. Such rules shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in and additional clauses describing additional rules to be included as necessary)."

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 the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 77.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 77, the Midnight Rules Relief Act. This piece of legislation will allow Congress to efficiently oversee Federal agency rulemaking.

Under the Congressional Review Act, known as the CRA, executive agencies must report all promulgated rules to both Chambers of Congress. The CRA gives Congress, then, the authority to pass joint resolutions to prevent agency rules from taking effect. The CRA's disapproval mechanism gives Congress a check on Federal administrative overreach.

Currently, the CRA forces Congress to introduce a separate joint resolution for each agency rule it seeks to review. This limit slows Congress' oversight of agency rulemaking.

Its inefficiency is most clear during the midnight rulemaking period of the last year of a President's term, when executive agencies historically issue more regulations than any other time in a President's term.

The 119th Congress can examine Biden administration rules that fall within the CRA lookback window. This window includes any rule submitted to Congress from August 16, 2024, to the end of the Biden administration.

During that period, the Biden administration finalized a staggering 1,406 rules.

H.R. 77 would make Congress' oversight more efficient during this midnight rulemaking period.

The Midnight Rules Relief Act would allow Congress to introduce joint resolutions considering multiple agency rules during the final year of a President's term.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may claim that this bill is only an attempt to slow down agency rulemaking, but that is incorrect. There are no provisions in this bill that are designed to slow down rulemaking.

Rather, this bill would merely allow Congress to more efficiently exercise the oversight authority it already has and respond to the influx of agency regulations during the midnight hours of the President's final term.

My colleagues would also like Americans to believe that this is an effort to repeal every regulation submitted to Congress. Again, that is inaccurate. After reviewing submitted regulations, Congress can pick and choose which rules to overturn, just as we do now.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the gentleman's bill is not to give Congress the power to undo midnight rules because Congress already has that power.

Under the Congressional Review Act, House Republicans can go to the floor this week, and they can try to undo every single regulation that was issued by the Biden administration from August of last year to Inauguration Day.

What does their bill do? It would allow the majority to roll up lots of midnight regulations and lots of others, too, including what you might call twilight, midday, and early morning regulations—indeed, all of the regulations adopted in the final 365 days of the prior administration, an entire year that takes place at midnight. All the regulations adopted in the last year could be tied together into a bundle, wrapped up together in a giant bunch, and then voted down as a single jumbo resolution.

This tactic could be used to try to get Congress to eliminate no fewer, by my count, than 355 major regulations from the last year of Joe Biden in one fell swoop, forcing every Member to vote either to sustain all of the regulations or to overturn and destroy all of them. By destroying them, that means the agencies could not try to promulgate similar regulations in the future without an act of Congress.

This would allow Trump's enablers and the sheeplike new Elon Muskovites in Congress to obliterate hundreds of completely diverse and unrelated regulations in one fell swoop. These are regulations that were adopted over the last year: Everything from removing lead from drinking water to making cell phones compatible with hearing aids to creating safety standards for infant bath seats to implementing the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that 43 States have constitutional or statutory single-subject rules for policy legislation initiatives and referenda is because voting on completely different subjects at the same time is a moronic way to govern and an invitation to political manipulation of the will of the people.

What is a Member to do if he or she strongly approves of, say, overturning 20 percent of these rules but strongly opposes overturning 80 percent of them? This weird dilemma makes us ask why we would even want to force such a choice. After all, the vast majority of America rejects this whole concept.

Well, the obvious purpose of this bizarre legislation is to get Republicans to vote to repeal extremely popular, commonsense regulations but then try to enable them to escape the political consequences of doing so.

Consider some of the Biden administration regulations which they would tuck into this monstrosity, omnibus midnight relief resolution and decide if you are willing to vote to overturn them, even if they are tucked in with some infamous washing machine regulation they love talking about.

Consider this one from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It cuts credit card late fees from an average of \$32 to \$8, meaning your credit card company cannot charge you more than \$8 for late fees because the CFPB brought a suit and determined that is the whole administrative cost of a late fee. It didn't say the credit card companies couldn't charge anything, but it said when they are charging you \$32, that is just a rip-off.

Now, our friends on that side of the aisle want to repeal this regulation because they insist it violates their precious *laissez-faire* principle. That is, let the credit card companies do whatever they want, but when it comes to leaving middle-class and working-class consumers to the mercy of gigantic credit card companies, my friends, *laissez* isn't fair. At least that is what the Democrats think, and we will stand up for this regulation.

If you think the credit card companies should be restored their power to charge whatever they want for late fees, way beyond their actual administrative expenses, then by all means support the Republicans' bill. Elon Musk and the billionaires will love you for it. Musk did, after all, just sign an agreement with Visa for his X wallet.

Another rule Republicans could add to their giant bundle is from the Department of Transportation, which requires airlines to provide automatic refunds when your flight is canceled and to disclose upfront baggage and flight change fees.

It used to be they could cancel your flight and just say they will give you another flight in the future at some point. The Department of Transportation determined that is not fair. If they cancel your flight, you get a refund. If you want to fly later or go take a train or find another mode of transportation, you can do it.

Now, they could throw that into the big bonfire of regulation destruction they are so excited about, and then you could consign your rights back to the microscopic fine print on the back of your airplane ticket rather than having the consumer champions at the Department of Transportation try to stand up for the people.

If you want the airlines to have that power over you, go ahead and vote for the GOP bill, support more *laissez-faire* for the billionaires. Strike a blow against the reviled Bidenomics. Give yourself all the airline inconvenience you want.

Another rule that they would throw in is the FTC's wildly popular click-to-cancel rule mandating that it should be just as easy to cancel a service advertised online as it is to sign up for it. The American people love that, right? Do you want to go back to the days when it was as easy as A-B-C-1-2-3 to sign up for an online service but then like the 12 labors of Hercules to try to get out of it when you no longer need it, then by all means support this great *laissez-faire* Republican bill. Strike a

blow against the big, bad, evil, mean, wicked, terrible regulations.

If you fall for all that propaganda, and you are more afraid of the big, bad, evil regulations than the big, bad, evil corporations, go ahead and vote for it. The unelected billionaire bureaucrat and his nameless, faceless, racist, junior bureaucrats in the Muskovite nighttime wrecking ball crew will be thrilled if you vote for it.

Another rule that is up for reversal is the CFPB regulation capping bank overdraft fees at \$5. My constituents in Maryland, who might not be as rich as some of the constituents over on the other side, were getting overdraft charges of \$35. They didn't like that, so they support the CFPB regulation capping overdraft fees from banks at \$5, which is at most what it costs the banks to process it.

That practice was costing American consumers, mostly young people, mostly older people and working-class people, \$5 billion a year. Biden's new \$5 rule, that is the max for overdraft fees. Excuse me. It is not a rule. It is a dreadful regulation to cut overdraft fees by more than 80 percent.

□ 1545

Guess what? The banks didn't go bankrupt. They have never been wealthier or healthier, with record profits in the last quarter, even with consumer safety regulations, which we are supposed to be so terrified about.

Go ahead and vote for the big banks, Elon Musk, and the Republicans. Vote against your own interests. You can lift the \$5 overdraft fee. I would be interested in what the gentleman thinks it should be, \$30, \$40? I don't know.

Finally, consider an HHS rule that you could be forced to vote for in advancing the big omnibus package they want: a ban on junk health insurance plans that rip our people off when they need healthcare the most and are most desperate. That is an HHS rule, and the Republicans say that that rule should be repealed because I guess the low-quality health insurance companies don't want to rip you off, right? If you believe that, then by all means, vote for the bill.

Instead of considering these regulations one at a time on their own merits and then voting on them transparently and publicly, as current law requires and as the vast majority of State constitutions and State legislatures require, this Republican bill would give Congress the power to wipe out all of these rules and hundreds of others in one single, massive party-line vote, which completely pulls the wool over the eyes of the American people.

Why do it? They haven't said. They just want it to slide through. They want to throw all these excellent regulations, supported by the vast majority of American people, in with a couple of regulations that I have heard them talk about, when I asked them why they want to do it, about washing machines. All right, say you don't like

those washing machine regulations. Make your argument to Congress. Let's debate it and discuss it, and maybe you will convince me. We will give it an up-or-down vote.

Each regulation gets its own vote. What is wrong with that?

No. They want to flood the zone with confusion and treat the people like sheep, not citizens. They don't want their constituents to notice the damage they are inflicting on the public good.

When I first heard about this legislative rip-off, I actually wanted to get in touch with the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, Representative ANDY BIGGS, because I remembered that he was the proud and impassioned sponsor of H.R. 91, which he introduced just a few weeks ago, on January 16, 2025. It was a very impressive bill. Guess what it is called? It is called the One Bill, One Subject Transparency Act. Let me repeat that: the One Bill, One Subject Transparency Act. That is his bill. I love the fact that he has been fighting for that. His bill "requires each bill or joint resolution to include no more than one subject and the subject to be clearly and descriptively expressed in the measure's title."

The midnight regulation kitchen sink bill would violate everything that I thought Congressman BIGGS believes about the legislative process: Members should be voting on one subject or one regulation at a time, not a dozen different subjects, not 100 different regulations in a single resolution, and the title of the bill should indeed clearly and descriptively communicate exactly what we are voting on, which means one thing.

Amazingly, before I could get to find Representative BIGGS to tell him that we had to get together across party lines to stop this new monstrosity I heard about, I was told by my staff that he was actually the author of the Midnight Rules Relief Act.

I couldn't believe it. I was dumbfounded and gobstopped. The lead sponsor of the One Bill, One Subject Transparency Act was now advocating this massive conglomeration of subjects and regulations, a huge legislative stew, a gumbo where poison pills and healthy vegetables are mixed up freely into one toxic, indigestible, and incomprehensible meal.

It is amazing to me. This is the cynical tactic that I thought my friends in the Freedom Caucus have for years been complaining about: the passage of bewilderingly complex and inscrutable legislation covering way too many subjects at once.

As Mr. BIGGS' press release on his bill stated: "Too often, congressional leaders use 'must-pass bills' . . . as methods for passing laws that may have failed if considered on their own." I will have some more to say about things that he has said about it in the past.

He had a solution to all of these tactics of political dishonesty. The One

Bill, One Subject Transparency Act would require that every bill considered by the House encompasses no more than one subject at a time. Let me repeat that: no more than one subject at a time. If a bill addresses two or more, then guess what? The bill becomes void.

I will stand up for that principle today that I thought once unified us. Borrowing from his own statements, I have also proposed an amendment to the Midnight Rules Relief Act. Using language taken directly from his legislation verbatim, I propose that any resolution we consider overturning agency regulations should be limited to a single subject, and if the resolution attempts to nullify regulations in two or more diverse areas, the resolution becomes, of course, null and void.

The whole point of the one bill, one subject House Republican movement led by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona is that Congress should not be destroying legislative transparency or accountability by shoving unrelated packages into a single moving legislative vehicle.

By the way, please spare me any lame rebuttal that we don't have time to actually do our jobs and hear each bill on its own, an argument that my Freedom Caucus friends have rightfully shown contempt for when raised in the past. If you want to repeal the \$5 bank overdraft fee, the clean water rule, or the click-to-cancel rule, be my guest. We have all the time in the world to debate why you want to overthrow the \$5 bank overdraft bill.

This week, the Republicans have brought a grand total of three bills to the floor, I think it is. We had some procedural minutia and three bills. We have nothing but time here. They have got no agenda.

Their whole agenda has been sidelined and supplanted by Elon Musk, who I thought was the fourth branch of government. Now, he seems to be the first branch of government, too, as my colleagues across the aisle simply want Elon Musk to do their jobs. We have members in committee thanking him for doing such great oversight.

Gee, I thought that Chairman COMER on the Oversight Committee was supposed to be doing oversight. I didn't think we needed a new fourth branch of government called Elon Musk to do that completely lawless and reckless and replete with conflicts of interest, but I digress.

Twenty-four resolutions of disapproval of specific regulations have actually been introduced in this Congress. Do you know how many of those resolutions of disapproval have been taken up in committees of jurisdiction? Zero. Do you know how many have been brought to the floor of the House by my colleagues, who are so exercised about big, bad, terrible, evil, and mean regulation? None of them.

They have not brought a single regulation forward. They have done nothing on regulations with all the time in the

world. Now, they want to destroy every principle they claim to adhere to in terms of legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The truth is that these Republican politicians are terrified to overturn these regulations in broad daylight. They know America supports them.

They should show some courage. Stand up for your anti-working class, anti-middle class, and plutocratic principles. Go ahead and vote to destroy the \$5 bank overdraft rule, but do it openly, do it clearly, and do it one by one.

Take each one on. We will stay here with you all day. We will even work a 9-to-5 day, something we haven't seen around here in a long time. We will work 8 hours or 12 hours if you want to get into the details of it.

Let's do our jobs for real. I dare you, all you single-subject zealots out there, to oppose this embarrassing and humiliating Midnight Rules Relief Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the good humor that came from the other side of the aisle. It had me in stitches.

I don't really believe that the gentleman was chasing me around because he wanted to sign on as a cosponsor of my single-subject rule. He knows where to find me. I am in the committees with him. He could have done it. He didn't do it.

What I do find is this is a problem for me because I had the Democratic debate bingo card going, and I was feeling pretty good because he did mention "Elon Musk" five times. He mentioned "billionaire" three times and "unelected billionaire" one time. I had those on my card.

Words I didn't have include "Muskovite," and I should have had that because he used that in Judiciary Committee earlier today. I also didn't have "flood the zone," and I also didn't have "gobstopped." I missed those on the bingo card for today.

I do find really intriguing his attempts to try to distract us from what this bill does.

The last thing I will say here before I yield to my friend from California is that the gentleman from Maryland mentioned omnibus bills, these omnibus bills that have everything in them, and he called them moronic. No doubt, I agree with him. The Inflation Reduction Act was moronic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Maryland, I would say that one of the nice things about this bill that we are considering is that it allows us—if there are any good Biden-era regulations out there, they can

stay—to simply choose to disapprove of the bad ones, of which there are quite a few.

Then to this idea that we can't disapprove of regulations as a batch because we need to have a debate over each and every one in this rarified Chamber, I would point out that there was no debate at all in this Chamber for any of those regulations when they were imposed by the agencies. We had no role whatsoever. This act allows us to reclaim our legislative authority and our role in the policymaking process going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the Midnight Rules Relief Act because President Joe Biden went on a regulation binge in his last few months in office. From August 1 of last year through the end of his Presidency, there were 1,524 new regulations issued. This bill today will allow us to press the reset button and to have a more considered process for policymaking when it comes to all of these different areas affected.

There are three main reasons I think that this is a good idea. The first has to do with the nature of regulations themselves, the death by a million cuts that is being felt by every industry and every sector throughout our country. When it comes to energy projects to make our country energy independent, when it comes to transportation projects to make our roads safer and to alleviate traffic, when it comes to forest management projects, when it comes to just about anything you can think of, and when it comes to being a small business owner, the sheer weight of regulation after regulation is making it unduly difficult to build, grow, expand, empower people, hire, and move us toward the prosperity that this country is truly capable of.

Secondly, there is a question of democratic legitimacy. When you have a President who has just been rejected by voters, or in this case at least he has chosen not to run again and his Vice President did not succeed in getting elected, to then issue over 1,500 regulations is a way of trying to lock in unpopular policies.

What this bill does, again, is it only affects new regulations in the last year of one's Presidency. It prevents this sort of undemocratic hangover effect, where new regulations are hastily thrown together in order to block the change that people have voted for.

Finally, I point out that there is an opportunity for Congress to reclaim its legislative authority. We have seen the administrative state and the bureaucracies that issued the sort of regulations we are talking about that have continued to grow and grow and affect American life in new ways and more intrusive ways every single year. We have had a few changes that have allowed us to reverse this decades-long trajectory. Of course, there is the election of President Trump and his commitment to rolling back regulations. There is also the decision from the Su-

preme Court revisiting the Chevron doctrine.

This legislation adds to that mix. It gives us the ability to say that we are not going to continue to outsource all of our lawmaking authority to administrative agencies. Rather, when it comes to the core of making policy that will affect the lives of Americans, we ought to be very mindful of giving that away and allowing bureaucrats to do the job that the American people have entrusted to us.

When we do that, we can reclaim the idea of self-government, that policy is made by those who truly represent the people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for proposing this legislation. I look forward to seeing it pass, and I look forward from there on out to the newly empowered Congress being able to consider the merits of those regulations and decide on much better policies moving forward.

□ 1600

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 77, the so-called Midnight Rules Relief Act. Despite the bill's title, this legislation is not really intended to address midnight rules at all. Instead, it is nothing more than an effort by the Republican majority to advance their antigovernment, deregulatory agenda under cover of darkness.

Republicans know that taking a series of votes making it easier for corporations to undermine our health, safety, and economic well-being would be deeply unpopular. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want the public to know that Republicans care more about corporations than consumers, so they want to package as many rules as possible into a single resolution that would eliminate these rules all at once, reducing transparency and obscuring the consequences.

This legislation would allow the majority to put dozens of critical regulations issued by the Biden administration on the chopping block. Republicans will talk all about the costs of these regulations, but the majority will never talk about the benefits, like healthier children, safer drinking water, and stronger consumer protections.

If my Republican colleagues really want to roll back regulations that ensure the safety of bath seats for infants or create dust, lead, and lead pipe safety standards, or update certain emergency braking standards, fine. Let's have that debate out in the open. We can let our constituents judge whether we took the right vote. Don't hide behind a giant omnibus bill that obscures the consequences of the majority's actions.

If we are truly concerned about so-called midnight rules, we have other

options to check them. For example, at the end of President George W. Bush's administration, I authored a bill that would delay implementation of rules issued near the end of a President's term, giving his or her successor the chance to review such rules and to determine if they should go forward.

I believe there are ways that we could work together in a bipartisan manner to address this issue.

Where past efforts tried using a scalpel to address the problems associated with midnight rulemaking, today's Republicans want to instead use a machete, hacking away at the Biden administration's regulatory agenda, putting all of the rules together in one vote, and furthering their ideological goal of radically transforming our government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle have mentioned several rules that Democrats particularly favor: bank fee regulation, maybe something about lead pipe regulation, and drinking water regulation. These aren't legislation. These are regulations.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: If you are afraid to vote on them, you are going to stick them in this midnight rules reversion.

This is what I would submit: When all legislative authority is delegated to the bureaucratic agencies—Elon Musk isn't the fourth branch of government. He is not. Scholars have said and written for 30 years about the administrative state effectively being the fourth branch of government.

When my colleagues look at what scholars have said about that and are delegating that, my Democratic colleagues should just fess up and say: We are afraid. We are afraid to put the CFPB bill on the floor that would reduce the fees. We are afraid of doing that because we might be held responsible by our constituents.

That is what the minority is claiming that we want. In reality, Democrats would rather have nameless, faceless, unelected bureaucrats govern this country. That is what my Democratic colleagues want.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at that, I find myself saying: If Democrats want to preserve the separation of powers, it may be gone, but we can actually reinstitute it. It is not three coequal branches of government. That is not what the Founders intended.

The Founders are very clear in the Constitutional Convention that Article I, that branch, which happens to be this branch, was meant to be the most powerful, and why? It was closest to the people.

Why was that important? They wanted this group of people to be actually bound to the people, be closest to the people.

When Members do what the Democrats want to do, which is to actually

delegate it over to the executive branch and to the bureaucracies, off to la-la land, and not really having an effective way to review it, that is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would prefer because it makes this body less accountable. Heaven knows, Democrats don't want to necessarily be accountable.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats argue that the Midnight Rules Relief Act does not allow for sufficient debate. That is one of the things we have heard here, but the purpose of the Midnight Rules Relief Act is to increase Congress' opportunity to consider and debate rules.

Since there was an influx of rules at the midnight hour, the last few months of a President's term, which my colleague from New York just mentioned, calling it, I believe, the Biden regulatory agenda, that is what it is. It is the Biden regulatory agenda. It is not the Democrat's elected official agenda, nor the Republicans. It is not these elected officials' agenda. It is not even President Biden's agenda, except for it has been done by a regulatory agency. My Democratic colleagues like that over there.

Congress becomes overwhelmed when we have 1,400 or 1,500 of those rules in the last few months. When Congress is overwhelmed like that, it means that many agency rules are left unreviewed altogether by Congress. It is not just some, but most. It is the vast majority, without a single second or an iota of debate by the elected officials.

America is being governed by unelected bureaucrats. That is who is governing America. The Midnight Rules Relief Act increases the opportunity for Congress to debate agency rules by allowing Congress to consider more than one rule at a time.

This allows agency rules, that would not otherwise receive any debate, to be debated in Congress. Take back the unelected bureaucrats' authority and put it in the hands of the people who have been elected.

Why is that important? We are meant to be accountable to the people. The reason that the House had the purse strings added to it is because we were closest to the people. We are meant to be more accountable to the people.

Prior to the 17th Amendment, the States had their authority and their rights preserved and protected by the U.S. Senate, but now the U.S. Senate is just a bunch of glorified national politicians.

What I would suggest is, if Congress wants to take back the legislative authority and actually have people who are accountable, then the Midnight Rules Relief Act needs to be passed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of what the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) just said that I agree with because he wasn't talking at all about his bill.

Let's start with what I really agree with the gentleman about.

Article I makes Congress the pre-eminent and predominant branch of government, as Madison said in the Federalist Papers. We are the predominant branch. Don't accept anything from anybody on either side of the aisle if they get up and talk about how we are three coequal branches, which is what they teach people in fifth grade.

First of all, "coequal" is not even a word. That is like the term "very unique" or something like that. Republicans are saying we are three equal branches.

I think not because the preamble of the Constitution leads right into Article I. All of the legislative power is vested in us, and it is laid out in Article I, Section 8. There are 18 different powers to regulate commerce domestically, internationally, the budget, taxes, et cetera.

Then Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 says: and all other powers necessary and proper to the execution of the foregoing powers.

Going to Article II, there are four short sections about the President. There wasn't even a President included in the Articles of Confederation. They decided to add it. Why? What is the core job of the President? It is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, not distorted, not mangled, not overturned, not defeated, not thwarted.

The President doesn't have the power to impound money that has been appropriated by Congress. An appropriations act is just another law, like the law that you can't assault Federal officers. An appropriations act is just like that. Congress is, indeed, preeminent and predominant, but I am afraid that, at that point, my agreement with the gentleman falls off.

Let me start by addressing the comments of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY). I don't know if the gentleman is there.

Mr. KILEY was actually a student of mine at Yale Law School. He was an A student all the way, but I would say he just gave us a B-minus argument because he at least addressed the idea of Congress reviewing regulations, and he said he thought that was important for legislative power.

We have that power. He didn't address what this bill is about, which is bundling together a whole bunch of dissimilar and unrelated regulations and voting on them once. The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) never talked about that. I hope the gentleman comes back to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) says that the Democrats are giving away legislative authority to the administrative agencies. Not at all. No. No. On the contrary. We think the administrative agencies must faithfully execute the laws that we, Congress, have passed.

This month, Republicans are the ones who have completely abdicated their legislative power. The majority is al-

lowing Elon Musk's actions. God knows what role he is playing. He is a special government employee who hasn't turned in any conflict of interest forms, at least that I have seen.

I don't even know who he thinks he is representing or advocating for other than his own business interests, and he hasn't shown us that he has a conflict of interest waiver for the billions of dollars of taxpayer money he gets from government contracts. Yet, my Republican colleagues are perfectly happy to sit on their hands for several weeks and not do anything to get in the way.

Some of them shamefully have even gotten up and thanked Elon Musk for the great job of oversight he is doing when we have an Oversight Committee that the Republicans chair. The Judiciary Committee could be looking at it also.

Instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are applauding a guy and his nighttime crew of a bunch of junior Muskovites who are hacking into computers and taking over the private data of millions of Americans in blatant violation of the Privacy Act and the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986, which was pushed by Ronald Reagan, who would be turning over to learn what has become of his party.

Mr. Speaker, why do Republicans want to be able to bundle all of these bills? Republican Members haven't said.

Why don't my Republican colleagues tell us which bills the majority wants to bundle together?

The gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) said: We are not going to put all those popular ones that I just talked about from the CFPB and the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Education. We are not going to put all those in it. It is just the unpopular ones.

Tell us which are the unpopular ones that Republicans are going to bundle together as the majority barrels this through.

The distinguished gentleman hasn't explained why he thinks this is befitting the legislative branch of government, which he rightfully commends as the preeminent branch of government.

I thought my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were opposed to multiple subject rules. I thought that the gentleman was advocating for single-subject bills. This is the exact opposite of that when everything is thrown into one big gumbo.

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

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I did not have junior Muskovite on the bingo card. I do find it interesting that the gentleman would be commenting on Ronald Reagan's current condition and his state of repose because I think he probably doesn't understand Ronald Reagan's philosophy at all.

Let's talk about what might be good if regulations are bundled together. Let's just consider a couple of things.

The need for the Midnight Rules Relief Act is most clearly seen in the wave of regulations issued by the prior administration in the eleventh hour of their administration. In the last few months, the Biden administration issued a staggering total of more than 1,400 final rules.

Here are two that might be single subject. Let's think about it. Would Democrats be okay if the Biden energy final rule of December 2024 was included, which effectively banned gas-powered water heaters in homes, which would increase their price by hundreds of dollars?

I wonder if my Democratic colleagues would be comfortable with sticking that with another Biden energy regulation issued in the same month, December of 2024, after he had already lost the election, that forces appliance manufacturers to comply with onerous rules that slow down the washing times for dishwashers from an hour or less to more than 2 hours?

One wonders. Those sound like they might be single-subject bills.

Moreover, there is nothing in here that mandates that we just bind everything together. The minority knows this doesn't require everything to be stuck together.

My Democratic colleagues know that they can be analyzed and bound together, as they can currently, except that they can't currently, can they?

I just picked two rules out of the air. Those two rules right there would require two separate bills. They would require two separate bills. Democrats don't want that.

Last October, the Environmental Protection Agency issued a final rule that dramatically raised the cost of repairing commercial and residential air-conditioning units. Maybe all three of those could go together in the same bill, but that can't be done under the current rule. That can't be done under the current law. We couldn't do it.

You would be stuck and you are going through the process, and believe me when I say I feel like we are going as slow as molasses here. My leadership would say that I complain about it all the time. We are taking next week off. Maybe Democrats would be comfortable if we were working next week and we were going to go through maybe 150 of these rules.

□ 1615

Maybe that would make you happy. What I will tell you is that the Midnight Rules Relief Act would allow Congress to consider and disapprove or accept all three of these burdensome regulations at one time. That makes us more responsive, and it makes us more able to process and oversee these regulators, these bureaucrats.

I find it intriguing. Elon Musk got mentioned again. He has replaced Trump. There is no longer TDS. Now, it is Elon Musk derangement syndrome because he has got to mention that on everything.

Here is the way it works. They want to say Elon Musk is looking at regulations and stuff like that, but we have an Oversight Committee. We do. We have an Oversight Committee, and we are busy conducting oversight.

It sure would be nice if the Oversight Committee could put some of these bills together as we consider these rules. However, when you have 1,400 rules, it doesn't matter how many oversight committees you have, you are going to have a tough time getting them done in a 2-year period. That is just the way it is.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I know they talk about the deranged Trump syndrome. Now they are talking about the deranged Musk syndrome. I do know that Steve Bannon has described him as a truly evil individual, so I understand that there are major conflicts emerging over there.

In any event, back to the merits of the bill. I have to adjudicate the merits of this bill by the lack of coherence and energy and passion with which my normally passionate and eloquent colleague is operating today. One can barely torture out an argument from everything he is saying for the bill, and I noticed there is no one left on his side who wants to be associated with it in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), my colleague.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Midnight Rules Relief Act, which would strip away the robust debate, careful deliberation, and transparency our democracy requires when considering the repeal of long-established Federal rules.

I have to be honest with you, it is so funny to me that I have just heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spend 30 minutes talking about the preeminence of Congress, about how we don't want unelected bureaucrats making these rules, when they are literally allowing an unelected Elon Musk to run roughshod over Congress' power of the purse and to literally break laws that Congress has passed and mandated.

Let's talk about what the Midnight Rules Relief Act actually means in practice. It means that Republicans would dismantle important protections in areas like public safety, consumer rights, environmental conservation, data privacy, and so much more all in one fell swoop—sometimes dozens, hundreds, or even thousands of rules that took years to develop all just smooshed together.

Things like safeguards against lead in our drinking water, rigorous safety standards for baby products, antismoking measures for youth, and consumer protections from shady business practices.

In one hasty move, these protections could vanish without thorough debate or transparent decisionmaking.

Those Federal rules and so many more could be wiped out in the blink of an eye without substantial debate, without sufficient transparency, without allowing the American people to know why we are repealing these rules or what conflicts of interest might be at play, especially from Elon Musk.

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 prohibit the bundling of rules related to issue areas where Elon Musk has a clear conflict of interest. With a net worth of around \$400 billion, Elon Musk has many conflicts of interests. That is why he should be bound by the same disclosure requirements and ethic guidelines as all other civil servants and elected officials, but, in the meantime, my amendment would force us to consider individually any regulation that may be a conflict of interest to Elon Musk.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. JACOBS. Get ready for these lists of conflicts of interests because it is long: anything related to national security, the aerospace industry, transportation and highway safety, biomedical technology, artificial intelligence, peer-to-peer payment systems, workplace safety and workers' rights, and data privacy. It is a long list, and it is why we should keep Elon Musk far away from our government.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, surely, it must have snowed in Arizona last night. I thought I heard the gentleman agree with Steve Bannon. Hell must have frozen over is all I can say.

Now, here is the deal. We just heard the gentlewoman talk about how this bill would strip away robust debate. No, it won't. It won't do that. You can debate these regulations under this provision. There will be debate.

The same rules remain in place, but what she actually aggrandized and what the gentleman has been aggrandizing all day is bureaucratic control of regulatory schemes. That is what they are promoting. They want the bureaucrats to control with us not having adequate opportunity to review those.

When you have an administration like the Biden administration as well as the administrations of Clinton, Obama, and Bush, they all increased in their last 6 months by two-and-a-half times the number of regulations that they issued. Those end up staying in place because there is not capacity under the current law to review those regulations and actually debate them.

My bill actually does the opposite of what they are suggesting. It actually brings us in as Members of Congress to review, debate, discuss, and decide if we want to accept or reject those bureaucratic rules.

For the other aspect of this, before I reserve again, I will just say this: If you like those regulations, then why don't you put them in a piece of legislation and promote them yourself?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, why don't we put them in legislation? I would love to. If your leadership would allow us to bring it to the floor, to cap bank overdraft fees at \$5, let's do it. I will take all these consumer public safety regulations, turn them into bills, and bring them to the floor as soon as you get an agreement from your leadership to do that. They don't even want to vote on the horrid bills that you bring forward much less the excellent bills that we have got.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this: If you want to defend the \$5 overdraft rule, if you want to defend the ban on junk health insurance, then vote against their bill. If you want to get rid of all this public safety regulation, then go ahead and support their bill.

The gentleman amazingly says in answer to my colleague from California that there will be time to debate the regulations. Their bill would allow for 355 major regulations to be bundled together so they can get away with just one vote. They would twist their arms to vote for that one vote for all the special interests out there who want to get rid of it.

Do you know how much time there would be to debate on each regulation if we had the normal 1 hour rule? As you know, right now each side gets 30 minutes. That is 60 minutes. We would be able to spend 10 seconds on each of those regulations. Just 10 seconds, and the gentleman assures us there will be ample time to do it.

Come on. Get real. Be serious.

This is an attempt to destroy the public interest in a way that the gentleman knows is an absolute travesty in terms of the integrity of the legislative process. He is the author of the one subject, one bill legislation. He is the author of it, and this bill is the absolute antithesis of it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters of opposition, one from the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards and one from Earthjustice.

COALITION FOR
SENSIBLE SAFEGUARDS,
February 12, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER JEFFRIES: The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards (CSS), an alliance of over 200 labor, scientific, research, good government, faith, community, health, environmental, and public interest organizations that represent millions of Americans and advocate for effective regulations to protect the public, and the undersigned organizations strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 77, the Midnight Rules Relief Act.

H.R. 77 would amend the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to allow simultaneous disapproval of dozens of regulations finalized near the end of presidential terms using a single joint resolution. The effect of this bill would be to greatly expand the CRA's anti-regulatory force by amplifying the harmful impact of the CRA's "salt the earth" provision, which bars agencies from issuing new rules that are substantially the same as the rules that are repealed. It would also make it easier for narrow majorities of lawmakers to repeal recently completed safeguards without the due consideration and deliberation that Congress should employ before taking such drastic steps. As such, the operation of the bill would significantly constrain agencies' authority to carry out their statutory missions to protect the public.

The proposed legislation is based on a fatally flawed premise—namely, that regulations which are proposed or finalized during the so-called "midnight" rulemaking period are rushed and inadequately vetted. In fact, the very opposite is true. In recent months, the Biden Administration has finalized regulations that increase overtime pay to put more money in the pockets of working families, limit carbon emissions from polluters to fight climate change, increase fuel efficiency standards to make cars cleaner, protect workers from harmful "non-compete" clauses in employment contracts, block companies from taking advantage of consumers with "junk fees," put new limits on toxic "forever chemicals" that poison communities across the country, and many more. Unlike CRA resolutions, which can sprint through Congress in just a few weeks, many of these regulations that will benefit the American public had been in the regulatory process for years.

In July 2016, Public Citizen released a report that compared rulemaking lengths for rules finalized at the end of the term or during the presidential transition period to those that were finalized outside of this period. The results were noteworthy. The report found that rules issued during the presidential transition period spent even more time in the rulemaking process and received even more extensive vetting than other rules.

Prominent administrative law experts have also concluded that the concerns regarding these regulations are not borne out by the evidence. For example, in 2012 the Administrative Conference of the United States (ACUS) conducted an extensive study of regulations finalized near the end of previous presidential terms and found that many end-of-term regulations were "relatively routine matters not implicating new policy initiatives by incumbent administrations."

ACUS also found that the "majority of the rules appear to be the result of finishing tasks that were initiated before the Presidential transition period or the result of

deadlines outside the agency's control (such as year-end statutory or court-ordered deadlines)." ACUS concluded that "the perception of midnight rulemaking as an unseemly practice is worse than the reality."

Supporters of H.R. 77 have presented no persuasive empirical evidence supporting their claims that regulations were rushed near the end of presidential terms. Likewise, they have supplied no evidence that such regulations did not involve diligent compliance with mandated rulemaking procedures. In reality, compliance with the current lengthy regulatory process prevents agencies from finalizing new regulations efficiently, and thus earlier in presidential terms.

In the end, it is difficult to overlook the tragic irony at the heart of H.R. 77. It would empower Congress to use the Congressional Review Act (CRA)—a process that is rushed, nontransparent and discourages informed decision-making—to block rules that have completed the long journey through the rulemaking process.

Unlike the CRA's expedited procedures, agency rules are subjected to myriad accountability mechanisms, and, for each rule, the agency must articulate a policy rationale that is supported by the rulemaking record and consistent with the requirements of the authorizing statute. In contrast, members of Congress do not have to articulate a valid policy rationale—or any rationale at all—in support of CRA resolutions of disapproval. Quite simply, they can be, and often are, an act of pure politics. H.R. 77 would make the situation even worse. It would, in effect, demand that all members of Congress have adequate expertise on all of the rules that would be targeted by a single disapproval resolution. Such a scenario would be highly unlikely.

It would also risk encouraging members to engage in "horse trading" to add still more rules to the disapproval resolution until enough votes have been gathered to ensure the resolution's passage. Surely, this approach to policymaking cannot be defended as superior to that undertaken by regulatory agencies.

Public Citizen, which co-chairs CSS, is actively tracking the CRA resolutions introduced in the 119th Congress. Over 60 rules are vulnerable to repeal through the CRA. Last Congress, 22 out of at least 109 CRA resolutions faced votes on the House or Senate floor. The targeted rules protect small businesses, workers, consumers, students, veterans, investors, people of color, clean air, clean water, renewable energy, wildlife, gun safety, among others.

CSS agrees that the CRA is in dire need of reform, but instead of expanding its harmful effects, as the Midnight Rules Relief Act would do, we encourage the House to evaluate proposals that would limit those effects. One such measure is the "Stop Corporate Capture Act." Among its many real and meaningful reforms to strengthen the regulatory process, the Stop Corporate Capture Act would address one of the most problematic aspects of the CRA by eliminating the "salt the earth" provision discussed above. Critically, the Stop Corporate Capture Act would also create a fast-track reinstatement process for rules that were the subject of resolutions of disapproval.

We look forward to working with Congress to ensure that our regulatory process is working effectively and efficiently to protect the American public.

We strongly urge opposition to H.R. 77, the Midnight Rules Relief Act.

Sincerely,

Accountable.US, AFL-CIO, American Bird Conservancy, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Americans for Financial Reform,

Animal Welfare Institute, CalWild, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Economic Integrity, Center for Food Safety, Center for Justice & Democracy, Center for Progressive Reform, Center for Responsible Lending, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Christian Council of Delmarva, Citizen Action/Illinois, Climate Action Campaign, Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, Consumer Action.

Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Federation of California, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, Cultivating Lives Educational Services, Inc., Earthjustice, Economic Action Maryland Fund, Economic Policy Institute, Endangered Habitats League, Endangered Species Coalition, Food & Water Watch, FOUR PAWS USA, Friends of the Earth, Government Information Watch/Greenpeace USA, Impact Fund, International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy.

Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, Kettle Range Conservation Group, Large Carnivore Fund, League of Conservation Voters, National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients), National Consumers League, National Employment Law Project, National Health Law Program, National Wolfwatcher Coalition, National Women's Law Center, Natural Resources Defense Council, Oceana, P Street, People Power United, Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Public Citizen, Public Justice, Public Justice Center, Resource Renewal Institute, RESTORE: The North Woods, Rise Economy, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Team Wolf, Texas Appleseed, Tzedek DC, Union of Concerned Scientists, United Steelworkers (USW), Vermont Public Interest Research Group, Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Womxn From The Mountain, Wyoming Wildlife Advocates.

EARTHJUSTICE.

Re Please Oppose H.R. 77, the "Midnight Rules Relief Act."

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of Earthjustice, I respectfully urge you to oppose H.R. 77 when it comes up for a floor vote next week. H.R. 77, titled "The Midnight Rules Relief Act," would amend the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to allow Congress to bundle an unlimited number of regulations finalized in the last months of a President's term into a single CRA resolution of disapproval, instead of blocking them one at a time as permitted under current law. The ability to reach back and place a multitude of an Administration's significant rules under the harsh provisions of the Congressional Review Act is dangerous and outrageous. In the interest of public health and environmental protections that keep us all safe, please oppose the Midnight Rules Relief Act and vote NO.

A resolution of disapproval containing dozens, if not hundreds, of administrative rules finalized over the previous potentially six months or more that dealing with the environment, public health, labor, education, and a myriad of other issues would get merely 10 hours of debate. Frankly, neither the full content of the resolution nor its sweeping implications would receive anything like the

scrutiny such a draconian measure deserves. In marked contrast, the very rules targeted by such a resolution would have been many years in the making and have had public engagement as required under the Administrative Procedure Act and other federal laws. Even worse than "repealing" in one fell swoop safeguards developed over the years is the CRA's requirement that an agency may not reissue the rule in "substantially the same form." In essence, proponents of this bill seek a permanent 11th-hour veto of essential safeguards, as Congress would never likely successfully re-legislate dozens or hundreds of rules.

There is no plausible reasonable governance justification for Congress to repeal a substantially large number of rules in one blunt measure. The various concerns raised to justify this amendment to the CRA are a pure fallacy. Proponents of H.R. 77 presume that "midnight rules," that is, rules finalized towards the end of a presidential term, lack the quality of analysis required in the rule-making process that helps justify regulations. However, most rules finalized in the last months of an administration, irrespective of political party, have gone through multiple years of review and processing, sometimes predating the administration's releasing the final rule.

The bill would also risk encouraging members of Congress to engage in "horse trading" to add still more rules to the en bloc disapproval resolution until enough votes have been gathered to ensure the resolution's passage. Indeed, this approach to policymaking cannot be defended as superior to the careful process undertaken by regulatory agencies for each separate rule.

In its current iteration, the CRA is an extremely blunt instrument that can permanently damage crucial public health and safety measures. It disregards the extensive work and expertise that went into the rule-making process, limits transparency in the political process, devalues public participation in rulemaking, and provides no judicial review. This legislative proposal would only intensify the dramatic and problematic consequences of the CRA by allowing Congress to bundle rules into one single resolution of disapproval.

We strongly urge you to oppose the Midnight Rules Relief Act and reject its false and misleading rhetoric, which is unrelated to the real problems of excessive and systemic delay in the regulatory process.

Sincerely,

BRIELLE L. GREEN, ESQ.,
Earthjustice, Policy & Legislation, Senior
Legislative Counsel, Regulatory Reform &
Access to Justice.

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

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I consider everything that was just said and what a travesty this bill is and how hardened and offensive this bill is, I find it intriguing.

Just like I am not sure I can accept that he was chasing me down because he wanted to sign on to my single-subject bill, I am not sure that his math is right on the 10 seconds to discuss and debate each bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. No. You had your 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is, this bill has the potential to bring back into control and authority the legislative power that has been so wrongfully and wholly without oversight delegated to these agencies that are out there.

It has resulted, under Democrat and Republican administrations, in regulations that impact every aspect of every Americans' life, and they have been put together by unelected bureaucrats.

There is a reason that people said we have had enough of it. That is one of the things that President Trump campaigned on. My colleagues across the aisle don't want to accept that, but the bottom line is this: The meddling that goes on in every aspect of your life they want to control whether you can have a gas heater in your home. They don't want that, but by golly they are going to pass an omnibus bill that spends trillions of dollars and then they are going to complain because we are bundling a few regulations together.

There is no requirement that you bundle every regulation together. There is no requirement that you bundle all of them together. There is no requirement that you bundle two together.

This bill merely allows that to take place. I have mentioned several of what those rules may be that would actually be within the same subject even, but the bottom line is this: If we don't do it, the bureaucrats are going to continue to run this place. They are going to run the country, and the American people will have no recourse.

This gives them recourse. We are the ones who are elected, not the bureaucrats. If you want the \$5 CFPB rule, then go ahead and introduce it. Don't complain to me, oh, gosh, your Speaker won't let it in. Yeah. I know how that goes. I have been here when there has been a Democrat Speaker. You know what? The pendulum swings back and forth, but what shouldn't swing back and forth is legislative authority.

We are the preeminent, predominant power amongst the separation of powers, the three branches of government, and there should not be four. Now, scholars will tell you there is a fourth. It is the administrative state. This curbs the administrative state. That is why this is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support and pass this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 122, 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. JACOBS. 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. Jacobs of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 77 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Ms. Jacobs moves to recommit the bill H.R. 77 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 8, insert “except in the case of a rule that concerns national security, the aerospace industry, transportation or highway safety, biomedical technology, artificial intelligence, peer-to-peer payment systems, fair labor practices, or the administration of the Privacy Act of 1974,” before “a joint resolution of disapproval”.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 213, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—205

Adams	Cuellar	Jackson (IL)
Aguilar	Davids (KS)	Jacobs
Amo	Davis (IL)	Jayapal
Ansari	Davis (NC)	Jeffries
Auchincloss	Dean (PA)	Johnson (TX)
Balint	DeGette	Kamlager-Dove
Barragán	DeLauro	Kaptur
Beatty	DeBene	Keating
Bell	Deluzio	Kelly (IL)
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kennedy (NY)
Beyer	Dexter	Khanna
Bishop	Dingell	Krishnamoorthi
Bonamici	Doggett	Landsman
Boyle (PA)	Elfrith	Larsen (WA)
Brown	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Brownley	Espallat	Latimer
Budzinski	Evans (PA)	Lee (NV)
Bynum	Fields	Lee (PA)
Carbajal	Figures	Levin
Carson	Fletcher	Liccardo
Carter (LA)	Foster	Lieu
Casar	Foushee	Lofgren
Case	Frankel, Lois	Lynch
Casten	Friedman	Magaziner
Castor (FL)	Frost	Mannion
Castro (TX)	Garcia (CA)	Matsui
Cherfilus-	Garcia (IL)	McBath
McCormick	Garcia (TX)	McBride
Chu	Golden (ME)	McClain Delaney
Cisneros	Goldman (NY)	McClellan
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez, V.	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Goodlander	McDonald Rivet
Cleaver	Gray	McGarvey
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	McGovern
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McIver
Conaway	Hayes	Meeks
Connolly	Himes	Menendez
Correa	Horsford	Meng
Costa	Houlahan	Mfume
Courtney	Hoyer	Min
Craig	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (WI)
Crockett	Huffman	Morelle
Crow	Ivey	Morrison

Moskowitz	Ross
Moulton	Ruiz
Mrvan	Ryan
Nadler	Salinas
Neal	Sánchez
Neguse	Scanlon
Norcross	Schakowsky
Ocasio-Cortez	Schneider
Olszewski	Scholten
Omar	Schrier
Pallone	Scott (VA)
Panetta	Scott, David
Pappas	Sewell
Pelosi	Sherman
Perez	Sherrill
Peters	Simon
Pingree	Smith (WA)
Pocan	Sorensen
Pou	Soto
Pressley	Stansbury
Quigley	Stanton
Ramirez	Stevens
Randall	Strickland
Raskin	Subramanyam
Riley (NY)	Suozi
Rivas	Swalwell

NAYS—213

Aderholt	Goldman (TX)	Miller (OH)
Alford	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gooden	Miller-Meeks
Amodei (NV)	Gosar	Mills
Arrington	Graves	Moolenaar
Babin	Green (TN)	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Greene (GA)	Moore (NC)
Baird	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Grothman	Moore (WV)
Barr	Guest	Moran
Barrett	Guthrie	Murphy
Baumgartner	Hageman	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Newhouse
Begich	Haridopolos	Norman
Bentz	Harrigan	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Obenolte
Bice	Harris (NC)	Ogles
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Onder
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Owens
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Perry
Bost	Hinson	Pfluger
Brecheen	Houchin	Reschenthaler
Bresnahan	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Hunt	Rose
Burlison	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Calvert	Issa	Roy
Cammack	Jack	Rulli
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	James	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Schmidt
Cline	Jordan	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cole	Kean	Sessions
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Shreve
Comer	Kennedy (UT)	Simpson
Crane	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Crank	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kim	Smucker
Davidson	Knott	Spartz
De La Cruz	Kustoff	Staubert
DesJarlais	LaHood	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	LaLota	Steil
Downing	LaMalfa	Steube
Dunn (FL)	Langworthy	Strong
Edwards	Latta	Stutzman
Ellzey	Lawler	Taylor
Emmer	Lee (FL)	Tenney
Estes	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Evans (CO)	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Ezell	Lucas	Timmons
Fallon	Luttrell	Turner (OH)
Fedorchak	Mace	Valadao
Feenstra	Mackenzie	Van Drew
Finstad	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Fischbach	Maloy	Van Orden
Fitzgerald	Mann	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Walberg
Fleischmann	Mast	Weber (TX)
Flood	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fong	McClain	Westerman
Fox	McClintock	Wied
Fry	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Fulcher	McDowell	Wilson (SC)
Garbarino	McGuire	Wittman
Gill (TX)	Messmer	Womack
Gimenez	Meuser	Yakym
	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

Crawford	Gottheimer	Luna
Donalds	Grijalva	Mullin
Garamendi	Johnson (GA)	Pettersen
Gillen	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Gomez	Leger Fernandez	Wilson (FL)

□ 1652

Messrs. BAIRD, BILIRAKIS, SMITH of Nebraska, GRAVES, GROTHMAN, VAN DREW, MASSIE, and TURNER of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MORRISON, Messrs. LEVIN, MFUME, and STANTON, Ms. DeLAURO, and Mr. RUIZ 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. GILLEN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 40.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 208, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—212

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

Miller (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman
Miller (WV)	Rose	Taylor
Miller-Meeks	Rouzer	Tenney
Mills	Roy	Thompson (PA)
Moolenaar	Rulli	Tiffany
Moore (AL)	Rutherford	Timmons
Moore (NC)	Salazar	Turner (OH)
Moore (UT)	Scalise	Valadao
Moore (WV)	Schmidt	Van Drew
Moran	Schweikert	Van Dyne
Murphy	Scott, Austin	Van Orden
Nehls	Self	Wagner
Newhouse	Sessions	Walberg
Norman	Shreve	Weber (TX)
Nunn (IA)	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Oberholte	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Ogles	Smith (NJ)	Wied
Onder	Smucker	Williams (TX)
Owens	Spartz	Wilson (SC)
Palmer	Stauber	Wittman
Perry	Stefanik	Womack
Pfleger	Steil	Yakym
Reschenthaler	Steube	Zinke
Rogers (AL)	Strong	

NAYS—208

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

NOT VOTING—13

Crawford	Grijalva	Petersen
De La Cruz	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Donalds	Leger Fernandez	Wilson (FL)
Gomez	Luna	
Gottheimer	Mullin	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1700

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I was unable to vote in the afternoon due to attending an event at the White House that was during voting time. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 40 and YEA on Roll Call No. 41.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 40 and NAY on Roll Call No. 41.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 879

Mr. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOLDMAN) as cosponsor of H.R. 879.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

HONORING BART REISING

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank one of the longest serving members of Team Scalise, a son of Covington, Georgia, and a proud Ole Miss alum, Bart Reising.

Bart came to the Hill in 2011 after working on political campaigns and served my good friends, AUSTIN SCOTT and Bill Flores, as their scheduler before joining my team in 2014 as operations director during the last few months of my chairmanship of the Republican Study Committee.

Bart continued his role as operations director when I was elected majority whip. He kept our office operations moving smoothly. Bart made sure that the workers in this beautiful Capitol, the men and women who literally make sure we have a functioning building, and the Capitol Police who protect us always knew that Team Scalise appreciated their efforts.

Later, as my member services director, he worked with so many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to make sure their needs were heard and taken care of.

When I became the majority leader and all my staff's roles and responsibilities

expanded, Bart took on the role of deputy chief of staff, a position that my chief has often reminded me has been instrumental to the success of our team and our House majority in the last Congress.

Bart has been a mentor to so many young Hill staffers, always taking time out of his incredibly busy schedule to meet with interns and staffers alike, providing invaluable guidance as they navigate their Hill careers.

To me and my wife, Jennifer, and our two children, he has been a dear friend. He is fiercely loyal, and I am deeply appreciative of all he has done for me and this institution. While Bart may be leaving the Hill, he is forever Team Scalise.

I wish Bart good luck in this next new adventure that he is now embarking upon. I know his parents, Craig and Susan, and his brother, Brett, are so proud of what he has accomplished. I thank him for the positive mark he has left on this great institution.

HONORING CHAMPION OF THE WEEK KHIRYE TYLER

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

Mrs. SYKES. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Khirye Tyler as Ohio's 13th Congressional District Champion of the Week.

Khirye is a music producer and recently worked on the production for Beyoncé's country album, "Cowboy Carter," which won Best Country Album at the 2025 Grammys.

Khirye's story is one of commitment and dedication, and he is a living testament to the saying: "It's not how you start but how you finish."

Khirye grew up in foster care where he was raised by pastors who often played piano for the church. It was during this time that he developed a passion for music. His work and passion helped "Cowboy Carter" debut at number one on the Billboard 200 album chart in April, and he is responsible for several credits, contributing to the writing, sound design, and production, as well as providing piano, percussion, and bass instrumentals.

As a card-carrying member of the BeyHive, I was thrilled to see somebody from Ohio's 13th Congressional District make an impact on an album that some have come to adore but, more importantly, put a stamp on music history. On Facebook on February 3, he posted:

A kid from Mansfield, Ohio, won two Grammys last night. Kind of wild to even say that. I am filled with gratitude. Album of the Year/Best Country Album. Thank you, God, for being God.

Congratulations again to Khirye on this fantastic accomplishment. We thank him for all that he does to inspire the next generation of music-makers. Creative visionaries like him are a shining example of what makes