

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that this is the position that galvanized the opposition to D.C.'s law. This provision is why Republicans want the Congress of the United States to behave like a 535-Member nationally elected super-city council with the power to overturn the work of the 13-member Council of the District of Columbia elected locally by the actual residents of Washington, D.C.

So what is so important about this provision? Well, the local police union doesn't like it, and they have been the chief lobbyists against it. They sued when this reform legislation was first passed in D.C., asserting that the provision removing police discipline from the collective bargaining table violated the U.S. Constitution, but they lost their case in the U.S. District Court for D.C. and the U.S. Court of Appeals for D.C., and the Supreme Court failed to grant cert.

Now, in their haste to kick around the people of Washington and not to support D.C. police officers who, after all, came to our defense on January 6, many of whom were wounded by the insurrectionists and ended up with broken fingers and arms and legs, and so on, our GOP colleagues are suddenly embracing the extreme position on police disciplinary matters which has already been rejected by the courts in which jurisdictions across America are debating and doing away with.

Now, why is the ending of discipline of police officers a subject for collective bargaining such a big deal? Well, Washington itself is a good example.

The D.C. Metropolitan Police Department has been forced by labor arbitrators to rehire a significant number of officers who had been fired for engaging in serious criminal misconduct, including criminal assault, including sexual assault.

Every D.C. police chief for at least the last 25 years have expressed outrage about having to hire bad cops after they have been fired for engaging in serious misconduct. Forcing police chiefs to reinstate bad cops fired for breaking the law is bad for public safety, bad for community trust, and bad for morale among the vast majority of good police officers who are doing their jobs, like the ones who came to defend us on January 6, 2021, against the violent mob insurrection incited by the former President.

This should not be a partisan point. This is a matter for local decision-making in Washington, D.C., as it is in every other jurisdiction in the country.

Mr. Speaker, 700,000 tax-paying American citizens have decided through their locally elected representatives that the chief of police who is appointed by the Mayor should be able to discipline bad actors within the police department. Reversing the D.C. government on this local matter is outrageous interference by Congress to impose a bad public policy on the Capital City.

The D.C. police accountability law makes reasonable, commonsense re-

forms that will make the D.C. police more accountable to the community of people they serve, increase public trust, and strengthen public safety.

In fact, multiple provisions constituting the D.C. police reform law are mainstream reforms that enjoy strong public support and are congruent with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which passed the House in the 117th Congress, and with police accountability laws enacted by dozens of States and localities in recent years in the wake of notorious episodes of brutality, like the unconscionable murder of George Floyd.

For example, since May of 2020, at least 24 States have enacted legislation to limit the use of dangerous neck restraints against citizens; 39 States have passed reforms related to officer education and training.

□ 1545

Twenty-six States have enacted laws to improve data collection and increase transparency. At least seven States, including Arizona, Colorado, and Wisconsin, have passed legislation requiring the publication of police databases or use-of-force information. Twenty States since 2020 have enacted laws that address State-level use-of-force standards.

This is a matter for States and localities to decide themselves. Reversing D.C. on this local matter is an outrageous effort to impose bad public policy on the people of D.C.

Voting to override the veto of this GOP resolution is yet another attack on local decisionmaking, federalism, and the policies of meaningful oversight and accountability that the majority of Americans want. A vote to override the veto today is a vote against political democracy and local self-government in America. A "yes" vote today is a vote against commonsense oversight and accountability over policing in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for democracy, stand up for political self-determination, and vote "no" on this attempt to override the President's veto.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I continue to support this bipartisan resolution as a majority of my colleagues in the House did 2 months ago. Not much has changed since we last passed this resolution of disapproval.

Since Congress sent this resolution to President Biden, we have continued to see rampant crime in the District of Columbia. D.C. residents and visitors are still unsafe in their Capital City.

The Metropolitan Police Department continues to face retention and recruitment challenges.

Crime levels are still higher in 2023 compared to the same time in 2022. Total crime is up 27 percent. Violent

crime is up 16 percent. Homicide is up 19 percent. Motor vehicle theft is up a staggering 118 percent. This is unacceptable.

Most notably, as of June 7, D.C. hit a concerning marker. There have been 100 murders in D.C. this year. According to the D.C. Police Union, this is the earliest point in the calendar year that the city has reached this marker since 2003.

However, in the Committee on Oversight and Accountability's March 29 hearing, D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson claimed that there is no crime crisis in D.C.

In another Oversight and Accountability Committee hearing on May 16, U.S. Attorney Matthew Graves refused to take accountability for his office's failure to prosecute 67 percent of cases last year.

The D.C. Council and the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia have failed the residents of D.C.

Congress has a duty to oversee the Nation's Capital and ensure its safety for all residents and visitors. It is time for this body to stand up to the criminals. I call on my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

The President's veto of H.J. Res. 42 serves no purpose other than to continue to allow crime to spread and hinder our local police from fulfilling their duties to protect the D.C. community and the Nation's Capital City.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to uphold what we and the Senate have done over the last 2 months by voting in favor of this resolution.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

GAS STOVE PROTECTION AND FREEDOM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1615.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 495 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1615.

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

□ 1552

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1615) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to ban gas stoves, with Mr. MCCORMICK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1615, the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act. I thank my friend and fellow Energy and Commerce Committee member, Representative KELLY ARMSTRONG, for his leadership and continued work on this initiative.

As I said in our full committee markup last month, the American people have had enough of Washington bureaucrats and Biden administration officials, or Big Brother, dictating every aspect of their lives, from the type of car you drive to what appliance you can use in the kitchen.

Back in January, we heard disturbing reports from one of the Commissioners at the Consumer Product Safety Commission that a nationwide, universal ban on gas stoves was on the table. This type of government overreach would be an assault on Americans' individual consumer freedoms to decide what works best for their own households and budgets.

Republicans stand with the American people, who overwhelmingly agree that banning gas stoves altogether is an egregious overreach and government-knows-best ideology at its worst.

The Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act will prohibit the CPSC from using Federal dollars to regulate or issue enforcement regulations on gas stoves as a banned product and prevent regulations that prohibit the sale or substantially increase the price of gas stoves while still allowing CPSC to protect consumers in the way that Congress envisioned.

Sadly, the Biden administration's Green New Deal agenda has fueled the

flames of radical left State and local governments, and many have already enacted their own complete gas stove bans, such as New York and some cities in California. In fact, many of these cities are facing their own battles, such as in Berkeley, California, the first city to enact a ban in 2019, where the law was recently struck down by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and in Palo Alto, California, where they enacted a ban but admitted to issuing an exemption for celebrity chef Jose Andreas, who argued traditional gas appliances were necessary to achieve their signature complex flavors. This carve-out from the far left is plain hypocrisy.

Meanwhile, down in my State of Florida, we just entered hurricane season, and households that are struggling after a natural disaster takes out their electricity would find it even harder to cook their food without gas stoves.

All of these reasons clearly demonstrate why this legislation is needed to prevent government overreach.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1615. Let's pass this commonsense, bipartisan legislation that supports American consumer choice and freedom for households to decide what works best for their own lives. It makes sense.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in strong opposition to H.R. 1615. This bill is an attempt to deliberately mislead the American people into thinking that they are at risk of losing their gas stoves.

Let me be emphatically clear. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is not banning gas stoves. The idea that anyone is coming into American homes to remove gas stoves is ridiculous. They are not banning gas stoves.

These facts have not stopped supporters of this bill from touting this false narrative to scare consumers and proposing legislation, like this bill, that will have detrimental impacts on our constituents' health and safety.

By limiting the tools that the CPSC can use to protect consumers, H.R. 1615 puts politics over people and consumer safety. It puts slogans over science-based policy decisionmaking.

The CPSC is an independent Federal agency with a long history of identifying and protecting children and adults from a wide range of products that are hazardous or that pose a risk of serious injury or death. The CPSC carries out its mission in numerous ways. It investigates safety allegations and recalls dangerous products to keep them off the market. It also works with industry to develop voluntary product safety standards. It issues and enforces standards for hazardous products so that it can ensure that these products are not dangerous for consumers.

In recent years, the CPSC has removed hazardous infant sleeping prod-

ucts. It has adapted corded window coverings to protect children from strangulation. It has worked with industry to reduce the risk of fires from hoverboards and scooters.

The CPSC's work saves life by protecting consumers—in many instances, children—from dangerous products, but H.R. 1615 will prevent the CPSC from doing its job.

Last December, the agency issued a recall of a gas stove product that was found to be a serious risk of injury or death from carbon monoxide poisoning. The agency was doing its job in recalling a dangerous product, but H.R. 1615 would prohibit the agency from using its rulemaking authority to ban such hazardous products, which could endanger the lives of any American who has that dangerous product in their home.

If you think about this, what you are basically saying is that this agency that protects our safety and health is just basically going to be emasculated and can't do its job. What possible help is that? Why would you do such a thing?

Each and every American benefits from the work done by the CPSC, and it would be unconscionable to weaken the Commission's authority.

This bill sets, in my opinion, a dangerous precedent, Mr. Chair, of stifling scientific investigation into health hazards and limiting the agency's authority to keep our children safe. Instead of taking actions to limit the agency's authority, we should encourage their work to explore allegations that consumer products put our children's health and safety at risk.

We should give the agency all the tools that they need, not eliminate the tools they currently have, to address health and safety risks as they arise.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1615. We must protect the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the authority to protect the health and safety of all Americans, but particularly our children.

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

□ 1600

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), our chairperson.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1615. The Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act is led by my friend Congressman KELLY ARMSTRONG from North Dakota. It has bipartisan support here in the House, and it is a companion to Senators CRUZ' and MANCHIN's bipartisan legislation in the Senate.

It will stop efforts by the Consumer Product Safety Commission that could result in an outright ban or substantial price increase in the cost of gas stoves while also allowing the Commission to

continue its important safety work for these appliances.

Commissioner Trumka suggested that the CPSC should consider a ban on gas stoves. He said, everything is on the table.

As FOX News reported last week, his efforts go back even further than previously reported and include the Biden administration coordinating last summer with an environmental activist on the legal rationale to ban stoves.

To justify a ban, Mr. Trumka has also cited a study by Rocky Mountain Institute, which has partnered with the Chinese Government and is pushing America away from reliable and affordable energy. We must stop this agenda and make sure people have access to affordable appliances like gas stoves.

We aren't alone in raising the alarm that this effort to ban stoves goes too far. In fact, in California, a celebrity chef was recently given an exemption by local Democrats so he wouldn't have to comply with Palo Alto's natural gas stove ban in his new restaurant.

Surely, we can all agree today to allow every hardworking person in this country, regardless of their income or celebrity status, to have the same freedom to decide for themselves what stove is in their kitchen.

Again, H.R. 1615 allows the CPSC to continue their important safety work, but it stops the administration from implementing a political agenda, completely divorced from reality, to ban an appliance that is preferred by 40 percent of American households.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman ARMSTRONG for his leadership, and I urge strong bipartisan support on H.R. 1615.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the ranking member of our Innovation, Data, and Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I say to Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congresswoman CATHY RODGERS that I consider them friends of mine, but I just don't quite understand the energy and hysteria about gas stoves.

No one is taking away your gas stove. I want to make that very clear. That is not the intention of this legislation.

I am the owner of a gas stove. I decided a long time ago that I really preferred gas stoves. I have a fairly new gas stove, but that doesn't mean that I don't want the very agency of government that I have worked with—and Congressman PALLONE talked about its successes—of saving people from hazards or reminding people or alerting people about hazards. That is all.

I own a new car. It is actually a Chevy Bolt. It is all electric, but like all the other cars that I have bought, I want to know about its safety history, all the things I could know. The other thing about a car, if something goes

wrong, I think there is going to be a recall, so I will have an opportunity to deal with this.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission wants to take a look at what may be a hazard and if there are threats to our children's health, to our families, if it could cause real problems. Why don't we want to know about those? I think this legislation takes away the opportunity for us to find out about what may, in fact, be a hazard. It may require some changes in gas stoves and the way they are manufactured. Why wouldn't we want to know that rather than subject our families, our children, our communities to something that could harm them?

This prevents information. I say to my colleagues across the aisle: Get your head out of the gas stove and let's let the facts be told so that we can make decisions as smart adults to decide whether or not we want to buy them and whether or not we need to see some changes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1615, the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act, would prohibit funding to the Consumer Product Safety Commission for only two purposes: first, to regulate gas stoves as a banned hazardous product; and second, to impose any consumer product safety standard on gas stoves that would result in a prohibition on the use or sale of the appliances, or otherwise substantially increase the average price.

Simply put, this bill prevents the Commission from banning the entire product category of gas stoves. This bill does not prevent the Commission from its statutory mission to address specific models of gas stoves or any other product that may pose an actual safety hazard.

We are debating this bill because Commissioner Richard Trumka has made repeated statements that the Commission would consider substantial regulatory actions on gas stoves categorically.

His comments include a December 2022 statement advocating for a ban on gas stoves. The chair of the Commission has walked back Commissioner Trumka's impulsive statements by declaring: ". . . I am not looking to ban gas stoves. . . ."

However, despite the chairman's cleanup statement, the Commission has since issued a March 1 request for information that included repeated mentions of toxic emissions and chronic hazards regarding gas stoves.

We all agree that consumer product safety is important. Yet, it is apparent that the underlying motivation behind this veiled consumer safety plan is a green climate agenda with the goal to further restrict natural gas.

Mr. Chairman, 20 congressional Democrats sent a letter to the Com-

mission in December 2022 that first mentioned the equivalent climate impact of regulating gas stoves before addressing the merits of any health concerns.

Let's discuss the alleged health concerns. First, multiple studies claiming that gas stoves create harmful indoor emission levels have been criticized for inaccurate conclusions and testing that failed to simulate real-world conditions.

Some of those studies measured indoor emissions in an area enclosed in a plastic tarp without any ventilation.

There are no studies establishing a causal relationship between cooking with gas stoves and asthma. Studies of actual homes under real-life conditions found that nitrogen dioxide levels were below the standard the EPA considers harmful to health.

Further, other cooking-related and non-cooking-related emissions factors have a meaningful effect on indoor emissions.

These are factors such as the chemical makeup of food and oils, cooking temperature, cooking methods, food surface-to-mass index, the use of exhaust and ventilation, and burning of tobacco, candles, and incense.

Again, all of this is secondary because we know the motivation of the CPSC, and throughout the entire administration, is a green climate push.

The goal is to dictate how you live every aspect of your life; how you save and invest for the future by pushing ESG; how you drive by banning gas-powered cars. Now the goal is to control how you cook and, literally, breathe inside your home.

I am confident in stating that the vast majority of North Dakotans don't want the Federal Government telling them how to live their life, particularly in their own home.

To my Democratic colleagues: If you agree with the chair of the Commission and don't want to ban gas stoves for over 187 million Americans, vote for the bill.

If you agree with Commissioner Trumka that the Federal Government should take away every gas stove in the country, oppose the bill.

Yet, before you oppose the bill, make sure you have a good answer for why your constituents can't cook the way they want, and be prepared to defend it.

I urge everyone to vote in favor of H.R. 1615 so we at least can end the Commission's misguided foray into the kitchens of every American.

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

I listened to my colleague from North Dakota, who I respect a great deal, but he specifically said, and I wrote it down, that this legislation would prohibit the Consumer Product Safety Commission from regulating gas stoves as a hazardous product.

Now, you listened to my colleague from Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, who said that from a practical point of view, how does that make sense?

This is the agency that is charged with basically looking at these products to see if they are hazardous, if they are unsafe for kids, if they are going to cause serious injury or death.

Now, one person, one commissioner has made some statements suggesting that he might be interested in banning gas stoves. I don't know all the details, but I understand that there is one commissioner that keeps being quoted.

First of all, this Commission has five members. There is one vacancy. Because one commissioner says that and doesn't have the power to effectuate it because he is only one person, you are then going to tell me that we should now take this sort of hatchet approach or severe approach of saying, well, then, because one commissioner thinks that, therefore, we should say that this commission cannot regulate gas stoves as a hazardous product?

Frankly, that is like cutting off your leg because you decide that there is some threat or something. It makes no sense to me.

We have the chairman of the Commission who actually used to work for the Energy and Commerce Committee; Chairman Hoehn-Saric.

He has been crystal clear and has stated publicly that the Consumer Product Safety Commission is not conducting a rulemaking to ban gas stoves.

Now, I use the analogy as a Member of Congress. I am one out of what, 435? I don't have the authority to say that because I want something done that that is what is going to happen—or even if there were 10 or 20 of us that said that; right?

As a single Member of Congress, I don't have the unilateral authority to decide what action the House of Representatives is going to take.

By the same token, one single member of the CPSC does not get to decide what action that body will take, and suggesting otherwise is just not accurate.

Even if he said that—and I believe he said that he might want to ban them—why would you then say, now we are going to put a pox on the whole Commission and say that they don't have the authority to look at hazards and tell me whether or not certain stoves would be dangerous?

I just think it is really contrary to protection of people's health and safety to take this kind of action just because one member of the Commission suggested it, but that is what you do.

Again, I would urge that we be practical about this, and let's not just take a hatchet to this Commission and this agency that over the years has protected us in so many ways from faulty products.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), my good friend.

□ 1615

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615.

Mr. Chair, I will include in the RECORD an article entitled "California city gives celebrity chef Jose Andres an exemption for his restaurant to use gas stoves."

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, of course they did. Let's look at how this happened.

It was reported that while the progressive city of Palo Alto, California, has a natural gas ban for all new buildings and renovations, a policy that Democrats are trying to enact all over the country, we find that the ban actually doesn't apply to everybody.

Mr. Andres' lawyers, in front of the city council, argued that he could not possibly cook with the efficiency and precision he desires if forced to use electric stoves. The city council agreed and gave him a one-off, only-for-him exemption to the rule, not for small, family-owned restaurants or working-class residents. No one else, just him.

Now, for those of you who aren't familiar with Mr. Andres, he is a wealthy, well-connected celebrity chef, very popular here inside the Washington Beltway, not only for great restaurants, but also for his leftwing activism for the border, climate change, and other liberal causes. I think you all get the picture here.

To be fair, I actually totally agree with Mr. Andres. It is true that gas stoves are not only more efficient but also perform in a way that many Americans and restaurant owners prefer.

All that we ask, and what this legislation before us would do, is give the American people that same economic freedom and choice, the choice to use appliances that they actually want and can afford.

If we don't act, if we don't pass legislation like this, the Biden administration will continue on its path to take this onerous policy prescription nationwide.

To add insult to injury, this celebrity chef and his wealthy, powerful, national Democratic friends, who aren't giving up their gas stoves, their fossil-fuel-fired stoves, are the same exact people lecturing my constituents about climate change.

They say that it is Appalachian Ohioans and working-class families all over the country who need to give up their cars, their stoves, and their furnaces to avert the climate crisis. This is madness. It is hypocrisy.

Mr. Chair, any American, regardless of whether or not they are a wealthy, politically connected coastal elites, should be able to cook on a gas stove if they choose to.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

I don't know about these celebrity stoves and Hollywood. You can bring up all of this if you want, but the bottom line is, this legislation doesn't guarantee that anybody gets to use their gas stove.

If a town in California or a State wants to prohibit it, they are still free

to do so. Let's not give the impression that somehow this legislation is going to prohibit towns or States or any kind of municipality from prohibiting gas stoves if they want to do so.

What this legislation says is that an agency that is basically told by Congress to protect us from hazardous utilities, hazardous equipment, and hazardous activity is going to be hamstrung so they can't protect us. That is all you are doing here.

Let's be honest. You are not doing anything else. I think it is outrageous to say that if this agency finds out that there is something that is going to kill kids or cause them to be poisoned, that they can't do their job.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a very effective member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. Chair, at a time when rolling blackouts have become more common and as it has become clear that green energy tools, like wind turbines and solar panels, cannot meet our energy needs, the Biden administration has taken yet another step to limit the ability of Americans to use natural gas in their homes.

The weaponization of government against our energy industry only serves to make our energy future less secure.

This legislation is about ensuring that American families have access to the products and the energy resources that they need and that they want.

Currently, natural gas stoves are the preferred cooktop appliance of nearly 40 percent of American homes. We know that natural gas is safe, it is reliable, it is affordable energy, and it is a source for millions of Americans.

The Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act is a step toward getting the Federal regulations out of homes and out of businesses. Any attempt to say that the Biden administration's actions are based in public safety is not supported by the data that we have at hand.

According to the National Fire Protection Association, electric ranges were 2½ times more likely to cause a home fire than gas stoves. Let me repeat that. Electric ranges were 2½ times more likely to cause a fire than gas stoves.

We know that gas stoves are safe, and we cannot allow the Biden administration to strip away consumer choice simply to fulfill its green energy agenda.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1615.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1615, the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act. This bipartisan legislation is pragmatic policymaking, one that safeguards the availability, use, and affordability of gas stoves.

By placing restrictions on the actions of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, an important Federal regulatory agency, this act will help preserve access to traditional gas stoves for all Americans.

Why is this important? Because the government should not be in the habit of restricting consumer choice or access to appliances that are integral to our everyday lives.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will stand here and say till they are blue in the face that they don't want to ban gas stoves and that it is ridiculous that anyone would dare claim that it is happening. The fact is, they are already doing it.

In New York State, most new construction starting in 2026 will ban gas stoves. That was put in the State budget just 2 months ago. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, nearly 62 percent of households in New York State have a natural gas cooking appliance. A potential efficiency standard can be financially detrimental to millions of New Yorkers.

If you look at the sign, it is talking about 23 hours more that Americans will have to use per year boiling water under this potential regulation. Guess what? Seventy percent of electricity is generated by natural gas. You will be using more natural gas, not less. Over the past two decades, natural gas has reduced carbon emissions 60 percent more than renewables.

In California, they tried the same thing and had it summarily thrown out of court due to the absolute absurdity of this effort.

We can and should build a diverse energy grid. We agree with that. It has got to be based on science and facts, not pie-in-the-sky ideas. We simply cannot outright ban sources of energy and appliances that millions of Americans rely on.

In short, the Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act is prudent legislation, one that values consumer choice and maintains the availability of essential household appliances.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this significant and sensible bipartisan effort.

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

The gentleman keeps saying that this administration is banning gas stoves. That is simply not the case. Plus, he is talking about efficiency standards. This legislation is not about efficiency standards. This legislation is about saying that the Consumer Product Safety Commission cannot research and make decisions about hazards and whether a particular gas stove is hazardous to people's health or might explode. It is not about efficiency standards.

Certainly we are not talking about saying that you have to move toward an electric stove as opposed to a gas stove. It just bothers me, Mr. Chair, that the other side continues to talk about banning gas stoves, about moving toward electric stoves, about efficiency standards. This is not what this bill is about. This is not what the Consumer Product Safety Commission is about.

Mr. Chair, again, I would urge opposition because the gentleman is not talking about this legislation.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), a good friend of mine and a very effective member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding. Mr. Chair, it is almost hard to believe that we are actually having to have this discussion. At a time when Americans are struggling to afford groceries, the Biden administration is trying to implement new rules to dictate what you have in your house, what kind of appliances you have in your home.

As my friend from New York just stood up and said that this is not just a Texas issue. This is not localized to one part of our country. This spans the entire country.

We have seen the EPA overreach in every single aspect of energy, every single aspect, whether it is with endangered species, the threat of nonattainment in the Permian Basin, where I represent, they are overreaching.

Their de facto ban on gas stoves would eliminate more than half of the gas cooktops on the market today while forcing 187 million Americans who use affordable, reliable natural gas to switch to expensive, less desirable alternatives.

If this administration was serious about limiting pollution and protecting our climate, they would unleash the energy that we produce in my district in the Permian Basin, they would put Midland over Moscow, and they would make it easier to produce clean energy, 40 percent cleaner natural gas in the U.S. compared to Russia. In fact, homes with natural gas appliances emit 22 percent less CO₂ than all-electric homes.

House Republicans are not just standing by idly. We are going to do something. We are doing something. We are going to prevent this overreach from happening.

Mr. President, unleash American energy. Don't make it harder to produce natural gas here. Don't limit the types of stoves and appliances we have in our homes. Quit overreaching.

Mr. Chair, allow Americans the freedoms that our Constitution protects and pass this bill. Our bill will prevent the administration from banning gas stoves or cooktops or imposing any standards that make gas stoves unaffordable.

I appreciate the leadership throughout this House from the Speaker and everyone else to bring this bill to bear. I urge a "yes" vote.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Again, I have to speak out against the misinformation that is being promulgated on the other side. It is simply wrong to argue, as the previous speaker did, that genuine concerns about the health effects of gas stove emissions are in any way tied to President Biden's clean energy agenda.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission is an independent Federal agency that is tasked solely with protecting consumers, and especially children, from consumer products that pose an unreasonable risk of injury or death.

The work of the Consumer Product Safety Commission has nothing to do with the Biden administration's clean energy policies, whether you agree with his policies or not, and we shouldn't let Republicans' fear of protecting our environment baselessly restrict CPSC's tools to protect America's children and their families' health and safety.

I could just read the bill that Mr. ARMSTRONG, the gentleman from North Dakota, said before, this bill says that the Commission cannot regulate gas stoves as a hazardous product or to impose or enforce any consumer product safety net standard on gas stoves. It has nothing to do with the environment. It is all about safety, so why do you talk about these other things?

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a great American hero and my fellow Floridian.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for yielding me the time. I am not going to need 2 minutes. You can calculate for that right now.

I am just going give a quick warning. With this administration, it is always an example of getting the camel's nose under the tent.

We are dealing with gas stoves today, and here is my prediction today: Give it a couple months, and they are going to be coming after everybody's backyard grills. They are going to be coming after your Fourth of July. They are going to be coming after you saying: Well, this is what it does if you go out there and you put burgers and dogs on your gas grill in your backyard on Memorial Day and Labor Day and Fourth of July. That is my prediction today.

Mr. Chair, that is really all the time I needed to say that this is how this administration is constantly working against the American people, and I expect this to be no different.

□ 1630

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

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

Mr. Chair, I think that the Democratic Party has an agenda—I really do—and it is the Green New Deal. That is what this is all about. I know how many people love their gas stoves. They love their gas stoves. They switched from an electric stove to a gas stove for a reason.

As a matter of fact, we have a gas stove and have had it for years. My family is very pleased. It is true that the food tastes better, particularly the Greek food tastes a lot better, with a gas stove.

Mr. Chair, I am very much in support of this bill, and I know we are going to get bipartisan support.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, is the gentleman closing or prepared to close? I have no additional speakers at this time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I have one more speaker.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, the minority's views and committee report state that this bill restricts the Commission from protecting consumers and performing its traditional functions, such as safety research, working with industry to develop standards, and recalling unsafe products. None of those claims are true.

The bill does not prevent the Commission from engaging in any of those functions. The bill simply prohibits the Commission from banning gas stoves as an entire product category by imposing a direct ban as a hazardous product or imposing safety standards in a manner that would substantially increase the price of gas stoves.

Nothing in the bill prohibits the Commission from conducting research on gas stoves. Nothing in the bill prohibits the Commission from developing voluntary safety standards with the industry. Nothing in the bill prohibits the Commission from seeking to have a product declared an imminently hazardous consumer product, which allows the Commission to seek a public notice, recall, repair, replacement, or refund for consumers.

This bill is about ensuring Americans have continued access to the entire product category of gas stoves. It does not in any way limit the Commission's ability to address a defective or dangerous model. Any attempt to suggest otherwise is inaccurate.

Mr. Chair, I think that is the important part of what we are talking about here. The Commission can still do its function, but it has to stay in its lane.

We have plenty of different agencies in the Biden administration that want to push their Green New Deal agenda on Americans—EPA, Department of Energy, Department of Defense, FTC, the list goes on and on.

Can we at least let the Consumer Product Safety Commission stay with-

in their lane, do their mission, deal with faulty products, deal with recalls, make sure that the product is safe, not push for an agenda that would take something away that millions and millions of Americans use every day for breakfast, lunch, and dinner?

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

Mr. Chair, I have to very much disagree with what the sponsor, Mr. ARMSTRONG, just said. I read section 3 to say that the Consumer Product Safety Commission would not be able to "impose or enforce any consumer product safety standard or rule on gas stoves under [such sections] that would otherwise result in a prohibition on the use or sale of gas stoves."

Mr. Chair, he could argue that that doesn't say that they can't adopt a safety standard, but the way this is written, it is quite clear that if they adopt a safety standard that has any possibility of leading to a ban of some type of gas stove, they wouldn't be allowed to do it.

The majority is really putting a straitjacket on the Commission by saying that if it does research or any kind of rulemaking or standard that says that this is hazardous, because that could ultimately lead to a particular type of gas stove being banned, then the Commission is not allowed to do it.

I understand what he is saying, but I disagree. I think the way this rule reads, if I were the Chair of the Commission, I would read this to say that I can't do research, can't adopt the standard, and can't adopt anything that would impose a safety standard because if I do that, then it might lead somehow to the banning of gas stoves.

Mr. Chair, he is kind of being a little cute and loose with this by suggesting that this just says they can't outright ban stoves. It says they can't adopt a safety standard.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG brings forward a really important bill that follows with a number of other pieces of legislation you are seeing on the floor. Tomorrow, you will see Mrs. LESKO's bill dealing with the same issue, the same idea that the Federal Government wants to ban gas stoves.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans are looking all across the country and saying that inflation is still skyrocketing for families and that energy costs are skyrocketing for families. You are paying 50 percent more at the pump when you fill up your car.

By the way, they want to ban the combustion engine, not through a congressional act, but through unelected bureaucrat regulations to get rid of

gasoline-powered cars. It is all part of this government control agenda that we are seeing from this administration.

It seems like in every single department of the Biden administration—the CFPB here, the Department of Energy over there, and EPA in another place—they are trying to tell people what they can and can't do with their lives—what kind of stove you can use in your house, for goodness' sake.

First of all, just look at the premise of what they are trying to do—to ban the gas stove, which means you have to then use an electric stove. Maybe a coal stove they would support, I don't know.

If you are choosing between a gas stove and an electric stove, we already know the gas stove is cheaper. They are targeting lower income families and raising the costs on lower income families. They are taking money out of the pockets of families who can least afford it.

Look at the energy side of this. I know this administration, more than any I have ever seen, has issued an all-out assault on American energy, not all energy. President Biden didn't cancel every pipeline. He canceled the Keystone pipeline and American pipelines. He green-lighted Russia's pipeline.

He didn't cancel all fossil fuels around the world. He said he just wants to make it harder to produce fossil fuels in the United States of America. Then, he went and begged Putin to produce more oil. He begged Saudi Arabia to produce more oil, and Venezuela. It just seems like, over and over again, it is American energy that they go after.

If you get rid of the gas stove, you are not getting rid of natural gas. Most places, a lot of places, get their electric from natural gas. You are going to ban the gas stove, and then you are going to take your electric stove—you don't plug it into a tree. You plug it into a socket that is probably fueled by natural gas, but they are probably going to try to ban that, too.

Who are the people that come up with these ideas when sitting around in a room? They are not trying to figure out how to lower inflation, not trying to figure out how to get spending under control, not trying to figure out how to secure America's border. They are trying to figure out how to take choices away from Americans, whether or not you can even buy a gas stove.

Mr. Chair, they are trying to take away the Second Amendment rights of disabled veterans on a bill we will be voting on later tonight on pistol braces. It is something that was designed for military veterans who risked their lives for our country and got so injured that their arms weren't able to use and hold a weapon like most people do. They came up with these braces to help them exercise their Second Amendment constitutional right. They want to get rid of that, too, and retroactively make felons out of millions of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this government control is out of control. It is about time we push back. You are seeing this whole week we are bringing bills, as we have in the past, to finally start standing up for those hardworking families who are struggling and are sick and tired of attacks on their freedom and their opportunities by this Federal Government.

Today it is gas stoves. A couple of weeks ago, EPA started coming up with rules that they haven't even finalized yet to try to ban the combustion engine. They want to do these things that are major changes that will affect people's lives adversely.

I used to watch how a bill becomes law. I think most Americans watched that, too. I hope they still teach civics in school instead of hatred of America, which they seem to want to do all the time. It used to be that if you wanted to change the way something works, you file a bill and go talk to your Member of Congress. You file a bill and go to committee and explain your idea. If it is a really dumb, nutty idea, it gets voted down.

I guess they got voted down so many times that they decided: Why go run for Congress? They just got into the unelected bureaucracy where they can come up with these ideas and where there is no accountability, which, by the way, is why we are bringing the REINS Act later this week, a bill that says any kind of change from an unelected bureaucrat that affects your life—these hardworking families who are sick and tired of waking up and saying: What did the government do to me today, and how am I going to now live my life and have my freedoms when they are trying to take them away at every different angle?

The REINS Act says that if an unelected bureaucrat does that, they have to come before Congress first.

The elected people who are held accountable every 2 years were on the ballot. If it is a really good idea, present it in public view on C-SPAN.

Can anybody tell me who the person is that came up with this rule that is going to affect every American's life? No one can name who they are. Why don't you make them come? If it is a great idea, they should be proud to present it in open view like this forum is right here. They can tell everybody what it is about. If we vote it up, it becomes law. If we vote it down, the dumb idea dies.

That is not how it works, which is why we need things like the REINS Act. This unelected bureaucracy, these Big Government socialists that want to control every aspect of your life, we are sick and tired of it.

We need to pass this bill. We need to pass the pistol brace bill. Tomorrow, we need to pass Mrs. LESKO's bill. We need to pass the REINS Act and the Chevron deference bill. That is just this week.

Every single week, we are seeing this administration go after the rights of

hardworking people, and they are sick and tired of it. I am glad this Republican majority is standing up for those families who are struggling and tired, too.

Mr. Chair, let's get this done. Let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. Chair, I keep listening to the speakers on the other side. First of all, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has not come up with any rule. Not only have they said they are not going to ban gas stoves, but this bill doesn't address any rule that they have come up with in regard to gas stoves. It simply says that they cannot regulate gas stoves by looking at potential hazards that might kill people or hurt children.

When I, as a consumer, go to the store and buy something—most people think that if they buy a gas stove, somebody locally or at the State level or in Washington has looked at that thing to see whether it is hazardous and is going to blow up and explode in my face.

What the Republicans are saying is: No, you can't do that. You can't look at this to see whether it is safe, whether it is going to explode, or whether it is going to be hazardous to my kids. You can't do that.

You are basically getting rid of what people expect. People expect, in my opinion—at least my constituents expect—that when they go buy something that could potentially be hazardous, someone has reviewed it to see if it is hazardous so it doesn't explode in their face and blow up their house.

What I am hearing from my constituents when I went home this weekend is that they are sick and tired of the Republicans coming to the House floor with misinformation and misleading ideas. They would like us to do something to help them, whatever the issue is, to actually do something that is meaningful to them.

□ 1645

This bill is nothing more than some kind of scare tactic by House Republicans to mislead the American public.

Lastly, Republicans were unable to muster enough votes to move forward and debate this bill. It is no surprise because the bill is terrible. At the time, a handful of my Republican colleagues acknowledged that this bill is just a messaging bill, and it has no chance of becoming law.

One Member of this body went so far as to say on the Republican side: Is it really a loss that we aren't passing anything? Haven't we had enough bills like this one that puts politics over policy and scare tactics over substance?

This body should be focused on passing meaningful legislation that works to protect the health and safety of children, their families, and consumers, and not undermining the work of an expert agency like the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Don't keep coming to the floor and saying that this is about clean energy, or this is about grills or something else. It is strictly about saying that this agency, which has the job to protect people from hazardous substances, cannot do that in the case of gas stoves.

I think it is pretty outrageous that my friends are saying that there isn't going to be a Federal agency that can do that because I know that when I go to the store and when my residents and my constituents go to the store, they would like to think that somebody is looking at this stuff to see whether it is going to explode in their face, and the other side is saying: No, that is not something that they can do.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1615 and in support of our gas stoves.

Across southern Michigan, people—including chefs in my district and, most importantly, my wife—are bewildered by the attacks on gas stoves, and many can't wrap their heads around it.

Here is the deal: a climate group with deep ties to the CCP published a questionable study on gas stoves. President Biden's climate czar and Energy Secretary have met with this group, and despite the group's deep ties to the CCP, American taxpayer dollars continue to be funneled to them.

Shortly after publication of the study, a Consumer Product Safety Commission member said that a gas stove ban was "on the table."

Let's be clear. The House is not going to stand by while the administration continues to restrict the freedoms of Americans, undermine energy security, and make life even more costly for families.

About 40 percent of Americans are utilizing gas stoves, and we are not going to restrict our own freedom because a group connected to the CCP would like us to.

Natural gas is safe, it is reliable, and it is affordable for millions of Americans. Natural gas makes America strong, resilient, provides stability, and has been the key factor in cleaning up our environment unlike other nations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to support our freedom, energy security, and a prosperous future.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I will say that there were a lot of things said that are really misinformation. No one is going to lose their gas stoves. This is not a plot to take that away.

I certainly encourage everyone to vote against this so that we can protect our children, we can have the Consumer Product Safety Commission alert us to problems that may occur, and to keep all of us safer. That is the point of this bill.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman said, 40 percent of Americans use gas stoves. They are very comfortable with their stoves. Let's not take it away from them.

The other side says that we are not going to ban gas stoves. Let's put the American people at ease.

Now we have seniors who are on limited incomes, and they love their gas stoves.

How are they going to replace them? Where are they going to get the money to replace these stoves?

Now, again, if we are not going to ban gas stoves, then let's put it in writing. Let's record the votes today. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, we are going to get bipartisan support for this particular bill.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1615

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 "Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

(2) GAS STOVE.—The term "gas stove" means any gas range, gas stove, or household cooking gas appliance that meets the standard set forth in American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Z21.1/ CSA Z21.1 or any successor standard.

(3) SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE AVERAGE PRICE OF GAS STOVES.—The term "substantially increase the average price of gas stoves" means that the average price of a gas stove, annualized over its expected life, would likely be substantially higher than the average spending by United States homeowners on cooking stoves and ovens based on the most recent data for consumer expenditures reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON CPSC BANNING GAS STOVES.

No Federal funds may be used by the Commission to regulate a gas stove as a banned hazardous product under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2057) or to impose or enforce any consumer product safety standard or rule on gas stoves under section 7 or 9 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 or 2058) that would otherwise result in a prohibition on the use or sale of gas stoves in the United States or would otherwise substantially increase the average price of gas stoves in the United States.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 118–108. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 20, insert after "United States" the following: ", would otherwise result in the unavailability in the United States of a type (or class) of product based on the type of fuel the product consumes,".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 495, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment which will prohibit the administration from unilaterally implementing extremely costly regulations that would result in the unavailability in the United States of a type or class of product based on the type of fuel the product consumes.

My amendment ensures that the Consumer Product Safety Commission focuses on actual hazards with design rather than targeting fuel sources.

We have a crisis at our southern border. Americans are worried about being able to provide for their families and not pay \$10 for a bag of grapes. Meanwhile, the Biden administration is focused on controlling the kind of stove Americans use in their homes.

Mr. Chair, 100 percent of the currently available freestanding gas stoves and 96 percent of gas cooktops will not meet the new standards proposed by the Biden administration's Department of Energy.

The Department of Energy estimates savings would average \$1.50 per year.

Mr. Chairman, do you know how much a gas stove that is compliant under this proposed rule would cost on average?

Installation costs are anywhere between \$3,600 on the high end to \$2,000 on the low end. Adding that to the cost of the stove puts you out another \$3,000 to \$4,000, at least. Saying it will save consumers money is a flat-out lie. Forcing people to switch to expensive alternatives will only further increase costs for hardworking families in my district and across America.

This reminds me a lot of when Mayor Pete said that if you can't afford the price of gas due to the administration's

anti-American energy policies, then Americans should just shell out \$40,000 to \$55,000 for a new electric vehicle.

This administration has proven to be completely out of touch.

Never mind the fact that Biden has also targeted dishwashers, refrigerators, water heaters, furnaces, and air conditioners. On top of families paying more for everyday costs due to Bidenflation, it is clear this administration has prioritized pandering to Green New Deal extremists rather than saving American families' hard-earned money.

I do thank my colleague, Representative KELLY Armstrong, for his leadership to ensure the CPSC cannot abuse Federal funds to regulate gas stoves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment and will make the bill stronger by preventing product regulation based on the type of fuel it uses. I appreciate Mrs. BOEBERT for offering this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment would expand the prohibition of using Federal dollars, Federal funds, to include any action—I want to repeat that, any action that would limit the ability of gas stoves based on the kind of fuel that it uses.

So if this amendment were to be adopted, it would absolutely endanger our children and all consumers.

For example, the negative health effects of lead are very well-known, particularly how lead might affect children. That is why we were able to phase lead out of gasoline in our cars, but this could open up the gate for manufacturers to actually use leaded gas to power a gas stove.

This amendment would then prohibit and prevent the Consumer Product Safety Commission—which is made to protect us and warn us—from giving us any kind of warning and stop the use of lead in a gas stove, and that would make no sense at all.

It is dangerous to block the Consumer Product Safety Commission from protecting American children from such hazards as lead. That is just one example. We simply cannot let these unfounded Republican attacks on the CPSC to disable us from having ourselves protected and from making sure that our children are going to be safe from hazards that are legitimately going to be warned.

So I absolutely urge this amendment to fail. It goes even far beyond the ridiculousness of the suggestion that as

a result of the underlying bill we would come to homes and take away their gas stoves.

This would create a hazard. This would create a hazard, and this amendment should not be adopted.

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, what makes no sense is the speech that we just heard regarding this amendment. There is so much of that that I cannot even fathom to put together.

I am hearing a lot about hazards from gas stoves that would cause harm for our children. I have four children. We have always had a gas stove, and they are doing pretty well.

I can see that the gentlewoman from Illinois has made it pretty long in her lifetime with the so-called dangers of gas products here in America.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what really is hazardous. What really is dangerous is the Green New Deal extremism that comes from the left because they want to suppress our good, clean energy right here in the United States of America that is cheap, that is reliable, and it is actually something that is affordable for Americans right now, unlike everything else because of the inflation that we are seeing from this administration.

What is hazardous and what is really dangerous are the tens of thousands of children who are mining for cobalt in Chinese-owned mines in the Congo with their bare hands. That is what is dangerous, and that is what this Green New Deal extremist policy encourages and pushes.

I have voted on so many bills for the Uighurs that are suppressed by the Chinese, but we never talk about the slave labor that takes place to produce the energy that the other side is trying to force on Americans with their overreach of government policy. That is what is dangerous.

□ 1700

An open border with fentanyl pouring over, that is dangerous. Families not being able to afford to feed their family, that is dangerous.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of this bill that makes so much more sense than the speech that we just heard from the other side of the aisle.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I don't know how the gentlewoman got to children in mines from an amendment that says that any kind of addition to manufacturing a gas stove, including lead, which the gentlewoman did not respond to, would be a danger.

I oppose this amendment. I think it is very harmful. It has nothing to do with many of the scenarios that were just illuminated or not, and I think that it is very important that we vote down this very dangerous amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MAST). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCORMICK) having assumed the chair, Mr. MAST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1615) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to ban gas stoves, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.J. Res. 44; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 42, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES RELATING TO "FACTORIZING CRITERIA FOR FIREARMS WITH ATTACHED 'STABILIZING BRACES'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives relating to "Factoring Criteria for Firearms with Attached 'Stabilizing Braces'", 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 210, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Garcia, Mike	Mills
Alford	Gimenez	Molinaro
Allen	Golden (ME)	Moolenaar
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)
Babin	Gosar	Moran
Bacon	Granger	Murphy
Baird	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Banks	Green (TN)	Norman
Barr	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bean (FL)	Griffith	Oberholte
Bentz	Grothman	Ogles
Bergman	Guest	Owens
Bice	Guthrie	Palmer
Biggs	Hageman	Peltola
Billirakis	Harris	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Perry
Boebert	Hern	Pfleger
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Brecheen	Hill	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Huizenga	Rose
Burgess	Hunt	Rosendale
Burlison	Issa	Rouzer
Calvert	Jackson (TX)	Roy
Cammack	James	Rutherford
Carey	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Carl	Johnson (OH)	Santos
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Ciscomani	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Clyde	Kiggans (VA)	Kiley
Cole	Kim (CA)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kustoff	Smith (NE)
Comer	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Crane	LaLota	Smucker
Crawford	LaMalfa	Spartz
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Staubert
Curtis	Langworthy	Steel
Davidson	Latta	Stefanik
De La Cruz	LaTurner	Steil
DesJarlais	Lawler	Steube
Diaz-Balart	Lee (FL)	Stewart
Donalds	Lesko	Strong
Duarte	Letlow	Tenney
Duncan	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Dunn (FL)	Lucas	Tiffany
Edwards	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Ellzey	Luna	Valadao
Emmer	Luttrell	Van Drew
Estes	Mace	Van Dwyne
Ezell	Malliotakis	Van Orden
Fallon	Mann	Wagner
Feenstra	Mann	Walberg
Ferguson	Massie	Waltz
Fischbach	Mast	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Wenstrup
Flood	McClain	Westerman
Foxx	McClintock	Williams (NY)
Franklin, C.	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Scott	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Fry	Meuser	Wittman
Fulcher	Miller (IL)	Womack
Gaetz	Miller (OH)	Yakym
Gallagher	Miller (WV)	Zinke
Garbarino	Miller-Meeks	

NAYS—210

Adams	Carbajal	Courtney
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Craig
Allred	Carson	Crockett
Auchincloss	Carter (LA)	Crow
Balint	Cartwright	Cuellar
Barragán	Casar	Dauids (KS)
Beatty	Case	Davis (IL)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis (NC)
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Dean (PA)
Bishop (GA)	Cherfilus-	DeGette
Blumenauer	McCormick	DeLauro
Blunt Rochester	Chu	DelBene
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Deluzio
Bowman	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Boyle (PA)	Cleaver	Dingell
Brown	Clyburn	Doggett
Brownley	Cohen	Escobar
Budzinski	Connolly	Eshoo
Bush	Correa	Españillat
Caraveo	Costa	Evans