

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1 Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

2 RPTS TARDIEU

3 HIF136030

4

5

6 MARKUP OF:

7 H.R. 1042, "Prohibiting Russian Uranium Imports Act"

8 H.R. 1640, "Save Our Gas Stoves Act"

9 H.R. 3277, "Energy Emergency Leadership Act"

10 TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2023

11 House of Representatives,

12 Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security

13 Committee on Energy and Commerce,

14 Washington, D.C.

15

16

17

18 The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m.,
19 in Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Jeff Duncan
20 [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

21 Present: Representatives Duncan, Burgess, Latta,

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

22 Guthrie, Griffith, Johnson, Bucshon, Walberg, Palmer, Curtis,
23 Lesko, Pence, Armstrong, Weber, Balderson, Pfluger, Rodgers
24 (ex officio); DeGette, Peters, Fletcher, Matsui, Tonko,
25 Veasey, Kuster, Schrier, Castor, Sarbanes, Cardenas, Blunt
26 Rochester, and Pallone (ex officio).

27 Staff Present: Kate Arey, Digital Director; Jolie
28 Brochin, Clerk, Health; Sarah Burke, Deputy Staff Director;
29 Marjorie Connell, Director of Archives; Lauren Eriksen,
30 Clerk, O&I; Sydney Greene, Director of Operations; Jack
31 Heretik, Press Secretary; Jessica Herron, Clerk, IDC; Nate
32 Hodson, Staff Director; Tara Hupman, Chief Counsel; Noah
33 Jackson, Clerk, C&T; Sean Kelly, Press Secretary; Peter
34 Kielty, General Counsel; Emily King, Member Services
35 Director; Elise Krekorian, Professional Staff Member, Energy;
36 Mary Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment; Jacob
37 McCurdy, Professional Staff Member, Energy; Brandon Mooney,
38 Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy; Kaitlyn Peterson, Clerk,
39 Energy & Environment; Karli Plucker, Director of Operations;
40 Emma Schultheis, Staff Assistant; Peter Spencer, Senior
41 Professional Staff Member, Energy; Michael Taggart, Policy
42 Director; Dray Thorne, Director of Information Technology;

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

43 Camden Burk, Minority Intern; Waverly Gordon, Minority Deputy
44 Staff Director and General Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio,
45 Minority Staff Director; Perry Hamilton, Minority Member
46 Services and Outreach Manager; Kris Pittard, Minority
47 Professional Staff Member; Greg Pugh, Minority Staff
48 Assistant; Kylea Rogers, Minority Policy Analyst; Andrew
49 Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and
50 Member Services; Medha Surampudy, Minority Professional Staff
51 Member; and Tuley Wright, Minority Staff Director, Energy,
52 Climate, and Grid Security.
53

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

54 *Mr. Duncan. It is 10:00, so the subcommittee will come
55 to order.

56 And the chair will recognize himself for an opening
57 statement. This is the Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and
58 Grid Security marking up three bills today. So I thank you
59 all for being here. We are holding another markup to advance
60 and unleash American energy.

61 The bills we are taking up today will secure our nuclear
62 supply chain, protect the freedom of Americans to chose their
63 home appliances, and strengthen our grid against
64 cyberthreats. The United States has become increasingly
65 dependent on Russian fuel necessary for our commercial
66 nuclear fleet. Currently, Russian imports account for
67 roughly 20 percent of the U.S. market.

68 The war in Ukraine has made it abundantly clear that we
69 cannot be at the whims of Russia for our fuel supply. It
70 should be a bipartisan national security objective to wean
71 the United States industry off of Russia uranium imports.
72 This requires a Made in America system for nuclear fuel,
73 domestic sourcing. This includes mining conversion,
74 enrichment, and fabrication.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

75 The first step in this process is putting the marker
76 down that we are banning Russian imports. I am proud to
77 co-sponsor H.R. 1042, the Prohibiting Russian Uranium Imports
78 Act, introduced by Chair Rodgers and my colleague, Mr. Latta
79 from Ohio. This bill will prohibit the importation of
80 unirradiated -- that is, fresh, unused, low-enriched --
81 uranium produced in the Russian Federation. This will give
82 the domestic industry the market certainty they need to
83 invest and build out the necessary infrastructure.

84 U.S. companies are already taking steps to this end.
85 But without certainty about the role of Russian fuel in our
86 market, investors won't put money into expanded capacity.
87 This bill would establish a date certain after which no
88 Russian fuel will be available for the long term. That will
89 allow this mature market to enter the long-term contracts
90 needed to fund secure non-Russian supplies.

91 The United States must lead in nuclear. This is
92 important for energy reliability, national security, and
93 mission-reduction goals. I urge my colleagues on this
94 committee to support this bill.

95 The second bill that I want to talk about is another

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

96 bipartisan national security priority -- should be hardening
97 our critical energy infrastructure to protect against
98 cyberthreats. H.R. 3277, the Energy Emergency Leadership
99 Act, introduced by Representatives Walberg and Blunt
100 Rochester would amend the Department of Energy Organization
101 Act to elevate the leadership of DOE's emergency response and
102 cybersecurity functions to the Senate-confirmed assistant
103 secretary level.

104 The DOE is a critical agency to coordinate, prepare for,
105 and respond to all threats and hazards to our energy supply.
106 Establishing assistant secretary leadership at the Department
107 will reflect the importance of managing this particular
108 threat.

109 This bill successfully moved from the House in the last
110 Congress, and I am optimistic it will have continued support
111 in this Congress.

112 And, lastly, we will be taking up 1640, the Save Our Gas
113 Stoves Act. I am a proud co-sponsor of this bill introduced
114 by my colleague, Congresswoman Lesko. It is no secret that
115 this Administration has waged war on American energy, doing
116 everything in their power to phase out oil and gas. They are

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

117 now taking it a step further, dictating what appliances
118 Americans purchase for their homes -- their homes-based fuel
119 sources.

120 Households that use natural gas for heating, cooking,
121 clothes drying, save an average of \$1,068 per year compared
122 to homes using electricity for those appliances. Low-income
123 Americans will be the most harmed by the rush to green the
124 mass electrification efforts pursued by the Biden
125 Administration.

126 The Save Our Gas Stoves Act would prevent this by
127 prohibiting the Secretary of Energy from finalizing,
128 implementing, or enforcing the current proposed energy
129 conservation standards for consumer conventional cooking
130 products and prohibit the enactment of any substantially
131 similar rule. Clarifying the Energy Policy and Conservation
132 Act prohibits an implementation of an energy conservation
133 standard that would result in a product being unavailable
134 based upon the type of product the fuel consumes.

135 Americans should be free to choose what cooking product
136 they use in their homes, and this bill ensures that.
137 Unfortunately, gas stove rulemaking is part of a larger

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

138 effort against the consumer appliances to federally mandate
139 that Americans purchase climate-friendlier appliances. So I
140 commend Congresswoman Lesko's leadership on this issue.

141 And I urge my colleagues to support that legislation in
142 front of us today, all of the legislation in front of us
143 today, the three bills we are marking up, which prioritizes
144 American energy security and puts the American people first.

145 And I will now recognize the ranking member,
146 Ms. DeGette, for 5 minutes.

147 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to talk
148 about the three bills that we are here to consider today,
149 H.R. 1042, 1640, and 3277. The first one, H.R. 1042,
150 prohibits the importation of Russian-made uranium into the
151 U.S.

152 Well, I think you would be hard pressed to find a single
153 person in this room who thinks that our continued reliance on
154 Russian-made uranium is not a problem that must be addressed,
155 including myself. So the legislation on its face seems like
156 a commonsense step to take, but I think we need to talk about
157 how we are going to make this happen, because the United
158 States currently imports nearly 1/4 of its enriched uranium

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

159 from Russia, and the bill says, and the chairman said, "Well,
160 we shouldn't be importing from Russia.'" "

161 That is correct. We shouldn't. But we need a plan for
162 how we are going to stop, because even though -- because the
163 dependence on Russian-made uranium remains a constant threat
164 to the fleet's future readiness, it puts our national
165 security at risk, so we need to end our reliance.

166 But it operates in a vacuum. We shouldn't be in a
167 position where we are relying on a potential adversary for
168 the resources we need, but first we need a plan to figure out
169 where we are going to get that material from someplace else.
170 We can't simply switch a -- flip a switch and domestically
171 produce the fuel needed overnight or even by 2028 as this
172 bill would allow by granting waiver authority to the
173 Secretary of Energy.

174 And as it stands now, the United States can produce only
175 1/3 of the uranium the domestic fleet needs. So we have to
176 expand the capability to fully satisfy our own needs. And I
177 think it will take significant time and a significant
178 investment, and I would urge my colleagues on the other side
179 of the aisle to work with us to do it. But before we cut

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

180 ourselves off from this uranium supply, unfortunately, we
181 need to work with our allies to ensure we have alternate
182 sources of uranium.

183 So if we figure that out, let's bring this bill back up
184 again, and then I will be happy to vote for it.

185 In addition, the legislation, as it stands now, still
186 doesn't address the need for a strategy to deal with spent
187 nuclear fuel. So whether it be in terms of Russian-made
188 uranium or the overall expansion of nuclear power in the
189 U.S., we have to address this issue of how to properly store
190 spent fuel.

191 I believe that nuclear is going to have to be a part of
192 our overall plan to combat the climate crisis, but we have to
193 not just talk about developing a long-term storage plan, we
194 actually have to do it. And so I look forward to working
195 together with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do
196 that.

197 Now, let's talk for a minute about H.R. 1640. 1640
198 kills Congressionally-mandated rulemaking that seeks to save
199 Americans money on their energy costs. It furthers a
200 misplaced fear that the government is somehow coming for your

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

201 stoves. I am here to say the Department of Energy is not
202 going to ban your gas stove. Let me say it again. The
203 Department of Energy is not going to ban your gas stove.

204 The energy efficiency rules that it is required by
205 Congress to put in place cover both gas and electric stoves.
206 They also apply only to new products and in no way will
207 affect the stove you currently own. And, in fact, nearly 1/2
208 of all gas stoves on the market today already comply with the
209 rule being proposed and would still be fully available to
210 consumers across the country.

211 So let's tone down the rhetoric on this one. Instead of
212 getting everybody ginned up on a non-issue, let's talk about
213 the issues that need to be addressed.

214 Well, okay. One more bill before us today, H.R. 3277.
215 It elevates the head of the Office of Cybersecurity to an
216 assistant secretary level position. That is a bill that was
217 previously passed out of the committee by a voice vote last
218 Congress. I expect that it will have no opposition today.
219 Good news, we can at least pass one bill today by voice vote.

220 And I yield back.

221 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

222 And I will now -- it is my honor to recognize the chair
223 of the full committee, Chair Rodgers, for 5 minutes for an
224 opening statement.

225 *The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This morning the
226 subcommittee continues our work to improve people's lives by
227 making energy more affordable and strengthening American
228 energy security. In order to achieve this, it is critical
229 that the U.S. maintain a strong energy mix. That is how we
230 win the future with clean, reliable, and affordable energy to
231 power our way of life, keep the lights on, build stronger
232 communities, keep our economy going, and as a key part of
233 that energy mix is nuclear.

234 American leadership in nuclear energy and nuclear
235 technology is critical to our economic and national security,
236 which is why one of the most urgent security needs America
237 faces right now is our dangerous reliance on Russia's supply
238 of nuclear fuels for our nuclear fleet. This threat is
239 intensified as a result of the war in Ukraine.

240 American nuclear fuel infrastructure has been stunted by
241 policies that Russia has exploited by flooding the U.S.
242 market with its cheaper fuel, which today accounts for more

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

243 than 20 percent of nuclear fuels for American reactors. Last
244 year alone, our industry paid over 850 million to Russia's
245 state-owned nuclear corporation, Rosatom, and its fuel
246 subsidiaries -- sub -- how do you say that word? Thank you.

247 That number could even be higher this year, and these
248 resources are no doubt going towards funding Putin's war
249 efforts in Ukraine -- \$850 million. Further, we have seen
250 how Putin has weaponized Europe's reliance on Russian natural
251 gas. There is no reason to believe that they wouldn't do the
252 same with our nuclear fuel supply if they saw an opportunity.

253 Rosatom has also supported China's nuclear energy
254 ambitions. The risk of continuing this dependence on Russia
255 for our nuclear fuels are simply too great. That is why I am
256 leading on H.R. 1042, the Prohibiting Russian Uranium Imports
257 Act, along with Mr. Latta, which bans fuel imports from
258 Russia and sends a strong signal to the market that will help
259 restore American nuclear leadership and fuel infrastructure.

260 We are also discussing several other important bills
261 today, including H.R. 3277, the Energy Emergency Leadership
262 Act, which Mr. Walberg and Ms. Blunt Rochester are leading to
263 continue the committee's bipartisan focus on protecting our

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

264 critical energy infrastructure. This bill, which passed the
265 House last Congress, assures that DOE's important
266 cybersecurity and emergency functions are led by a Senate-
267 confirmed assistant secretary.

268 We will also be considering H.R. 1640, the Save Our Gas
269 Stoves Act, which is led by Representative Lesko. This will
270 prevent Department of Energy from banning gas stoves. This
271 ban is just the latest attempt by the Biden Administration to
272 use the Federal Government's power to dictate every aspect of
273 our lives, from what kind of a car we drive, how we wash our
274 clothes, how we heat our homes and businesses, to now how
275 Americans are allowed to cook food for our families by trying
276 to ban gas stoves.

277 Ultimately, these bans will only force higher costs on
278 hard-working families and disproportionately harm the most
279 vulnerable communities. I look forward to discussing these
280 solutions in greater detail.

281 I yield back.

282 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.

283 And I will now go to the ranking member, Mr. Pallone,
284 for 5 minutes.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

285 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we are
286 marking up three energy bills. While I am pleased that we
287 are moving forward with a bipartisan bill that passed the
288 House last Congress, I am concerned the Republican majority
289 continues to pave a partisan path when it comes to energy
290 policy to the detriment of the American people.

291 H.R. 3277, the Energy Emergency Leadership Act, is a
292 bipartisan bill that directs the Secretary of Energy to
293 designate energy emergency and security matters to an
294 assistant secretary. This bill will ensure the continued
295 prioritization of addressing our energy infrastructure and
296 cybersecurity threats, and I thank representatives
297 Blunt Rochester and Walberg for their leadership on this
298 legislation in this Congress.

299 Unfortunately, the good ideas end there. H.R. 1630, the
300 so-called Save Our Gas Stoves Act, is nothing more than a
301 political stunt to continue the Republican scare tactics and
302 outright misinformation when it comes to energy efficiency
303 standards.

304 H.R. 1630 prevents the Department of Energy from
305 finalizing a commonsense, congressionally-mandated energy

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

306 efficiency standard for new cooktops. The proposed rule
307 simply requires new cooktops to be more efficient. This will
308 reduce energy bills for consumers and cut harmful indoor air
309 pollution that disproportionately impacts children's health.

310 We are likely to hear a lot of scare tactics about this
311 rule today. And despite what you will hear from my
312 Republican colleagues, it does not ban gas stoves, it does
313 not remove gas stoves from homes, and it does not prevent you
314 from putting a gas stove in your home. In fact, 50 percent
315 of the stoves on the market today are already in compliance
316 with the proposed standard, which will not take effect until
317 3 years after it is finalized.

318 Republicans claim to care about energy prices, but this
319 bill prohibits DOE from finalizing a rule that could save
320 consumers up to \$1.7 billion a year. DOE is only trying to
321 make stoves more efficient and lower energy bills for
322 Americans, but Republicans are moving a bill today that will
323 increase energy prices for consumers. Rather than focusing
324 on the facts, Republicans are misleading Americans in order
325 to keep their fossil fuel friends happy, and I urge my
326 colleagues to oppose this political stunt.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

327 We will also consider H.R. 1042, the Prohibiting Russian
328 Uranium Imports Act. America's nuclear power reactors are
329 far too reliant on Russian enriched uranium for fuel. Today
330 about 20 percent of the uranium used to power these reactors
331 is imported from Russia. This was a problem before Putin's
332 invasion of Ukraine, but this tragic war has only underscored
333 how problematic it is that America is so reliant on Russia
334 for nuclear fuel.

335 The United States needs to develop a more robust
336 domestic nuclear fuel cycle industry. The problem here is
337 not mining the uranium. The real chokepoint is uranium in
338 conversion and enrichment, two critical steps necessary
339 before mined uranium can be placed into a reactor.

340 Our Nation only has one enrichment facility and not a
341 single currently operating conversion facility. Because of
342 this, no matter how much uranium is mined domestically, we
343 still rely on other countries to process it.

344 So I support ending our dangerous reliance on Russia for
345 enriched uranium, but simply banning the importation of
346 Russian uranium will not solve this problem. We need more
347 domestic conversion and enrichment capability or else we

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

348 could face a problematic situation in which our Nation's
349 nuclear power reactors might struggle to find the fuel they
350 need to operate.

351 Secretary Granholm voiced support for a more
352 comprehensive solution to build this infrastructure
353 domestically when she testified before this subcommittee last
354 Thursday. When asked about a ban on Russian uranium,
355 Secretary Granholm said, and I quote, "I am worried about the
356 gap. We need to build up the supply here."

357 So I plan to oppose H.R. 1042. I find our continued
358 reliance on Russian uranium very troubling. And my staff
359 requested that any Russian uranium ban also include
360 investments in domestic fuel cycle infrastructure, but we
361 were told that was not on the table at this time.

362 We should pass a ban without addressing -- we should not
363 -- in my opinion, we should not pass a ban without addressing
364 the underlying lack of domestic nuclear fuel cycle
365 infrastructure, and I actually have an amendment when the
366 bill comes up to do that. And I hope we can find a way to
367 work together to achieve both of these important goals
368 together.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

369 And with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman, the balance
370 of my time.

371 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

372 And the chair will remind members that pursuant to the
373 committee rules all members' opening statements will be made
374 part of the record.

375 Are there any further opening statements? Mr. Latta is
376 recognized for an opening statement.

377 *Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very
378 much for holding today's markup.

379 I wanted to speak briefly in favor of the gentlelady of
380 the full committee chair's legislation, the Prohibiting
381 Russian Uranium Imports Act of which I am original
382 co-sponsor.

383 For several Congresses now, I have advocated for
384 policies that would help our domestic nuclear industry build
385 up their supply chains and reduce U.S. reliance on foreign
386 nations for nuclear fuels. This is a matter of energy
387 security and national security.

388 I have previously led a legislative effort to authorize
389 the establishment of a uranium reserve, and more recently

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

390 introduced legislation to establish and expand our domestic
391 nuclear fuel programs.

392 In the aftermath of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, it is
393 critical that the United States immediately stop subsidizing
394 Putin's war through the continued importation of Russian
395 fuels. I applaud the chairwoman for her leadership in
396 crafting this legislation and look forward to discussing it
397 today.

398 I am happy that my legislation in this effort to ban
399 Russian uranium imports have both spurred a conversation
400 surrounding the need to boost the domestic fuels market, and
401 I believe we can and will advance this effort in a bipartisan
402 way.

403 After having discussions with industry and other
404 stakeholders, I believe the chairwoman's legislation takes
405 the right approach in sending a critical market signal that
406 Russian uranium imports will be cut off, and industry will
407 need to focus on new fueling sources.

408 At the same time, I believe we will have to work -- do
409 more work to do -- to help grow our domestic supply of HALEU,
410 and I want to work with our full committee chair, the

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

411 subcommittee chairman, and with the colleagues from across
412 the aisle to update my legislation to reflect new feedback
413 before it is considered by our subcommittee.

414 Later I will be offering an amendment to H.R. 1042 that
415 will, in addition to making technical changes, require the
416 execution of a market evaluation to ensure DOE and Congress
417 will have the most up-to-date information as we explore
418 avenues to support industry. This will inform the necessary
419 blueprint for boosting the domestic nuclear fuels industry
420 and will put us on a path to greater energy security.

421 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of
422 my time.

423 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

424 Are any further opening statements? Seeing nobody
425 seeking recognition, the chair will call up H.R. 3277.

426 Before I recognize the clerk to read the bill, I just
427 want to thank all of our staff on both sides that sit through
428 the markups, sit through the hearings, and do the incredible
429 work. Noah was an intern in my office 3 or 4 years ago, and
430 it is great to see you at the table.

431 So the clerk will report the title.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

432 *The Clerk. H.R. 3277, a bill to amend the Department
433 of Energy Organization Act with respect to functions assigned
434 to Assistant Secretaries, and for other purposes.

435 Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of
436 Representatives of the United States of America in Congress
437 assembled.

438 Section 1, Short Title. This Act may be cited as the
439 Emergency -- Energy Emergency Leadership Act.

440 [The Bill H.R. 3277 follows:]

441

442 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

443

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

444 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
445 the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for
446 amendment at any point. So ordered.

447 Are there any bipartisan amendments to H.R. 3277?

448 Okay. Seeing that no amendments will be offered, any
449 discussion on the bill?

450 *Mr. Walberg. Mr. Chairman?

451 *Mr. Duncan. The chair recognizes Mr. Walberg.

452 *Mr. Walberg. I move to strike the last word.

453 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.

454 *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we are
455 considering H.R. 3277, the Energy Emergency Leadership Act,
456 which I introduced, along with my friend, Congresswoman
457 Blunt Rochester.

458 The legislation requires a secretary of energy to
459 elevate energy emergency and energy security functions to the
460 assistant secretary level. Addressing threats to our energy
461 reliability is of the highest importance, and we need to
462 structure the Department accordingly.

463 As we become more reliant on technology in every aspect
464 of our lives, it is important to understand the magnitude of

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

465 the risks associated with this dependence. Our Nation's
466 critical energy infrastructure in particular is a prime
467 target for cyberattacks, and the consequences of a successful
468 attack could be catastrophic.

469 In addition, as our energy systems become increasingly
470 more complex, they have also become more vulnerable to all
471 manner of hazards, including natural disasters, physical
472 attacks, and global shortages. We need to be better
473 prepared.

474 We all saw the shortages and chaos that ensued after
475 Colonial Pipeline suffered a ransomware attack. Imagine what
476 would happen if a cyberattack were to shut down our electric
477 grid for even a day. Hospitals would be unable to provide
478 critical care, transportation systems would be disrupted, and
479 our economy would grind to a halt. The potential loss of
480 life and damage to our economy is simply too great to inure.

481 The FAST Act rightfully provides the DOE with several
482 new energy security security authorities to respond to fiscal
483 and cyberattacks to our critical energy infrastructure.

484 DOE built on this authority by creating the Office of
485 Cybersecurity and Energy Security Emergency Response, or

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

486 CESER. Congress should strengthen this mission further by
487 creating a Senate-confirmed assistant secretary position to
488 run CESER. We would need a dedicated person to turn to with
489 respect to infrastructure, cybersecurity, emergency planning,
490 and emerging threats.

491 This bill will help to ensure that our government has
492 the necessary leadership and coordination to respond quickly
493 and effectively to any crisis, including cyberattacks on our
494 critical infrastructure. It will also promote continuity of
495 high-level leadership throughout future administrations,
496 increase accountability, and encourage more effective and
497 seamless information-sharing with federal and industry
498 stakeholders.

499 The threats we face are serious. We need to provide DOE
500 with all the tools we can to address them and secure our
501 energy future.

502 I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3277, and I yield
503 back.

504 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

505 Any other members seeking recognition? Ms. Blunt
506 Rochester is recognized.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

507 *Ms. Blunt Rochester. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike
508 the last word.

509 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognized.

510 *Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the
511 recognition. The growth in connected devices and distributed
512 energy resources promises cost-saving benefits to Americans
513 through improvements in energy efficiency. However, the
514 growth in devices and infrastructure with increased
515 connectivity and automation throughout the electricity system
516 also makes the energy systems on which our constituents and
517 our businesses rely vulnerable to cyberattacks and natural
518 disasters.

519 In 2022, the number of risks to critical infrastructure
520 escalated due to the increase in cyber ransom crimes, threats
521 from nation state actors and the war in Ukraine.

522 Members of this committee will remember the cyberattacks
523 on the Colonial Pipeline. We have also seen energy grids
524 shut down by individuals destroying transformers at power
525 stations. Protecting the web of power resources that ensure
526 the health and wellness of our country and economy is
527 critical, and our government needs the resources to protect

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

528 these energy systems from potential threats that will arise.

529 I am proud to co-lead H.R. 3277, the Energy Emergency
530 Leadership Act, with Mr. Walberg, who I have partnered with
531 on multiple different bills and appreciate your leadership,
532 because it will help us tackle the myriad of threats facing
533 our critical infrastructure. Our bill will support the
534 Department of Energy in its efforts to coordinate, prepare,
535 and respond to all hazards to the supply of energy, including
536 cybersecurity and natural disasters.

537 This assistant secretary level position will strengthen
538 coordination across the Department, ensure more effective
539 interagency collaborations, and increase accountability to
540 Congress. This legislation will go a long way in helping to
541 protect the Nation's electric infrastructure from threats
542 that could cause disruptions to our lives, our economy, and
543 undermine our national security.

544 It is imperative that we take proactive steps to
545 mitigate the risks of these types of attacks, and the Energy
546 Emergency Leadership Act will help in achieving that goal.

547 I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan
548 legislation, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

549 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.

550 Any other members seeking recognition on the bill?

551 The chair recognizes himself, and I move to strike the
552 last word and am recognized.

553 I want to thank the bipartisanship on this particular
554 piece of legislation. I think it is critical as we talk
555 about building out the infrastructure that is needed, not
556 just repairing and updating but building out future
557 infrastructure, making sure we have someone at the Department
558 of Energy that is dedicated and focused to making sure the
559 components are put in place as we build it out, making sure
560 that we address all the national security threats that could
561 happen on our infrastructure.

562 The gentlelady mentioned Colonial Pipeline, one of many
563 instances where we believe that cyber hacks have tried to
564 take place, and we know there are foreign bad actors out
565 there that are attempting it every minute of every day.

566 So this is critical. I appreciate the bill. I support
567 it.

568 And with that, I will yield back.

569 Any other members seeking recognition?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

570 Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding
571 H.R. 3277 to the full committee.
572 All those in favor, say aye.
573 Any opposed, no.
574 And the ayes have it.
575 You all want a roll call? Okay. A roll call has been
576 requested, so the clerk is instructed to call the roll.
577 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess?
578 *Mr. Burgess. Aye.
579 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess votes aye.
580 Mr. Latta?
581 *Mr. Latta. Aye.
582 *The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.
583 Mr. Guthrie?
584 *Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
585 *The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes aye.
586 Mr. Griffith?
587 *Mr. Griffith. Aye.
588 *The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.
589 Mr. Johnson?
590 *Mr. Johnson. Aye.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

591 *The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
592 Mr. Bucshon?
593 *Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
594 *The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
595 Mr. Walberg?
596 *Mr. Walberg. Aye.
597 *The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
598 Mr. Palmer?
599 [No response.]
600 *The Clerk. Mr. Curtis?
601 *Mr. Curtis. Aye.
602 *The Clerk. Mr. Curtis votes aye.
603 Mrs. Lesko?
604 *Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
605 *The Clerk. Mrs. Lesko votes aye.
606 Mr. Pence?
607 *Mr. Pence. Aye.
608 *The Clerk. Mr. Pence votes aye.
609 Mr. Armstrong?
610 [No response.]
611 *The Clerk. Mr. Weber?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

612 *Mr. Weber. Aye.
613 *The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes aye.
614 Mr. Balderson?
615 *Mr. Balderson. Aye.
616 *The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes aye.
617 Mr. Pfluger?
618 *Mr. Pfluger. Aye.
619 *The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes aye.
620 Chair Rodgers?
621 *The Chair. Aye.
622 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes aye.
623 Mr. Duncan?
624 *Mr. Duncan. Aye.
625 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan votes aye.
626 Ms. DeGette?
627 *Ms. DeGette. Aye.
628 *The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.
629 Mr. Peters?
630 *Mr. Peters. Aye.
631 *The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.
632 Mrs. Fletcher?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

633 *Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
634 *The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.
635 Ms. Matsui?
636 *Ms. Matsui. Aye.
637 *The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
638 Mr. Tonko?
639 *Mr. Tonko. Aye.
640 *The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
641 Mr. Veasey?
642 *Mr. Veasey. Aye.
643 *The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.
644 Ms. Kuster?
645 *Ms. Kuster. Aye.
646 *The Clerk. Ms. Kuster votes aye.
647 Ms. Schrier?
648 *Ms. Schrier. Aye.
649 *The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.
650 Ms. Castor?
651 *Ms. Castor. Aye.
652 *The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.
653 Mr. Sarbanes?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

654 *Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.

655 *The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.

656 Mr. Cardenas?

657 *Mr. Cardenas. Aye.

658 *The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.

659 Ms. Blunt Rochester?

660 *Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.

661 *The Clerk. Ms. Blunt Rochester votes aye.

662 Mr. Pallone?

663 *Mr. Pallone. Aye.

664 *The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

665 *Mr. Duncan. Is any member not recorded? Mr. Palmer --

666 how is Mr. Palmer recorded?

667 *The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.

668 *Mr. Palmer. Aye.

669 *The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

670 *Mr. Armstrong. How is Armstrong recorded?

671 *The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong is not recorded.

672 *Mr. Armstrong. I vote yes.

673 *The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong votes aye.

674 *Mr. Duncan. Any other member not recorded? With that,

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

675 the clerk will call the tally.

676 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote there were
677 30 ayes and zero noes.

678 *Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill is agreed
679 to. It will be forwarded to the full committee.

680 The chair will now call up H.R. 1640 and ask the clerk
681 to report.

682 *The Clerk. H.R. 1640, a bill to prohibit the Secretary
683 of Energy from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the
684 proposed rule titled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy
685 Conservation Standards"--

686 [The Bill H.R. 1640 follows:]

687

688 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

689

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

690 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
691 the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for
692 amendment at any point. So ordered.

693 Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Any
694 amendments to the bill?

695 Seeing none, the chair will now recognize the sponsor of
696 the bill, Mrs. Lesko, to explain the bill.

697 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am proud to
698 sponsor H.R. 1640, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act. This bill
699 prohibits the Department of Energy from implementing its
700 proposed rule that would eliminate the future sale of the
701 vast majority of gas stove products that are available today.

702 The DOE's proposed rule for consumer conventional
703 cooking products applies the maximum technologically feasible
704 level, something that has never been done before. There are
705 basically two types of gas stoves, the cooktops that don't
706 include an oven and are mounted on top of the counter, and
707 the more common freestanding ranges that combine a cooktop
708 with the oven.

709 The proposed rule, based on DOE's own analysis, would
710 eliminate 96 percent of gas cooktops that are available

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

711 today. And let me show you that, so that you say that it is
712 not disinformation. It is right in the DOE's own report
713 right here, which I can submit for the record.

714 The proposed -- even worse, the rule would eliminate all
715 currently available models of freestanding ranges, which make
716 up almost 90 percent of all gas stoves sold today. Let me
717 repeat: no freestanding ranges that have been tested meet
718 the standards level under the proposed new rule.

719 So when Secretary Granholm told us just last week that
720 the new rule would only affect high-end gas stove products,
721 that is simply not the case.

722 Testing by the Association of Home Appliance
723 Manufacturers found that under the proposed rule the time it
724 would take to boil a pot of water would increase by about
725 7 minutes. Over a full year, the new standard would cost
726 consumers nearly a full day simply waiting for water to boil.

727 The new standard could mean ranges and cooktops would
728 have no more than one large burner, which of course would be
729 hard for large families. In DOE's own report -- again, right
730 here -- it says that the proposed rule would eliminate
731 96 percent of an entire class of cooktops available today.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

732 Then later DOE claimed that only 50 percent of the
733 products available today would be eliminated, and that has
734 been brought up by my Democratic colleagues about the
735 50 percent. But it appears DOE pulled this number out of
736 thin air, because DOE didn't even test the stoves that they
737 said would qualify, so how do they know that they would?

738 To date, DOE provides no data or substantiation for how
739 it determined the models on retailer websites, which would
740 meet its proposed standards. DOE estimates that the proposed
741 rule will save \$21.89 per stove over 14 years. That is \$1.50
742 a year or 12 cents a month, hardly worth the lack of consumer
743 choice, hardly with the lack of having large burners, hardly
744 worth waiting for water to boil for 7 additional minutes per
745 pot of water.

746 According to the DOE, natural gas is three-and-a-half
747 times cheaper than electricity. According to studies,
748 households that use natural gas for heating, cooking, and
749 clothes drying save an average of \$1,068 per year compared to
750 homes using electricity for those applications.

751 This bill already has 55 bipartisan co-sponsors.
752 Republicans and 29 Democrats already voted for an amendment

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

753 on the floor, which was included in H.R. 1 to do the same
754 thing as this bill.

755 I ask my colleagues to join me in protecting consumer
756 choice. I ask my colleagues to join me in saving our gas
757 stoves. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting yes.

758 And, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert
759 into the record a letter from the American Gas Association
760 supporting my bill, and I yield back.

761 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection. So ordered.

762 [The information follows:]

763

764 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

765

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

766 *Mr. Duncan. Any other discussion on the bill?

767 Mr. Tonko is recognized.

768 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the
769 last word.

770 I want to be perfectly clear. DOE has not proposed
771 banning gas stoves, and that is worth repeating. The
772 proposed rule that would be blocked by this legislation
773 simply would not ban gas stoves. This rule would also not
774 apply to existing appliances. It would go into effect on new
775 stoves several years from now.

776 DOE's proposal is not some unachievable goal. Fifty
777 percent of the gas stoves currently on the market, including
778 entry-level models, can already achieve the proposed
779 standard. There is no doubt that there will be plenty of
780 available options when this rule goes into effect.

781 Let's remember that DOE's efficiency standards protect
782 consumers. They ensure that manufacturers, especially
783 foreign manufacturers that are happy to dump cheap, low-
784 quality products on American consumers, must achieve minimum
785 levels of energy efficiency. As someone who represents many
786 people with gas stoves, I want to make certain they have

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

787 access to the most efficient appliances.

788 Over the past year, I heard from many constituents
789 dealing with soaring fuel prices. People with more efficient
790 appliances are better able to cope with these price shocks.
791 This is why DOE has estimated that its proposal will result
792 in some \$1.7 billion worth of savings for consumers. This is
793 especially important for renters, who very often do not have
794 a choice on what appliances their landlord will provide for
795 them.

796 I remember when there was bipartisan agreement around
797 the importance of energy efficiency. It is a commonsense,
798 low-cost, consumer-friendly strategy to reduce demand for all
799 fuel types. We should be striving to get back to that
800 consensus by making energy efficiency our fuel of choice.

801 This bill is the wrong approach. It will allow wasteful
802 products to continue to be sold when there is widespread
803 availability of superior, cost-effective, and more efficient
804 stoves.

805 With that, I urge members to oppose this bill. And,
806 Mr. Chair, I yield back.

807 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

808 Any other members seeking recognition? The gentleman
809 from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, is recognized.

810 *Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to
811 strike the last word in support of this legislation.

812 Over the last few years, we have seen this push to get
813 rid of natural gas. And as a result, the Federal
814 Government's effort to micromanage people's lives has
815 significantly picked up steam.

816 As I said in the environment subcommittee last week,
817 this points to a troubling pattern at the EPA, the Department
818 of Energy, and the entire Administration for that matter.
819 What they do is pick a policy outcome, whether it is ending
820 the use of natural gas or oil, pushing Americans toward
821 electric vehicles or other green wish list items, and then
822 shoehorn in a regulation on the back end to make it happen.

823 What is the reasoning for this? Well, they say to
824 protect the environment and reduce carbon emissions of
825 course. It is good -- "For your own good," they say. But
826 are we sure about that?

827 Because it is important to realize that this proposed
828 gas stove ban is not occurring in a vacuum. The American

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

829 people are struggling with inflation, and in real time they
830 are seeing their standard of living decline relative to their
831 income.

832 In Appalachia, Ohio, do you think my constituents have
833 the money to rewire their home's entire electric system for
834 an electric range? And pay to get their gas line capped and
835 the meter taken off?

836 Now I am sure that wasn't in the sales pitch for the
837 all-electric kitchen, and this isn't a one off. Here is
838 little more context on what the American people are facing.
839 The forced electrification is coming for much more than just
840 our stoves. For example, many of my constituents heat their
841 homes affordably and reliably with natural gas, but not if
842 the Biden Administration has its way.

843 DOE just last year proposed rules to outlaw many popular
844 gas furnaces to force Americans into installing expensive
845 electric heat pumps. That could run up astronomical electric
846 bills in cold climates.

847 And water heaters? Well, the Department of Energy is
848 coming for those, too. They have proposed policies to
849 mandate so-called "demand-response technology," better

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

850 described as remote-controlled capability, so the government
851 can shut water heaters off in the case of a strained electric
852 grid.

853 Demand-response is also being proposed for thermostats
854 and even washers and refrigerators. Are you seeing a pattern
855 here, friends?

856 Instead of using its resources and expertise to work to
857 provide more abundant and reliable baseload electricity, our
858 Department of Energy has decided that the American people are
859 the problem, that our citizens use too much energy, and they
860 believe it is the American people who must sacrifice. And it
861 doesn't end there.

862 This summer in fact my constituents -- again, already
863 suffering with inflation -- will be in for a rude awakening
864 when they stop at the hardware store on the way home from
865 work, and they find out about the new lightbulbs rule. I kid
866 you not, the Department of Energy just last month announced
867 it will institute new rules to outlaw the sale of
868 incandescent lightbulbs and mandate more expensive LED bulbs
869 starting in August.

870 And, finally, I mention water heaters. When hardworking

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

871 Americans get home from work and running their errands, and
872 feed their kids, I am glad they can rest assured that DOE is
873 still thinking of them when they can take a shower under a
874 recently reinstated, DOE-mandated, maximum flow rate-
875 compliant showerhead.

876 So I think everyone gets the picture. These are all
877 reasons why the Lesko legislation is sorely needed. These
878 types of rules to electrify homes, end natural gas, and limit
879 energy -- limit energy use don't cut nearly enough carbon to
880 influence the global climate. China and India alone are
881 increasing emissions astronomically farther above the
882 reductions we will see from any of these rules.

883 But why does the Administration still press forward? It
884 is not about air conditioners or dishwashers, which have new
885 rules, too. It is actually much simpler. Because it is not
886 about carbon, because if it were, we would see cooperation
887 from the Administration in expanding the use of American
888 natural gas, both here at home and abroad. No. It is not
889 about carbon. It is about control.

890 But instead of empowering Americans and making it a goal
891 to improve the quality of living standards, bureaucrats in

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

892 the Biden Administration will stop at nothing to use the
893 levers of government to pick winners and losers and centrally
894 plan the economy. This legislation would curb many of these
895 worst abuses, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

896 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

897 *Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman. He yields back.

898 Any other member seeking recognition? Ms. Castor from
899 Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

900 *Ms. Castor. I move to strike the last word,
901 Mr. Chairman.

902 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognized.

903 *Ms. Castor. Well, thank you so much.

904 Colleagues, Americans are free to choose their home
905 appliances. My neighbors back home are very good at
906 comparison shopping. They are always -- when we are talking
907 about the kitchen. They are looking for an appliance that is
908 safe. They are looking for an appliance that is affordable,
909 they are looking for something that serves their needs. You
910 know, we have come a long way from cooking over open flame
911 and handwashing our clothes in the last century. Thank
912 goodness, appliances in America have gotten better and better

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

913 over time.

914 But let's talk about the fantastic energy-efficient
915 induction cooktops. They are similar to the glass electric
916 cooktops that many people are familiar with, but they
917 outperform and out-innovate anything else that is on the
918 market now.

919 And I thought I would borrow from David Letterman's Top
920 Ten, but I will spare you ten. I will just give you five.
921 These induction cooktops are very easy to clean. They are --
922 nothing gets stuck in the gas wires and down there. They are
923 smooth; they are easy to clean.

924 Number 4 reason that you are going to love induction
925 cooktops. According to consumer reports, induction cooktops
926 outperform every other kind of range. They heat up quickly.
927 You don't have to sit there watching your pot of water
928 boiling. It happens really fast, superb simmering. It
929 better responds to your desired heat control.

930 Top 3 reason, there are built-in safety features. If
931 you do not have your pot on the stove, it doesn't turn on.
932 The cooktop doesn't heat up. You are not going to get
933 burned. Your kids aren't going to get burned. This is a

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

934 fantastic -- let me talk to you as a mom. This is a
935 wonderful safety feature.

936 Number 2 Top Ten reason, they are more efficient than
937 gas or electric, and there are incredible discounts now.
938 Thanks to the Inflation Reduction Act, a family can save
939 about \$840 on these energy-efficient appliances, depending
940 upon your income. So please don't peddle this misinformation
941 that these are expensive. This is a consumer choice, and
942 right now you get a significant rebate money back into your
943 pocket.

944 But the number 1 reason you all are going to love
945 induction cooktops, they are better for the environment.
946 They are better for your health. These do not burn fossil
947 fuels in your home. It is a real problem, especially because
948 most people do not have ventilation, they don't -- or they
949 don't even turn on their range hoods when they are cooking
950 with methane gas.

951 Methane is a very potent greenhouse gas. Recent studies
952 have shown that methane leaking from gas-burning stoves
953 installed in U.S. homes, even when they are turned off, have
954 the same negative impact on the environment as carbon dioxide

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

955 emitted from around 500 gasoline-powered vehicles.

956 This is also a significant health concern. If you have
957 children who suffer from asthma, if you are an older -- if
958 you are a pregnant woman, what is happening in your
959 kitchen -- carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, other
960 pollutants and carcinogens -- are going right into your
961 kitchen. These can trigger asthma attacks, significant heart
962 impacts.

963 What is really happening here is my colleagues are
964 trying to scare you, say, "We are coming for your stove."'
965 That is not what this is about. What this is about is saving
966 you money, cutting pollution, and tackling the climate
967 crisis. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are
968 so wedded to polluter profits -- the gas and oil industry --
969 that they are willing to go this far with this conspiracy-
970 laden bill. It is a waste of our time. It is a disservice
971 to our neighbors back home who are smarter than this. They
972 can make their own decisions, if you give them the
973 information they need.

974 So I gave you top -- five top reasons why the induction
975 stove is the way of the future. They are easier to clean.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

976 They outperform anything else on the market. They have
977 built-in safety features. They are more efficient. And they
978 have -- there are incredible discounts right now.

979 Go to rewritingamerica.org, put in your ZIP code. You
980 can find out how much money you can save. It is \$840 for
981 these appliances, depending on your income, but most
982 importantly, they are better for your health. They are
983 better for the environment. They are going to help us save
984 money, cut pollution, and mitigate the climate crisis.

985 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

986 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.

987 I will now go to Mr. Palmer for 5 minutes.

988 *Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike
989 the last word.

990 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.

991 *Mr. Palmer. I appreciate the fact that we have been
992 making the point that the Biden Administration and the
993 Department of Energy has been threatening access to gas
994 stoves; not only that, to other residential and commercial
995 uses of natural gas. And I appreciate the fact that my
996 Democratic colleagues are now admitting that they are full

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

997 fledged in support of this with their comments.

998 Saying that the Department of Energy and that our
999 Democratic colleagues have no desire to eliminate natural gas
1000 reminds me of the epilogue about boiling a frog. You know,
1001 you start by putting the frog in lukewarm water, and you
1002 gradually turn up the heat until it is too late, and only, as
1003 Representative Lesko pointed out, using an electric stove, it
1004 will just take a lot longer to boil that frog.

1005 According to the Department of Energy's own analysis,
1006 38 percent of Americans use natural gas for cooking. And I
1007 remember as a kid, as I pointed out a few times, I grew up
1008 dirt poor. We heated our house with a coal-burning stove.
1009 And I was in seventh grade before we were finally able to get
1010 a natural gas floor furnace that my dad installed himself.

1011 And what natural gas meant to our household, and what it
1012 means to other Americans who depend on natural gas to heat
1013 their homes, to heat their water, to cook their food, but the
1014 American people see this for what it is. It is really a
1015 direct attack on all natural gas use in the country, and it
1016 is another example of the Biden Administration's desire to
1017 control every decision that we make. And it is essentially a

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1018 tax on consumers who are already being squeezed by inflation.

1019 As I have pointed out many times in here, energy costs
1020 are the single-most inflationary component in the entire
1021 economy. And this idea that we are going to use government
1022 subsidies, you know, those are not cost-free. We all know
1023 this. It comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. Everybody is
1024 paying for it. The regulatory cost, everybody pays for that.
1025 That gets passed on to the consumer.

1026 And what they are doing here again is just inflicting
1027 another financial burden, particularly on low-income and
1028 middle-income families. They argue that -- I heard one of my
1029 Democratic colleagues make the point that half of the stoves
1030 already meet the proposed rule. Well, we don't even know
1031 what the proposed rule is yet, but I am happy to point out
1032 that that also means that half of them don't. And we don't
1033 know whose households that 50 percent are in.

1034 So I just think the legislation that Representative
1035 Lesko has brought to the table is not only the right course
1036 of action to oppose what the Department of Energy is doing,
1037 what my Democrat colleagues are trying to do, what the Biden
1038 Administration is trying to do, just another example of a

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1039 complete disregard for economics, for how people live, for
1040 how people want to live. I really think she is providing a
1041 great service to the American people by introducing this
1042 legislation.

1043 And I would also like to point out that it makes us less
1044 reliant on China. I mean, this idea that we are going to go
1045 100 percent renewable just means that we will be 100 percent
1046 reliant on China. And there are so many things that you
1047 could say about where this Administration is heading with its
1048 energy policy that I think the American people are beginning
1049 to wake up to not only how it undermines our economic
1050 security but it is undermining our national security.

1051 And it may sound strange to link that to preserving the
1052 right to have a natural gas cooktop, but it all fits together
1053 with this huge agenda that the Biden Administration and my
1054 Democrat colleagues are trying to enforce upon the American
1055 people that impact their choices, but also impact the
1056 long-term economic viability of this Nation.

1057 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically encourage
1058 every member of this committee to vote for Representative
1059 Lesko's bill, and I yield back.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1060 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1061 Any other members seeking recognition? The gentlelady,
1062 Mrs. Fletcher from Texas, is recognized.

1063 *Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I just
1064 want to weigh in very briefly here to say that I agree that
1065 the Federal Government should not be banning gas stoves.
1066 Like many Texans, my gas stove got me through the freeze a
1067 couple of years ago when we were out of power for several
1068 days. Between having a gas stove and a gas jet fireplace,
1069 that was about all we could do when the temperature was less
1070 than 40 degrees inside our own home. And then we had to boil
1071 our water on top of that. So certainly many of us in Texas
1072 understand the importance.

1073 I just want to make a quick point. There are a handful
1074 of concerns about some differences in this bill and the
1075 amendment we voted for on the floor, very technical around
1076 some of the language here. And so I intend to vote yes on
1077 this bill today, but I would love it if we could get an
1078 agreement that we could work through some of these technical
1079 concerns, because I do think that energy efficiency standards
1080 are an important tool at DOE for driving innovation, for

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1081 dealing with efficiency, and there is a little bit of concern
1082 around the future rulemaking piece in Section 3.

1083 So if we could just agree to work on that, I would
1084 appreciate it.

1085 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.

1086 And we will definitely have staffs talk about any
1087 suggestions you may have before this gets to full committee
1088 markup.

1089 *Mrs. Fletcher. Terrific. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
1090 yield back.

1091 *Mr. Duncan. Any other member. Mr. Pence from Indiana
1092 is recognized.

1093 *Mr. Pence. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to
1094 strike the last word.

1095 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.

1096 *Mr. Pence. I yield my time to the gentlelady from
1097 Arizona.

1098 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1099 And thank you, Mr. Pence.

1100 I just want to address a couple of the things that have
1101 been said. My Democratic colleague, Representative Castor,

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1102 talked passionately about induction cooktop stoves, said my
1103 legislation was a waste of time. I obviously disagree.

1104 But the thing I want to really concentrate on, which she
1105 said, is something to the effect of "Constituents are smart.
1106 They can make their own decisions about which stoves to
1107 buy."

1108 Well, that is exactly the point of my legislation. The
1109 Department of Energy's new proposed energy efficiency
1110 standards will not allow people to select whatever stove they
1111 want to have, because even in the DOE's own report it said
1112 that it would -- 96 percent of existing cooktops, gas
1113 cooktops, would not meet the new standards. And all of the
1114 freestanding stoves that 90 percent of the people have in
1115 their homes, which is the cooktop on the top and the oven,
1116 freestanding, none of those would quality for the new
1117 standards.

1118 So the stoves would have to be changed. That is all
1119 that would be available on the market. So people won't have
1120 a choice. That is my point. That is the point of the
1121 legislation.

1122 The other thing that I would like to point out is

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1123 several of my Democratic colleagues even said in their
1124 argument against my bill, "Well, the DOE says that it would
1125 only affect 50 percent of the existing gas stoves.'" Well,
1126 that means 50 percent of the gas stoves won't be available.
1127 The ones that are available today will not be available in
1128 the future to purchase.

1129 And the last thing I would like to say is there is --
1130 you know, some of my Democratic colleagues are like it will
1131 not ban existing gas stoves. They are not going to take them
1132 out of the home. I agree. That is not what it does. That
1133 is not what my bill does. What it says is that the DOE
1134 cannot impose these standards, so that new stoves that are on
1135 the market will not be available to constituents.

1136 And with that, I yield back.

1137 *Mr. Pence. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

1138 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back his time.

1139 Any other member seeking recognition? Mr. Pfluger from
1140 Texas is recognized.

1141 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be
1142 brief. I have to ask the question of, why are we here? You
1143 know, what is the purpose of this? And I think we can sum it

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1144 up by saying it is overreach.

1145 And the reason that we are having to have this markup is
1146 because we have seen incredible examples of overreach. I
1147 mean, Americans at home, if you are wondering why
1148 Congressional approval ratings may be sub-10 percent, it is
1149 because we are having to have a hearing and a markup like
1150 this to push back on the overreach.

1151 You know, we had the Secretary of Energy here last week,
1152 and there were a couple of questions that I in particular
1153 asked, and others asked. And I have to point out that, you
1154 know, let's look at the priorities of the Department of
1155 Energy. When I asked the Secretary of Energy where our
1156 energy came from, how much annual electricity Americans use,
1157 the Secretary, unfortunately, did not know those answers that
1158 were clearly on the website that DOE publishes.

1159 And if you are thinking about national security issues
1160 right now, China -- the CCP, our adversaries around the
1161 world, have to be laughing at the fact that we are literally
1162 having to have a talk about consumer selection of appliances.
1163 Instead of focusing on where our energy is going to come from
1164 and allowing our country to produce the best sources of

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1165 energy, we are literally having to push back on the overreach
1166 the Biden Administration has consistently shown Americans
1167 that they are willing to do, and it comes in the form of now
1168 stoves and natural gas stoves in homes.

1169 So, you know, from my constituents back home, I want you
1170 to know that every single day I am going to be up here really
1171 focusing on the national security issues, which involve
1172 making sure that we can produce enough energy and we don't
1173 have to be reliant on other countries for our energy.

1174 And today is an example of supporting my colleague, Mrs.
1175 Lesko, because she is doing a great job of pushing back on
1176 the overreach that this Administration has consistently
1177 demonstrated that they are willing to do in the form of
1178 telling you what kind of stove you can have in your home.

1179 So, Mr. Chairman, thank you for this. I wish that we
1180 were not in this position to have to have this markup, but we
1181 are, and I appreciate the efforts to push back.

1182 With that, I yield back.

1183 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1184 Any other members seeking recognition?

1185 Seeing no others, I will recognize myself. I move to

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1186 strike the last word and recognize myself.

1187 This rule may not be out there yet, but it is a proposed
1188 rule by the Department of Energy. We have a legislative
1189 responsibility in the role of governing this Nation to make
1190 decisions about what is in the best interest of our Nation,
1191 our states, and ultimately our constituents.

1192 This is the wrong approach from the Department of
1193 Energy, which at a time when we have so many other needs to
1194 address, like advanced nuclear technology, to maybe lessen
1195 our dependence on some fossil fuel generation, we are
1196 focusing on household appliances.

1197 This is -- I want to just put this fact out there.
1198 Nearly 187 million Americans use natural gas because it is
1199 more affordable and reliable. That is not to leave out the
1200 future homeowners who are building a house and designing
1201 their appliances and want to have choices to make for the
1202 best interests of them and their family, the most affordable,
1203 the most reliable, and most efficient to cook the meals that
1204 they provide for their families.

1205 And I am not going to leave out the thousands upon
1206 thousands of restaurants across this country that prepare our

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1207 meals every day on gas stoves, gas cooktops.

1208 And as a small business owner in the past, I can tell
1209 you these restaurants make business decisions from a cost-
1210 effectiveness standpoint, a long-term utility bill
1211 standpoint, and the bottom line. And they choose natural
1212 gas, they choose gas cooktops to use, when the choices are
1213 currently out there to go electric for their restaurant or
1214 gas, and they choose gas because it is the best interest for
1215 their bottom line. It is the best interest for efficiency
1216 within their restaurant to provide those meals in a timely
1217 manner for the customers that are sitting out there waiting.

1218 So maybe the rule isn't out there yet, but we see blue
1219 states across this country already banning stoves in their
1220 home. Stoves today, hot water heaters tomorrow, HVA systems
1221 and heat packs the next day, and it goes on and on.

1222 I think the time is now to say no. To say no, that it
1223 is not the role of the Federal Government to limit the
1224 choices of American families that they make for their homes,
1225 their food preparation, and their bottom line, and their
1226 utility cost.

1227 So I appreciate the gentlelady for authoring this bill.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1228 I am a proud co-sponsor of it. I urge my colleagues to
1229 support it, because I think it is the right legislative move
1230 for the elected representatives in the United States
1231 Congress, who have a role in governing this Nation. It is
1232 not just the Department of Energy's responsibility for doing
1233 this.

1234 We have a responsibility to focus on what might be
1235 coming down the pike and whether that will be good or bad for
1236 the Nation. This is forward-thinking to stop limiting the
1237 consumer choices our constituents can make or not make.

1238 And with that, I yield back.

1239 Any other member seeking recognition?

1240 Seeing none, the chair will ask the clerk to call the
1241 roll. We do have a recorded vote requested, so we are just
1242 going to move straight to that.

1243 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess?

1244 *Mr. Burgess. Votes aye.

1245 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess votes aye.

1246 Mr. Latta?

1247 *Mr. Latta. Aye.

1248 *The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1249 Mr. Guthrie?
1250 [No response.]
1251 *The Clerk. Mr. Griffith?
1252 *Mr. Griffith. Aye.
1253 *The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.
1254 Mr. Johnson?
1255 *Mr. Johnson. Aye.
1256 *The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
1257 Mr. Bucshon?
1258 *Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
1259 *The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
1260 Mr. Walberg?
1261 *Mr. Walberg. Aye.
1262 *The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
1263 Mr. Palmer?
1264 *Mr. Palmer. Aye.
1265 *The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.
1266 Mr. Curtis?
1267 *Mr. Curtis. Aye.
1268 *The Clerk. Mr. Curtis votes aye.
1269 Mrs. Lesko?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1270 *Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
1271 *The Clerk. Mrs. Lesko votes aye.
1272 Mr. Pence?
1273 *Mr. Pence. Aye.
1274 *The Clerk. Mr. Pence votes aye.
1275 Mr. Armstrong?
1276 [No response.]
1277 *The Clerk. Mr. Weber?
1278 *Mr. Weber. Aye.
1279 *The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes aye.
1280 Mr. Balderson?
1281 *Mr. Balderson. Aye.
1282 *The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes aye.
1283 Mr. Pfluger?
1284 *Mr. Pfluger. Aye.
1285 *The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes aye.
1286 Chair Rodgers?
1287 *The Chair. Aye.
1288 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes aye.
1289 Chair Duncan?
1290 *Mr. Duncan. Aye.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1291 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan votes aye.
1292 Ms. DeGette?
1293 *Ms. DeGette. No.
1294 *The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes no.
1295 Mr. Peters?
1296 *Mr. Peters. No.
1297 *The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
1298 Mrs. Fletcher?
1299 *Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
1300 *The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.
1301 Ms. Matsui?
1302 *Ms. Matsui. No.
1303 *The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes no.
1304 Mr. Tonko?
1305 *Mr. Tonko. No.
1306 *The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.
1307 Mr. Veasey?
1308 *Mr. Veasey. Aye.
1309 *The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.
1310 Ms. Kuster?
1311 *Ms. Kuster. No.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1312 *The Clerk. Ms. Kuster votes no.
1313 Ms. Schrier?
1314 *Ms. Schrier. Aye.
1315 *The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.
1316 Ms. Castor?
1317 *Ms. Castor. No.
1318 *The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes no.
1319 Mr. Sarbanes?
1320 *Mr. Sarbanes. No.
1321 *The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.
1322 Mr. Cardenas?
1323 *Mr. Cardenas. No.
1324 *The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes no.
1325 Ms. Blunt Rochester?
1326 *Ms. Blunt Rochester. No.
1327 *The Clerk. Ms. Blunt Rochester votes no.
1328 Mr. Pallone?
1329 *Mr. Pallone. No.
1330 *The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes no.
1331 *Mr. Duncan. Is any member not recorded?
1332 *Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1333 *The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie, you are not recorded.
1334 *Mr. Guthrie. I vote aye.
1335 *The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes aye.
1336 *Mr. Armstrong. How is Mr. Armstrong recorded?
1337 *The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong is not recorded.
1338 *Mr. Armstrong. I vote yes.
1339 *The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong votes aye.
1340 *Mr. Duncan. Any other member unrecorded?
1341 Seeing none, the clerk will report the total.
1342 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote there were
1343 20 ayes and 10 noes.
1344 *Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill is agreed
1345 to and will be forwarded to the full committee.
1346 The chair will now call up H.R. 1042 and ask the clerk
1347 to report.
1348 *The Clerk. H.R. 1042, a bill to prohibit the
1349 importation into the United States of unirradiated low-
1350 enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation,
1351 and for other purposes.
1352 Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of
1353 Representatives of the United States--

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1354 [The Bill H.R. 1042 follows:]
1355
1356 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****
1357

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1358 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, the first reading of
1359 the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for
1360 amendment at any time. So ordered.

1361 Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Any
1362 other amendments to the bill?

1363 *Ms. Kuster. Mr. Chairman?

1364 *Mr. Latta. Mr. Chairman?

1365 *Mr. Duncan. Mr. Latta is recognized. You have an
1366 amendment?

1367 *Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an
1368 amendment at the desk labeled MA_01 to H.R. 1042.

1369 *The Clerk. The clerk will report the amendment.

1370 *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1024, offered by
1371 Mr. Latta. Page 4, line 2, after "Representatives'" insert
1372 "the Committee on Finance"--

1373 [The Amendment offered by Mr. Latta follows:]

1374

1375 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1376

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1377 *Mr. Duncan. Further reading of the amendment is
1378 dispensed with. Mr. Latta is recognized to explain the
1379 amendment.

1380 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
1381 amendment to H.R. 1042 accomplishes two points. First, it
1382 responds to some technical assistance from the Department of
1383 Energy to remove one of the consultations with the Department
1384 of Commerce because the programs at issue are DOE programs.

1385 Members should know that this bill, which we started
1386 working on last year, reflects technical advice from DOE, its
1387 National Nuclear Security Administration, and the Department
1388 of Commerce. This portion of the amendment also provides
1389 conforming changes to the underlying law.

1390 Second, the amendment revises Section 3 of H.R. 1042 to
1391 replace a funding authorization for the American assured fuel
1392 supply with a more comprehensive market evaluation for DOE to
1393 begin immediately upon enactment.

1394 Here, rather than focus on an existing DOE program that
1395 would risk undermining market competition for new capacity,
1396 DOE would first identify potential domestic supply needs,
1397 taking into account waivers authorized under the bill,

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1398 private and government-enriched uranium inventories, market
1399 demand, and current orders and announced plans for new
1400 production capacity, including domestic capacity.

1401 This evaluation will provide DOE, this committee, and
1402 appropriators up-to-date information to authorize and provide
1403 targeted support needed for the industry if it is needed.
1404 And this would account for market competition, supply
1405 diversity, and long-term fuel supply needs for the United
1406 States.

1407 I agree with our chairwoman that the prerequisite for
1408 any action to ensure that we have domestic supplies is to
1409 provide the certainty that Russian fuel not be available to
1410 the United States for a long period of time.

1411 The market for fuel is a mature market. The United
1412 States has the largest nuclear fuel market in the world.
1413 Recent Commerce Department determinations find that Russia
1414 has limited options if we cut them off and strong incentive
1415 to flood the market if it has the opportunity.

1416 Right now, we could lose Russian access to Russian fuels
1417 at any time. Last week, the Secretary of Energy said that
1418 utilities need to build up domestic capacity in advance

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1419 before they can end the use of Russian supplies. I agree
1420 with our chairwoman that this thinking only delays the action
1421 we must take to provide market certainty.

1422 Without assurance that Russia will not reenter the
1423 market in the future, there will not be the certainty needed
1424 to invest in new capacity, and taxpayers shouldn't carry this
1425 risk either. If we don't provide that market certainty, our
1426 nuclear fleet will remain at risk of supply disruptions, and
1427 Russia will continue to benefit from its strategic control
1428 over U.S. energy supplies.

1429 I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and to
1430 support H.R. 1042.

1431 Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

1432 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1433 Any other member wishing to speak on the amendment?

1434 Seeing none, I will now call for a vote.

1435 All those in favor of the Latta amendment, say aye.

1436 Any opposed, no.

1437 And the ayes have it.

1438 Any other member wishing to offer an amendment?

1439 *Ms. Kuster. Mr. Chairman?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1440 *Mr. Duncan. Ms. Kuster.

1441 *Ms. Kuster. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike

1442 the last word. I am going to offer and withdraw my

1443 amendment, Kuster_029.

1444 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady is recognized.

1445 So we have withdrawn that amendment?

1446 *Ms. Kuster. No, no, no. I was going to speak to it.

1447 I did know if --

1448 *Mr. Duncan. Okay. You are recognized.

1449 *Ms. Kuster. Thank you.

1450 *Mr. Duncan. The clerk will report the amendment.

1451 *Ms. Kuster. Thank you.

1452 *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1042, offered by

1453 Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire. Page 2, line 7, insert "or by a

1454 Russian entity'" after--

1455 [The Amendment offered by Ms. Kuster follows:]

1456

1457 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1458

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1459 *Mr. Duncan. Further reading of the amendment is
1460 dispensed with, and Ms. Kuster is recognized to explain the
1461 amendment.

1462 *Ms. Kuster. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think everyone
1463 on this committee can agree that the United States should not
1464 buy low-enriched uranium from Russia. The proceeds of the
1465 more than \$1 billion that we spend on these imports go
1466 directly into the Russia war machine and the unlawful Russian
1467 war in Ukraine.

1468 My amendment would widen the definition in this bill to
1469 make it more difficult for Rosatom, Russia's state-owned
1470 nuclear energy company, and its affiliates, to -- cannot
1471 evade the import prohibition in the bill.

1472 As this bill moves to full committee, I hope we can work
1473 in a bipartisan way to strengthen the underlying proposal to
1474 ensure Russia cannot evade these restrictions. I also hope
1475 we can ensure there is adequate support for the domestic
1476 supply chains to ensure there are no fuel disruptions due to
1477 this ban.

1478 And with that, I ask for unanimous consent to withdraw
1479 my amendment.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1480 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.
1481 Anyone else seeking recognition to speak on the
1482 amendment? She withdrew the amendment. Right.
1483 So the gentlelady withdrew the amendment.
1484 Any other amendments to be offered?
1485 Mrs. Rodgers is recognized.
1486 *The Chair. I move to strike the last word.
1487 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady moves to strike the last
1488 word. The gentlelady is recognized.
1489 *The Chair. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we
1490 sit here today, our nuclear industry continues to purchase
1491 more than 20 percent of its nuclear fuel from Russia. Russia
1492 ranks as the world's biggest supplier of enriched uranium,
1493 accounting for nearly half of the global capacity.
1494 Moscow's state-owned nuclear power company, Rosatom, has
1495 earned billions from U.S. and European customers. Russia
1496 could disrupt these supplies to the United States tomorrow or
1497 at any time. Putin won't hesitate to weaponize Russia's
1498 energy supplies for his strategic advantage, as we know that
1499 the uncertainties of war could disrupt this supply and lead
1500 to the loss of nuclear fuel supplies, and we know that the

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1501 uncertainties of war could disrupt this supply and lead to
1502 the loss of nuclear fuel supplies.

1503 The harm from this would not -- the harm from any of
1504 this would not be immediate. That is because the industry
1505 has long lead stockpiles of fuel supplies, and there are
1506 other government resources that have been established which
1507 would protect operations from vulnerable reactors for many
1508 years.

1509 Also, fortunately, the Ukraine war is compelling
1510 European and U.S. utilities to shift contracts to non-Russian
1511 fuels. But this is not expected to be enough to build the
1512 domestic capacity to replace Russian fuels or to solve our
1513 fuel supply vulnerability, which will have long-term
1514 consequences for the health of the industry.

1515 People may not realize it, but fuel processing plants in
1516 the United States already have the licensed capacity today to
1517 replace the supply of Russian low-enriched uranium fuel. The
1518 problem is, no facility owner is going to invest the billions
1519 of dollars to reach that licensed capacity without the
1520 certainty of long-term contracts for their products to cover
1521 the investments.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1522 And those long-term contracts from fuel customers, the
1523 utilities, will not be written if there remains uncertainty
1524 about the future of Russian fuels and the risk that Russia
1525 will once again be able to flood the market with its massive
1526 production capacity.

1527 Last week Secretary Granholm agreed that we must make
1528 sure our fleet is secure and should ban Russian fuels as a
1529 part of a long-term uranium strategy. However, she had the
1530 sequence exactly backwards. To flip the switch on building
1531 American nuclear fuels infrastructure, and provide the
1532 domestic fuels industry needs, we first need to signal that
1533 Russia won't be able to come into the American market for a
1534 very long time.

1535 H.R. 1042 provides the long-term certainty needed to
1536 establish a durable, domestic supply of fuel for the fleet.
1537 It establishes a prohibition on Russian-sourced fuels and
1538 waivers to cover supply gaps leading up to a date certain,
1539 2028, when no more Russian fuel will be allowed to be
1540 imported into the United States. This both protects any
1541 identified short-term needs of the industry and provides the
1542 long-term certainty necessary for contracts and investments

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1543 to flow to build out American capacity.

1544 This puts the private market to work, a market involving
1545 tens of billions of dollars through 2040. This protects
1546 taxpayers who also need certainty that any DOE assistance
1547 will not be wasted with a rebound to Russian fuels.
1548 H.R. 1042 provides that there will be a role for federal
1549 support, but we first must have the market certainty in place
1550 to assess what that support should be.

1551 I am pleased Mr. Latta has offered this amendment to
1552 update our bill to require a comprehensive market evaluation,
1553 something DOE has yet to do. This will provide the
1554 information necessary to target any additional assistance
1555 where it may be needed, so we ensure a strong domestic fuel
1556 supply.

1557 H.R. 1042 will make our domestic industry more secure
1558 from the looming threats of Russia. I urge you to support
1559 the Prohibiting Russian Uranium Act. It strengthens American
1560 industry, protects taxpayers, increases our security, and
1561 will help stop Putin from weaponizing energy resources to
1562 undermine freedom here and around the world. It strengthens
1563 American industry, protects taxpayers. I think I just said

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1564 that.

1565 So thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

1566 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back.

1567 Any other members seeking recognition? Mr. Cardenas.

1568 *Mr. Cardenas. Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

1569 I will be brief. I was trying to look for an opportunity to

1570 say what I am about to same with germaneness. And since

1571 uranium has a half-life of thousands of years, I just wanted

1572 to say thank you to my wife Norma for 31 years of marriage

1573 today for -- and the germaneness --

1574 [Applause.]

1575 *Mr. Cardenas. And the germaneness is that my love for

1576 you is eternal.

1577 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1578 Any other members seeking recognition? Congratulations,

1579 Tony.

1580 Any members seeing to offer an amendment? Mr. Pallone

1581 is recognized.

1582 *Mr. Pallone. That is hard to follow. But thank you.

1583 Yes, I have amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

1584 *Mr. Duncan. The clerk will report the amendment.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1585 *Mr. Pallone. MN_01.

1586 *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1042, offered by Mr.

1587 Pallone. Strike Section 3 and insert the following,

1588 "Section 3, United States Nuclear Fuel Security Initiative,

1589 (a) Sense of Congress''--

1590 [The Amendment offered by Mr. Pallone follows:]

1591

1592 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1593

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1594 *Mr. Duncan. Further reading of the amendment is
1595 dispensed with. Mr. Pallone is recognized to explain his
1596 amendment.

1597 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1598 I agree with Chair Rodgers that our civilian nuclear
1599 fleet's dependence on Russian uranium is a problem, and we
1600 are certainly willing to work in a bipartisan fashion to
1601 address this issue.

1602 Unfortunately, as Energy Secretary Granholm highlighted
1603 in this very room last week when she came before the
1604 subcommittee, if we are serious about weaning ourselves off
1605 of Russian uranium, then we have to be serious about making
1606 investments in the domestic uranium supply chain.

1607 Now, setting a deadline, as Chair Rodgers said, for
1608 ending imports will create a market signal for expanded
1609 private investment, but this will need to be paired, in my
1610 opinion, with federal support to quickly end the use of
1611 Russian fuel. Without government investment, a 2026 target
1612 will not be tenable.

1613 So right now there is only a single uranium enrichment
1614 facility operating in the United States. It can only support

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1615 roughly 1/3 of our uranium requirements for our nuclear
1616 fleet. There are zero -- not one uranium conversion facility
1617 that is currently operating in the U.S. So, simply put,
1618 right now we lack the infrastructure to ban all Russian
1619 uranium imports overnight, and such a ban could put at risk
1620 our Nation's largest single source of clean energy.

1621 Instead, we have to wind down imports of Russian uranium
1622 while simultaneously investing in our own domestic
1623 manufacturing and processing capabilities, which is exactly
1624 what my amendment does.

1625 My amendment simply adds a new section to the bill that
1626 is identical to a bill introduced by Mr. Latta, the Nuclear
1627 Fuel Security Act. This bill would create programs within
1628 the Department of Energy to ensure the supply of low-enriched
1629 uranium that our current reactors demand and the high-assay
1630 low-enriched uranium that the next generation advanced
1631 nuclear reactors will need.

1632 Partnering these ideas together will allow us to ensure
1633 we get off Russian uranium responsibly without handicapping
1634 our domestic nuclear industry. In fact, we understand that
1635 the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee will hold a

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1636 markup tomorrow on similar language to this amendment, also
1637 pairing it with language to ban Russian imports.

1638 So I urge any members of this subcommittee interested in
1639 working in a thoughtful manner on this vital issue to support
1640 my amendment.

1641 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

1642 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1643 Any further discussion on the amendment? Mr. Latta is
1644 recognized.

1645 *Mr. Latta. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last
1646 word.

1647 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman is recognized.

1648 *Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate my
1649 colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their
1650 engagement on this issue on nuclear fuels. I said earlier I
1651 am proud of the work that I have done, and the other members
1652 of the subcommittee, and for helping to spur this important
1653 conversation that we are having, especially this conversation
1654 that came up when the secretary was here last week, and the
1655 conversation we are having today.

1656 With the market evaluation component in H.R. 1042, it

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1657 takes the right approach at reducing United States' reliance
1658 on Russian imports of uranium. In light of the new feedback
1659 we have received and the good conversations I have had with
1660 my colleagues and the stakeholders, I am hopeful that we can
1661 incorporate the feedback into an updated version of my
1662 legislation.

1663 If my colleague would be willing to withdraw the
1664 amendment, I am committed to working with you, our full
1665 committee chair, and other members of this committee to
1666 update this legislation that can be considered within the
1667 subcommittee in the very near future.

1668 And with that, I yield back.

1669 *Mr. Pallone. Will the gentleman yield?

1670 *Mr. Latta. Yes, I yield back, or I yield to my friend.

1671 *Mr. Pallone. I appreciate that, and I certainly would
1672 like to work with you. That is the whole point. But I do
1673 think that it is important to move forward with this
1674 amendment today. Again, it is essentially what you had
1675 stated in your bill, and I don't see any reason why we
1676 shouldn't pair it today.

1677 Again, I keep -- I understand that this deadline for

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1678 ending imports of a good thing to do, but I think that we
1679 need to have some federal support to end the use of Russian
1680 fuel. And without that government investment, I don't think
1681 the target that the chair has proposed can be met.

1682 So I don't see any reason why we shouldn't move forward
1683 with the amendment. So I am not going to withdraw it, but I
1684 appreciate what you said.

1685 *Mr. Latta. Well, reclaiming my time -- and I thank my
1686 friend, but, as I said, I think that if we can work on this
1687 legislation in the future on both sides of the aisle, I am
1688 committed to it. I want to make sure we get this across the
1689 finish line.

1690 But, at this time, I would ask my fellow members to
1691 oppose the amendment, and at this time I yield back the
1692 balance of my time.

1693 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1694 Any other members seeking recognition on the amendment?

1695 Seeing none --

1696 *Mr. Pallone. I ask for a roll call, Mr. Chairman. You
1697 were going to maybe do it anyway, but I would ask for it.

1698 *Mr. Duncan. Seeing no other members seeking

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1699 recognition, a roll call has been requested on the amendment,
1700 so the clerk will call the roll.
1701 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess?
1702 *Mr. Burgess. No.
1703 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess votes no.
1704 Mr. Latta?
1705 *Mr. Latta. No.
1706 *The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.
1707 Mr. Guthrie?
1708 *Mr. Guthrie. No.
1709 *The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes no.
1710 Mr. Griffith?
1711 *Mr. Griffith. No.
1712 *The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.
1713 Mr. Johnson?
1714 *Mr. Johnson. No.
1715 *The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes no.
1716 Mr. Bucshon?
1717 *Mr. Bucshon. No.
1718 *The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes no.
1719 Mr. Walberg?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1720 *Mr. Walberg. No.
1721 *The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes no.
1722 Mr. Palmer?
1723 *Mr. Palmer. No.
1724 *The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.
1725 Mr. Curtis?
1726 *Mr. Curtis. No.
1727 *The Clerk. Mr. Curtis votes no.
1728 Mrs. Lesko?
1729 *Mrs. Lesko. No.
1730 *The Clerk. Mrs. Lesko votes no.
1731 Mr. Pence?
1732 *Mr. Pence. No.
1733 *The Clerk. Mr. Pence votes no.
1734 Mr. Armstrong?
1735 *Mr. Armstrong. No.
1736 *The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong votes no.
1737 Mr. Weber?
1738 *Mr. Weber. No.
1739 *The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.
1740 Mr. Balderson?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1741 *Mr. Balderson. No.
1742 *The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.
1743 Mr. Pfluger?
1744 *Mr. Pfluger. No.
1745 *The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.
1746 Chair Rodgers?
1747 *The Chair. No.
1748 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes no.
1749 Chair Duncan?
1750 *Mr. Duncan. No.
1751 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan votes no.
1752 Ms. DeGette?
1753 *Ms. DeGette. Aye.
1754 *The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.
1755 Mr. Peters?
1756 *Mr. Peters. Aye.
1757 *The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.
1758 Mrs. Fletcher?
1759 *Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
1760 *The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.
1761 Ms. Matsui?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1762 *Ms. Matsui. Aye.
1763 *The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
1764 Mr. Tonko?
1765 *Mr. Tonko. Aye.
1766 *The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
1767 Mr. Veasey?
1768 *Mr. Veasey. Aye.
1769 *The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.
1770 Ms. Kuster?
1771 *Ms. Kuster. Aye.
1772 *The Clerk. Ms. Kuster votes aye.
1773 Ms. Schrier?
1774 *Ms. Schrier. Aye.
1775 *The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.
1776 Ms. Castor?
1777 *Ms. Castor. Aye.
1778 *The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.
1779 Mr. Sarbanes?
1780 *Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
1781 *The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
1782 Mr. Cardenas?

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1783 *Mr. Cardenas. Aye.

1784 *The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.

1785 Ms. Blunt Rochester?

1786 *Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.

1787 *The Clerk. Ms. Blunt Rochester votes aye.

1788 Mr. Pallone?

1789 *Mr. Pallone. Aye.

1790 *The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

1791 *Mr. Duncan. Any member unrecorded?

1792 The clerk will report the total.

1793 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote there were

1794 13 ayes and 17 noes.

1795 *Mr. Duncan. The noes have it, and the amendment fails.

1796 Any further discussion on the bill?

1797 Mr. Palmer is recognized.

1798 *Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very

1799 brief.

1800 In this discussion about where we are heading in regard

1801 to the use of our nuclear facilities for generating power, we

1802 had a very productive and instructive, in my opinion, hearing

1803 on next generation nuclear and where we ought to go.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1804 And one of the questions that I posed to the director of
1805 our nuclear laboratory in Idaho was about how we can recycle
1806 what we have always considered spent nuclear fuel in the next
1807 generation nuclear. And I asked him, if we utilized what is
1808 in storage in I think 36 states that we have accumulated over
1809 the years, how long could we operate our nuclear facilities
1810 using spent fuel? In other words, not relying on anybody
1811 else. And he had actually already run those numbers and he
1812 said 100 years.

1813 So our long-term perspective really ought to be directed
1814 toward next generation nuclear, and it helps alleviate any
1815 reliance on Russia on anybody else for our nuclear fuel.

1816 With that, Mr. Chairman, I happily yield back.

1817 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1818 Any further discussion on the bill? Mr. Curtis is
1819 recognized.

1820 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak from a
1821 very unique perspective. I think Mr. Pallone mentioned there
1822 is one active uranium processing mill in the United States,
1823 and I am very proud that that is in my district.

1824 And what I have seen is there has been a lot of

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1825 discussion today about our ability to ramp up to the capacity
1826 needed. And what I have seen is an abundance of
1827 overregulation on this processing mill. What I have seen is
1828 signals from Washington, D.C., that investors would be scared
1829 of and shy away from.

1830 And if we really want to amp up U.S. production, I think
1831 we need to change two factors, and that is the message and
1832 signal that we are sending from Washington, D.C., that we are
1833 going to do business here in the United States, and that we
1834 will regulate this mill with appropriateness for
1835 environmental and safety standards, but not with an
1836 environmental agenda which goes far beyond these.

1837 So I support this bill today, and you can imagine how it
1838 is viewed with hypocrisy in my district that we are willing
1839 to import this from Russia and then turn a blind eye to the
1840 way that it is processed over there, the environmental
1841 standards that are ignored, the human rights standards that
1842 are ignored, and overregulate that in my district where we
1843 have an abundance of uranium and a processing mill.

1844 So I add my support to this bill, and I hope that we
1845 will send the right messages, so that we can do this at home

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1846 in a reasonably responsible way.

1847 And I yield the balance of my time.

1848 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back.

1849 Any other members seeking recognition?

1850 The chair will seek recognition, and I move to strike
1851 the last word. I am recognized.

1852 When I was a young man in the 1970s, the Department of
1853 Energy was created, and it was created for one purpose, to
1854 end our dependency on foreign countries for our energy. And
1855 energy today takes a lot of different forms, but the mission
1856 of the DOE is still clear -- to make sure that this Nation,
1857 from a national security aspect, and just from a standard of
1858 living aspect, that we can meet our own energy needs in this
1859 country. Pick your source.

1860 Today we are talking about uranium, and the fact that
1861 our Nation gets and relies upon 20 percent or more of
1862 enriched uranium from a foreign adversary: Russia. In the
1863 spirit of how the DOE is created, this is something the
1864 Department of Energy should be focused on. It shouldn't take
1865 an act of Congress to say we need a domestic support of
1866 enriched uranium to fuel the nuclear reactors that provide

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1867 the baseload energy that our constituents require and depend
1868 on every day. We should not be reliant on another country to
1869 meet our needs.

1870 Shoring up domestic supply chain for enriched uranium
1871 that our utilities can use to produce the power is critical
1872 to this Nation. We have seen what Vladimir Putin has done
1873 with influencing policy and standard of living issues in
1874 Europe by cutting on and cutting off the flow of natural gas
1875 and other energy sources to Europe.

1876 What is to say he doesn't cut off or limit the supply of
1877 enriched uranium to the United States? It is a national
1878 security issue for baseload generation.

1879 Even in the move to lessen carbon emissions in this
1880 country, nuclear power plays a huge role in that. But in
1881 order for it to continue to play a huge role, and a future
1882 larger role in energy production in this country, we have got
1883 to make sure they have the fuel that is necessary to burn in
1884 the reactors. Bottom line.

1885 I agree with Mr. Palmer. We have to -- and I commit to
1886 having a hearing on reprocessing and closing the fuel cycle
1887 and what we will do with the nuclear waste, and I look at it

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1888 as an asset, not a waste. It is a national asset, sits in 39
1889 states, Mr. Palmer, not 36 -- 39 -- at 121 sites. And that
1890 is an asset that can be reprocessed and used, as you said,
1891 for over 100 years of fuel.

1892 But until we get to that point, we need to make sure
1893 that utilities have a steady, reliable, domestically sourced
1894 supply chain of enriched uranium for our reactors. It is a
1895 national security issue, and the market needs this right
1896 signal that Congress is sending that we are focused on a
1897 domestic supply chain for that.

1898 I think Chair Rodgers' bill is appropriate in saying
1899 there needs to be a drop dead date. There needs to be a
1900 timeline. There needs to be a date certain, so that the
1901 market can respond to that. It is a mature market. It can
1902 do this. We can do this and be a leader in this globe on
1903 nuclear technology and nuclear fuel and nuclear energy
1904 production.

1905 I believe that really is a bipartisan approach. I am
1906 seeing more and more signals from my colleagues on the other
1907 side of the aisle that they are embracing nuclear, advanced
1908 nuclear, and SMRs and everything that we are looking at. But

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1909 in order for any of those technologies to work, it has to
1910 have either low-enriched or highly enriched nuclear fuel,
1911 domestically sourced, so we are not reliant on the whims of
1912 some oligarch or dictator across the globe.

1913 So this is the right bill. I commend Chair Rodgers for
1914 putting this up, and I fully support it. And I like the
1915 Manchin bill, and Latta's bill, and we will deal with that.
1916 But today is the right time to pass this legislation to the
1917 full committee, get it to the floor, send it to the Senate,
1918 and do the right thing for sourcing -- domestically sourcing
1919 something that is so critical to our baseload generation
1920 across this country and the future of nuclear energy in this
1921 country.

1922 And so I urge my colleagues to support that. I will
1923 yield back my time.

1924 Any further discussion on the bill?

1925 Seeing none, a roll call has been requested, so the
1926 clerk will report the -- or call the roll.

1927 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess?

1928 *Mr. Burgess. Aye.

1929 *The Clerk. Mr. Burgess votes aye.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1930 Mr. Latta?
1931 *Mr. Latta. Aye.
1932 *The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.
1933 Mr. Guthrie?
1934 *Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
1935 *The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes aye.
1936 Mr. Griffith?
1937 *Mr. Griffith. Aye.
1938 *The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.
1939 Mr. Johnson?
1940 *Mr. Johnson. Aye.
1941 *The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
1942 Mr. Bucshon?
1943 *Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
1944 *The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
1945 Mr. Walberg?
1946 *Mr. Walberg. Aye.
1947 *The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
1948 Mr. Palmer?
1949 *Mr. Palmer. Aye.
1950 *The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1951 Mr. Curtis?
1952 *Mr. Curtis. Aye.
1953 *The Clerk. Mr. Curtis votes aye.
1954 Mrs. Lesko?
1955 *Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
1956 *The Clerk. Mrs. Lesko votes aye.
1957 Mr. Pence?
1958 *Mr. Pence. Aye.
1959 *The Clerk. Mr. Pence votes aye.
1960 Mr. Armstrong?
1961 *Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
1962 *The Clerk. Mr. Armstrong votes aye.
1963 Mr. Weber?
1964 *Mr. Weber. Aye.
1965 *The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes aye.
1966 Mr. Balderson?
1967 *Mr. Balderson. Aye.
1968 *The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes aye.
1969 Mr. Pfluger?
1970 *Mr. Pfluger. Aye.
1971 *The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes aye.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1972 Chair Rodgers?
1973 *The Chair. Aye.
1974 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes aye.
1975 Chair Duncan?
1976 *Mr. Duncan. Aye.
1977 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan votes aye.
1978 Ms. DeGette?
1979 *Ms. DeGette. No.
1980 *The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes no.
1981 Mr. Peters?
1982 *Mr. Peters. No.
1983 *The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
1984 Mrs. Fletcher?
1985 *Mrs. Fletcher. No.
1986 *The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes no.
1987 Ms. Matsui?
1988 *Ms. Matsui. No.
1989 *The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes no.
1990 Mr. Tonko?
1991 *Mr. Tonko. No.
1992 *The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

1993 Mr. Veasey?

1994 *Mr. Veasey. No.

1995 *The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes no.

1996 Ms. Kuster?

1997 *Ms. Kuster. No.

1998 *The Clerk. Ms. Kuster votes no.

1999 Ms. Schrier?

2000 *Ms. Schrier. Yes.

2001 *The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

2002 Ms. Castor?

2003 *Ms. Castor. No.

2004 *The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes no.

2005 Mr. Sarbanes?

2006 *Mr. Sarbanes. No.

2007 *The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.

2008 Mr. Cardenas?

2009 *Mr. Cardenas. No.

2010 *The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes no.

2011 Ms. Blunt Rochester?

2012 *Ms. Blunt Rochester. No.

2013 *The Clerk. Ms. Blunt Rochester votes no.

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

2014 Mr. Pallone?

2015 *Mr. Pallone. No.

2016 *The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes no.

2017 *Mr. Duncan. Are there any members unrecorded?

2018 Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.

2019 *The Clerk. Chair Duncan, on that vote there were

2020 18 ayes and 12 noes.

2021 *Mr. Duncan. The ayes have it, and the bill is agreed

2022 to and will be forwarded to the full committee.

2023 Without objection, the staff is authorized to make

2024 technical and conforming changes to the legislation approved

2025 by the subcommittee today. So ordered.

2026 Without objection, the subcommittee will stand

2027 adjourned.

2028 [Whereupon, at 11:34 a.m., the subcommittee was

2029 adjourned.]