



FROM: Kountoupes Denham Carr & Reid

DATE: Tuesday, May 13, 2025

RE: House Energy and Commerce Full Committee Reconciliation Markup of H. Con. Res. 14

Topline Summary

- Members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee convened on Tuesday to begin their markup of Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year (FY) 2025. The Committee's legislation, which is divided into four sections; Energy, Environment, Communications, & Health, is estimated to save \$880 billion over 10 years. During opening statements, Democrats were heavily critical of the underlying text and focused almost entirely on its potential impacts on Medicaid and its beneficiaries. Democratic members highlighted CBO estimates that 13.7 million Americans could lose their healthcare coverage under the bill and attributed this to the eligibility requirements it would impose on beneficiaries. Conversely, Republicans argued that the bill would help eliminate waste and fraud within the Medicaid program, ensuring its long term viability and health. The Committee advanced the committee recommendations and language for H. Con. Res. 14 to the Budget Committee on a party-line vote of 30Y-24N.
- The Committee began its consideration of the underlying text with Subtitle A, the energy portion of the bill. During debate of this subtitle, Republicans argued that the underlying text would help bolster American industries such as oil and gas as well as decrease the United States dependency on foreign energy. Democrats, however, were very critical of the bill text, arguing that it would favor the fossil fuel industry at the expense of clean energy, repeal critical grants and programs from the IRA which have bolstered domestic industries such as EVs, and eliminate state's authority over energy infrastructure within their borders. A majority of the discussion, however, focused on provisions within the underlying bill that would allow LNG companies to pay a \$10 million fee in order to bypass portions of the permitting process for LNG exports. Democrats argued that this policy amounted to a pay to play scheme which would ultimately lead to greater national security risks, greater environmental risks, and potential corruption. Democrats additionally argued that the policy would effectively eliminate public input and other forms of review in the permitting process for these imports as well. Republicans responded to these claims by noting that the legislation would not eliminate all forms of review, explaining that the FERC review process would not be impacted. Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) offered an amendment which would prevent the implementation of the bill until the OIG at DOE certified that it will not result in increased instances of corruption which jeopardize the permitting process. This bill was not favorably agreed to along party lines. Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA) offered an amendment which would prevent the bill from being implemented until the administration lowered tariffs on energy products to 2024 levels. Rep. Auchincloss criticized the uncertainty that tariffs have caused within the energy sector and expressed concern that these policies could ultimately hinder the United States ability to develop new technologies in geothermal, nuclear, and AI. This amendment was also not favorably agreed to along party lines.



- The Committee continued with consideration of the underlying text with Subtitle B, the environment portion of the bill. Democratic members voiced strong opposition to provisions that would dismantle key environmental programs enacted under the IRA. Ranking Member Pallone warned that the bill seeks to repeal clean vehicle standards, slash funding for programs like the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, environmental justice block grants and climate pollution reduction grants, undermining investments improving communities. Rep. Tonko expressed concern over the elimination of air pollution controls and climate research funding. Rep. Ruiz highlighted disproportionate health impacts in polluted communities, while Rep. Dingell condemned the repeal of emission standards as destabilizing for the auto industry and a threat to American jobs and competitiveness. She also introduced an amendment to delay GGRF repeal pending consumer cost analysis, arguing that the program drives clean energy investment and economic growth. Rep. Troy Carter offered another amendment to preserve climate justice grants for low-income communities, but both of these amendments were rejected. Other Democrats like Reps. Menendez, Barragan and Peters defended programs like the methane fee, EV incentives and clean energy job creation, pushing back against Republican claims of fraud and inefficiency. Republicans countered with critiques of EV costs, emissions data and regulatory overreach.
- The Committee then considered Subtitle C which focused on the communications portions of the bill. Much of the focus throughout debate on Subtitle C centered around spectrum auction authority. While members on both sides of the aisle seemed to support restoring the FCC's auction authority, Democrats took issue with the underlying bill's use of the revenue that could be generated from those auctions. Democrats highlighted the growing need to modernize emergency services and drive down broadband costs, arguing that revenue raised from spectrum auctions should be used to invest back to address these needs. Democrats also spoke out against the underlying bill's inclusion of a 10-year moratorium on state regulations for AI. Members on this side of the aisle argued that the moratorium would prevent states from protecting consumers, adding that the federal government and the underlying bill have failed to provide federal protections for consumers against this rapidly changing technology. In response to an amendment offered by Ranking Member Pallone on the matter, Republicans highlighted that the federal preemption was necessary in order to ensure that the federal government could effectively modernize and incorporate AI. The amendment was not favorably agreed to along party lines.
- The Committee spent a majority of the markup focusing on the health subtitle of the underlying bill. Democrats continued to highlight that the underlying bill could remove over 13.7 million Americans from Medicaid and criticize provisions which would require \$35 copay per doctors visit, eliminate staffing requirements for nursing homes, limit states enrollment periods, allow insurance companies to offer less coverage than previously required under ACA, ban those who fail Medicaid eligibility requirements from seeking coverage on ACA marketplace, & prohibit states from raising provider tax. Republicans argued that the underlying bill would address waste, fraud, and abuse within the Medicaid program, therefore protecting its long-term viability and ability to serve its beneficiaries effectively. Democrats offered amendments focusing on medical debt, Planned Parenthood, healthcare coverage, HCBS, provider taxes, most-favored nations, and nursing homes. Despite this, however, every amendment offered by those in the minority were not favorably agreed to along party lines.

Members Attending: Chairman Brett Guthrie (R-KY), Ranking Member Frank Pallone (D-NJ), Rep. Diana DeGette (D-CO), Rep. Doris Matsui (D-CA), Rep. Buddy Carter (R-GA), Rep. Kathy Castor (D-FL), Rep. Morgan Griffith (R-VA), Rep. Nannette Barragan (D-CA), Rep. Paul Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Scott Peters (D-CA), Rep. Lori Trahan (D-MA), Rep. Yvette Clarke (D-NY), Rep. Nick Langworthy (R-NY), Rep. August Pfluger (R-TX), Rep. Raul Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-MI), Rep. Alexandra



Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), Rep. Kim Schrier (D-WA), Rep. Darren Soto (D-FL), Rep. John James (R-MI), Rep. Gus Bilirakis (R-FL), Rep. Lizzie Fletcher (D-TX), Rep. Jake Auchincloss (D-MA), Rep. Kat Cammack (R-FL), Rep. Erin Houchin (R-IN), Rep. Robin Kelly (D-IL), Rep. Greg Landsman (D-OH), Rep. Cliff Bentz (R-OR), Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL), Rep. Troy Carter (D-LA), Rep. Russell Fry (R-SC), Rep. Kevin Mullin (D-CA), Rep. Russ Fulcher (R-ID), Rep. Diana Harshbarger (R-TN), Rep. Tom Kean (R-NJ), Rep. Bob Latta (R-OH), Rep. Richard Hudson (R-NC), Rep. Rob Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. John Joyce (R-PA), Rep. Gary Palmer (R-AL), Rep. Neal Dunn (R-FL), Rep. Dan Crenshaw (R-TX), Rep. Randy Weber (R-TX), Rep. Rick Allen (R-GA), Rep. Troy Balderson (R-OH), Rep. Laurel Lee (R-FL), Rep. Michael Rulli (R-OH), Rep. Gabe Evans (R-CO), Rep. Craig Goldman (R-TX), Rep. Julie Fedorchak (R-ND), Rep. Marc Veasey (D-TX), & Rep. Jennifer McClellan (D-VA).

[Live Hearing Link](#)

Markup called to order by Chairman Guthrie.

Opening Statements

Chairman Brett Guthrie (R-KY): Good afternoon everybody, and welcome to today's markup, which is a rare opportunity to address issues spanning the full jurisdiction of this Committee, from unleashing American energy to ending costly EV mandates, advancing American innovation to truly strengthening the Medicaid program for the most vulnerable Americans, and improving Americans' access to quality health care.

The House Budget Committee has tasked us with identifying \$880 billion in savings and new revenue.

We've worked diligently to meet that target by ending wasteful Green New Deal-style spending, supporting the rapid innovation of American industry and federal agencies, and eliminating the waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicaid that jeopardizes care for millions of women, children, people with disabilities, and elderly Americans.

To ensure American energy dominance, we will secure our energy infrastructure by taking steps to refill our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which strengthens our energy security and supports our national security. In order to support the abundant energy production that will be necessary to secure our grid, and in order to increase revenue, we will expand the use of user fees to help streamline the siting and permitting of new oil, natural gas, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen pipelines.

We can save \$172 billion over the next 10 years by repealing burdensome Biden-Harris Administration regulations, and over \$100 billion by eliminating EV mandates imposed by the vehicle emission and CAFE standards that have failed to serve American taxpayers.

And through investments to modernize the Department of Commerce, we can integrate AI systems to make the Department more secure and effective. To protect the integrity of this project, we are implementing guardrails that protect against state level AI laws that could jeopardize our technological leadership.

Our legislation will raise \$88 billion of new revenue through a historic agreement reauthorizing the FCC's spectrum auction authority, while protecting U.S. national security.

Biden-era inflation has left Americans struggling to access affordable health care.



The issue has been exacerbated by the decisions of left-leaning state governments to spend taxpayer dollars on illegal immigrants. We make no apologies for prioritizing Americans in need over illegal immigrants and those who are capable but choose not to work.

Our priority remains the same: strengthen and sustain Medicaid for those whom the program was intended to serve: expectant mothers, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly.

We are prepared to stop the billions of dollars of waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicaid program by beginning to rein in loopholes, ensuring states have the flexibility to remove ineligible recipients from their rolls, and removing beneficiaries who are enrolled in multiple states. These are all commonsense policies that will return taxpayer dollars to middle-class families.

Medicaid was created to protect health care for Americans who otherwise could not support themselves, but Democrats expanded the program far beyond this core mission. That's why we are establishing common sense work requirements for capable, but not working adults in the expansion population. Let me be clear – these work requirements would only apply to able-bodied adults without dependents who don't have a disqualifying condition, encouraging them to re-enter the workforce and regain their independence.

All of this is part of our effort to strengthen Medicaid for the people that need it most.

When President Trump delivered his second inaugural address, he promised “a revolution of common sense” that would launch a generation of growth, prosperity, and health.

This reconciliation bill is critical to that promise the President and Congressional Republicans made to the American people.

Today, we bring before the committee a package that unleashes American energy dominance, advances innovation, and protects access to care for our most vulnerable.

Each of these is a core part of our effort to re-spark the American Dream and ensure our country will always be the land of opportunity.

I have no doubt that we will have some robust discussions today about these proposals. These discussions are important, and I look forward to using this time to address the issues that matter most to the American families we serve. So, I thank you all for your hard work as we continue our work to serve the American people.

Ranking Member Frank Pallone (D-NJ): For months now, President Trump and Congressional Republicans promised the American people they would not cut Medicaid benefits or strip away people's health care. In February, President Trump said: “Medicare, Medicaid – none of that stuff is gonna be touched.” House Speaker Johnson doubled down on that promise, stating, “The White House has made a commitment, the President has said over and over: ‘We’re not going to touch Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid. We’ve made that same commitment.’”

Those are the promises Republicans made to the American people. Well now, we have the bill, and it is clear they were being deceitful all along.



You don't have to take my word for it – the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office's own analysis shows that at least 13.7 million Americans will lose their health care coverage as a result of Trump and Congressional Republicans' actions. The Medicaid and Affordable Care Act cuts included in the Energy and Commerce bill will make up at least 8.6 million of that total number. And these are just early numbers from CBO – they are expected to grow.

Let me be clear – this is not a moderate bill, and it is not focused on cutting 'waste, fraud, and abuse.' Instead, Republicans are intentionally taking health care away from millions of Americans so they can give giant tax breaks to the ultra-rich who don't need them.

Medicaid is a lifesaving program that 80 million Americans count on every day. It provides health care to 1 in 3 Americans and nearly half of all children in the United States. It covers close to half of all births and is the largest source of funding for long-term care for seniors and people living with disabilities.

With this bill, Republicans are essentially telling millions of Americans – gotcha – no more health care for you. They are putting all sorts of burdensome and time-consuming roadblocks in the way of people just trying to get by – all so they can kick them off their health coverage. And if someone loses their coverage through Medicaid, this Republican bill bans them from getting coverage through the ACA Marketplace. They are prohibiting these people from getting health care. And this is just one way this bill repeals the ACA and makes it more difficult for people to get health coverage.

And Republicans are making it more difficult for states to finance their share of Medicaid costs by preventing them from implementing new provider taxes. This will be catastrophic for states as their health care needs change over time.

With this Republican bill, millions of Americans will lose their health care coverage. Hospitals, particularly those in underserved and rural communities, will close. Nursing homes will close, and seniors will lose the care they rely on. Emergency rooms will once again be overflowing as people are forced to delay care until it's life or death. And a larger number of uninsured Americans will lead to higher health care premiums for everyone – at a time when Republicans are already making health care unaffordable for millions more.

For decades, Democrats have been working relentlessly to make quality health care more accessible and affordable. It's worked – thanks to our efforts the number of uninsured Americans reached historic lows. But that is now all at risk as Trump and Congressional Republicans look to strip health care away from more than 13 million Americans and drive-up costs for everyone else.

What we are debating here today matters to millions of Americans. People like Lauren and Dani Zalepka. Lauren, who's on the right, is a longtime disability advocate in my community, but she's also a mom to her daughter Dani who has intellectual and developmental disabilities and relies on Medicaid. Thanks to programs available to Dani through Medicaid, she has become more independent. The programs help her manage her anxiety and stay connected to her friends.

Lauren is concerned about how devastating Medicaid cuts would be for people with disabilities. She has said: "Without programs like Medicaid that help them get out of bed in the morning, they will literally be stuck or worse, out in the community, unsafe and victimized." Lauren worries that cuts to Medicaid will take away her daughter's life, and she says: "Dani doesn't deserve that."



Lauren's right – Dani doesn't deserve that. And that's why Democrats will fight this cruel bill. The cruelty is the point that will strip health care away from millions of Americans so Republicans can give their ultra-rich friends massive tax breaks. We want to protect people's health care – not take it away.

And with that I yield back the balance of my time.

Rep. Diana DeGette (D-CO) also mentioned Republicans past insistence that they would not cut Medicaid and highlighted that 13.7 million could lose coverage under the bill. Rep. DeGette highlighted a constituent who had become paralyzed after a car accident, noting that Medicaid allowed him the ability to recover and live a full life. Rep. DeGette argued that the bill would lead to more dependency on states, reduce healthcare access for Americans, and severely impact local economies. She criticized eligibility requirements in the bill, including work requirements, and reiterated that this would lead to restricted access and higher uninsured rates.

Rep. Richard Hudson (R-NC) expressed his concern around ensuring the integrity and long-term viability of Medicaid so that Americans can continue to access its critical resources. He argued that Democrats are misrepresenting the contents of the bill.

Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL) talked about the importance of social security for her constituents, and called on her Republican colleagues to make sure the funding is available as it is a "life or death" situation.

Rep. John Joyce (R-PA) discussed waste and fraud within government programs and argued that the underlying bill does not address any changes to social security. Rep. Joyce argued that Americans who are able to return to the workforce have been draining resources from Medicaid and claimed that the underlying bill would ensure Medicaid is viable and stable going forward.

Rep. Doris Matsui (D-CA) compared the current discourse over Medicaid to the time when the Affordable Care Act was first passed and called out her Republican colleagues for not supporting funding for healthcare. She discussed her constituents with disabilities and argued that Medicaid is critical to ensure disability rights and dignity. She asserted that the Republicans' \$800 billion cut would be detrimental to disabled citizens despite their claims that it would not significantly impact that population.

Rep. Kathy Castor (D-FL) highlighted a young constituent of hers who suffers from cancer, noting that Medicaid was able to provide the family coverage when her employer based insurance was dropped. Rep. Castor noted the significant number of pediatric cancer patients who depend on Medicaid and expressed concern that the underlying bill might cut her constituents coverage at such a critical juncture.

Rep. Paul Tonko (D-NY) also highlighted a constituent who has greatly benefited from Medicaid and emphasized the benefits having coverage has on patients families as well. Rep. Tonko argued that families should not have to face more red tape when navigating healthcare coverage and care. He asked the majority to rethink the underlying bills cuts and red tape around the health program.

Rep. Yvette Clarke (D-NY) brought up the positive impact that Medicaid has had on specific constituents and hospitals in her district. She argued that Medicaid is an essential institution, and that choosing not to support it is a partisan choice that will negatively impact vulnerable populations. She also stated that Medicaid cuts would hurt predominantly Republican communities, such as red states.



Rep. Raul Ruiz (D-CA) encouraged his colleagues to work towards policies which benefit and improve the lives of constituents. He argued that the underlying bill would lead to at least 13.7 million people losing coverage and discussed one of his constituents who depends on Medicaid for her healthcare. Rep. Ruiz also noted his constituents dependency on planned parenthood as well for critical reproductive healthcare.

Rep. Scott Peters (D-CA) discussed a constituent who is fulltime caretaker for his disabled mother and noted that, under the bills work requirements, he would lose eligibility and his healthcare which his family depends on. He argued that the underlying bill is really about taxes and warned about the costly impacts of making TCJA tax policies permanent. Rep. Peters argued that, to cover these costs, the underlying bill decimates Medicaid and will make Americans sicker, all while increasing the deficit.

Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-MI) discussed a constituent's family that was attending the reconciliation. She talked about their fears over potential cuts. The Rep. stated that Michigan predominantly supports Medicaid, and that a significant amount of the state's population receive coverage. She also claimed that Medicaid was not a matter of fiscal responsibility, asserting that Medicaid is 22% more effective than private-cost programs.

Rep. Dan Crenshaw (R-TX) apologized to people who came all the way to this hearing because they were lied to by left-wing media and politicians about what is in this bill. He said that none of these people had actually read the bill and told George that his family would go home a lot better off.

Rep. Marc Veasey (D-TX) criticized past claims from Republicans that they wouldn't cut Medicaid. Rep. Veasey argued that the underlying bill would target children, mothers, seniors, and those with disabilities. He noted the topline cut in revenue, adding that this was done to fund the administration's tax cuts.

Rep. Robin Kelly (D-IL) said that this is not about government efficiency. She said that this Markup is about ripping healthcare away from working families, children, seniors, people with disabilities, veterans and pregnant women. She said that her Republican colleagues dismiss and laugh over Democrats' concerns over \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts as a misunderstanding. She went on to share a story of how Medicaid saved a child in her constituency from a rare condition, emphasizing that Medicaid is a lifeline for that child and millions of Americans across the country.

Rep. Nanette Barragan (D-CA) also noted Republicans past claims around not cutting Medicaid. She then highlighted a young constituent who would not have been able to receive treatment and care without Medicaid. She highlighted that the underlying bill cuts Medicaid, attacks the children's health insurance program, and impacts the insurance marketplace at-large. Rep. Barragan noted the eligibility requirements and expressed concern over beneficiaries ability to handle significant paperwork. Rep. Barragan also noted that, as costs continue to shift to states, Medicaid services such as community based care and assistance with transportation could be in jeopardy first.

Rep. Julie Fedorchak (R-ND) stated that Medicaid costs would increase drastically in future years due to ineligible members joining the system. Rep. Fedorchak argued that money meant for Medicaid would be spent on those individuals (i.e. undocumented, deceased, non-disabled). She asserted that the reforms Republicans are proposing would help the communities that Medicaid was designed for.

Rep. Darren Soto (D-FL) talked about how today is about taking healthcare from the poor to fund tax cuts for the rich. He mentioned how Republicans lost 20 seats in the 115th Congress after attacking



Obamacare, and the very same thing will happen again if Republicans keep up this act. He said that you can't cut \$750 billion from Medicaid and not have this affect our seniors, kids and veterans. He urged his Republican colleagues to not support such a bill.

Rep. Gary Palmer (R-AL) argued that those who are eligible for Medicaid will not lose Medicaid. Rep. Palmer argued that, between 2015-2024, there was \$543 billion worth of improper payments under Medicare and Medicaid, arguing that this fraud needs to be addressed. He echoed comments from those on his side of the aisle that the underlying bills policies around Medicaid will help save it.

Rep. Kim Schrier (D-WA) discussed the importance of providing healthcare to rural communities. She stated that cutting Medicaid would pose a threat to the maintenance of rural-based hospitals across the country, creating a critical access issue.

Rep. Lori Trahan (D-MA) shared a story about one of her constituents and how Medicaid has been crucial to allowing him to participate meaningfully in society. She said that this bill will slash the federal Medicaid funding that people rely on. She said that these people need Medicaid to be protected and urged her Republican colleagues to oppose the bill.

Rep. Lizzie Fletcher (D-TX) expressed her concern about the underlying bill. She highlighted CBOs estimate that 13.7 million people who depend on Medicaid will lose coverage. She highlighted a constituent who received home healthcare through Medicaid which allowed him to move out of care facilities and increase his own autonomy. Rep. Fletcher argued that Democrats have chosen policies which invest in the U.S. and Americans. She argued that Medicaid expansion included in the ACA has benefited millions.

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) questioned a section of the bill that stated individuals kicked from Medicaid would not be allowed to buy their insurance. She brought up specific districts in the United States that would be negatively affected from hospital closures. She also argued that the money taken from Medicaid cuts would go towards tax cuts for the rich instead of being invested in those in need of healthcare.

Rep. Jake Auchincloss (D-MA) noted that the 13.7 million people who will lose healthcare will not stop getting he sick. He explained that, due to losing coverage of primary and preventative care, these individuals will ultimately require more healthcare and visit the ER more often. He noted that, because of this, this policy will impact all Americans as healthcare becomes more expensive and health insurance premiums increase. Rep. Auchincloss additionally argued that those who remain on Medicaid will find it less effective and beneficial due to the bill. He highlighted a constituent who was paralyzed in an accident and highlighted the number of Americans who don't plan to rely on Medicaid but ultimately do because of similar circumstances.

Rep. Troy Carter (D-LA) said that Republicans are misleading the American people with this bill. He said that this is stealing from the poor and giving to the rich in the form of massive tax breaks for the wealthiest of the wealthy. He said that it is cruel, inhumane and wrong. He said that these decisions aren't just numbers on paper, they are affecting real lives. He then talked about one of his constituents and how Medicaid has been so crucial for them.

Rep. Rob Menendez (D-NJ) highlighted one of his constituents who relies on Medicaid and noted that none of the savings being generated by the underlying bill will be reinvested in the program. He noted



that the bill will make it harder for American families to access healthcare and encourage the Committee to work on policies that reinvest in the Medicaid program, not cut it.

Rep. Kevin Mullin (D-CA) talked about one of his disabled constituents who receives essential care from Medicaid, emphasizing that this is not government efficiency, it is utter cruelty. He implored his colleagues to consider these kinds of cases within their own districts, and to oppose the bill.

Rep. Greg Landsman (D-OH) referenced the Chairs comments about cutting healthcare for the people who don't need it as much. He questioned who in the U.S. doesn't need healthcare, noting that the cuts and red tape included in the bill will force people off insurance and impact the ability of beneficiaries to access healthcare. He highlighted provisions in the bill which prevent states from increasing provider taxes despite shifting much of the cost to them.

Rep. Jennifer McClellan (D-VA) – argued that the proposed bill would rise health care costs for everyone and kick eligible citizens from Medicaid. She asked Republicans to consider all the constituent stories that previous speakers shared in the hearing before deciding.

Rep. Erin Houchin (R-IN) emphasized that her Democratic colleagues are “fearmongering”. She said that this budget does not cut Medicaid, Medicare or Social Security for Americans who actually need them. She said that they are in fact eliminating waste fraud and abuse, saving the American taxpayers’ money. She said it is ending free healthcare for illegal immigrants, stopping payments to deceased individuals/duplicate enrollees, and funding underage transgender surgeries.

Rep. Kat Cammack (R-FL) argued that the most vulnerable, including mothers, should have access to resources across the country and argued that those referenced by Democrats would not lose coverage. Rep. Cammack claimed that millions of those on Medicaid are ineligible for the program and that additional millions choose not to work.

Chairman Guthrie clarified which individuals in the bill were exempt from the work requirement. He claimed that Democrats were misconstruing this exemption and argued that bill would target those who were most in need.

Ranking Member Pallone argued that the underlying bill eliminates healthcare from millions of Americans to help fund tax cuts. He moved that the Committee adjourn.

Pallone Motion to Adjourn

Pallone Motion to Adjourn was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y–29N.

Agenda

[H. Con. Res. 14](#), Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy

[H. Con. Res. 14](#), Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment

[H. Con. Res. 14](#), Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications

[H. Con. Res. 14](#), Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Discussion



H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy

Ranking Member Pallone discussed the IRA and argued that the bill helped lower prices and improve clean energy. Ranking Member Pallone expressed concern that the underlying bill would raise prices and gut the IRA. He criticized the provisions in the bill which would allow fossil fuel companies to pay \$10 million to obtain pipeline permits and ignore environmental laws. He said the figure for LNG is \$1 million and argued that LNG producers could even ignore national security concerns and requirements under the provision. Ranking Member Pallone noted Democrats willingness to work on permitting reform and argued that the underlying bill does not do that. He argued that states would lose authority over energy infrastructure within their borders as well and reiterated that prices would increase under the bill. He urged opposition to the energy section of the bill.

Rep. Peters said that he is confused that we are talking about efficiency while Republicans are favoring fossil fuel projects like coal, while shutting down affordable clean energy projects including solar and battery storage. He added that it also ignores transmission projects. He emphasized that sources of energy like LNG are still important, but we need to focus on a true “all energy” approach, not one that favors certain ones over another.

Castor Amendment 62BC2 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy

Rep. Castor argued that families are being financially squeezed right now and that the Trump administration is making it worse. She noted that utility companies have hiked rate over the past few months and noted the lack of legislation offered by the majority to address these issues. Rep. Castor explained that her amendment would delay provisions in the bill from being implemented until the Energy Information Administration studies the impact of the underlying bill. Rep. Castor highlighted the home energy rebates and transmission improvement line policies passed by Democrats a few years ago and noted their efforts to drive down costs.

Rep. Bob Latta (R-OH) noted that taking advantages of the US’s natural resources would help lower electricity prices in comparison to relying on sustainable energies. He urged his colleagues to consider rejecting the amendment.

Rep. Ocasio-Cortez expressed support for the amendment and argued that it would ensure the policies in the bill aren’t increasing costs on Americans. Rep. Ocasio Cortez argued that the underlying bill would increase gas exports by permitting new exports, leaving less gas available for Americans.

Rep. Castor discussed the negative impact that this bill would have in terms of consumer pricing and allowing natural resource companies to bypass current governmental checks and balances. She highlighted the importance of the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program, which she argued was critical for her constituents dealing with the aftermath of natural disasters. Rep. Castor stated that repealing tax incentives for cleaner energy is not recommended by experts in the energy industry because it will increase domestic energy prices. She urged support for her Amendment.

Rep. Rick Allen (R-GA) talked about how electricity in New York is much more expensive than it is in Georgia. He added that one of the largest clean energy facilities in the country, Plant Vogtle, is in his district. He said he didn’t know what numbers his Democratic colleagues were referring to, but ultimately using all sources of energy brings prices down, not just renewables.



Rep. Soto expressed his support for the amendment and noted the underlying bills elimination of the existing advanced technology vehicle manufacturing provisions. He highlighted the increasing production of EVs in his state and argued that American consumers are trending that direction as well. He expressed concern that, without these provisions, China could increase its overcapacity of EVs in the U.S. and eliminate high-paying American jobs. He then noted that the underlying bill would defund interstate transmission lines and argued that this reduction would lead directly to increased energy prices.

Castor Amendment 62BC2 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-30N.

Ocasio-Cortez Amendment 97AU7 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy

Rep. Ocasio-Cortez said her amendment would seek to address potential corruption. She highlighted recent man-made disasters brought on by polluting corporations. She argued that language in the bill which allow gas companies to bypass the traditional permitting process by paying a \$1 million fee. She argued that allowing corporations to completely bypass entire permits is dangerous and could negatively impact Americans. She explained that her amendment would require the OIG at DOE certify that the bill will not result in increased instances of corruption which jeopardize the permitting process.

Rep. Latta stated that the amendment was not necessary and that the current bill ensured that proper permitting processes would be taken. He stated that companies that violated permitting laws would face consequences outlined in the present version of the bill.

Rep. Castor expressed support for the amendment and explained that it would simply delay provisions in the bill from taking effect until the OIG certify that instances of corruption will not increase. She highlighted oil spills which have impacted her constituencies and warned that the underlying bill would effectively box out local communities from being involved in the development of new energy projects. She highlighted that the bill would eliminate judicial review as well as eliminate studies which ensure the project will benefit local communities.

Rep. Schrier said that she wants to strike the last word to express support for Congresswoman Ocasio-Cortez's amendment. She said that she is all for permitting reform, but there are ways to streamline permitting without sidelining renewable energy projects. She said that the Senate made great progress on this during the last Congress, but it couldn't get through this committee. She encouraged her colleagues to support the amendment.

Ranking Member Pallone discussed the LNG section of the underlying bill which allows LNG companies to submit a \$1 million to bypass permitting. He argued that the payment would eliminate any form of review and considers the \$1 million as being in the public interest.

Rep. Barragan expressed her support for the amendment. She argued that the Trump administration is corrupt and that measures should be taken to ensure anti-corruption efforts. She also brought up a constituent with a health condition who wrote to her to express his support for Medicaid. He discussed how Medicaid allowed him to maintain his independence. She argued that this point is related to the current proposed amendment because it also concerns limiting government waste and corruption and criticized the General Inspector office of Medicaid.



Rep. Fletcher expressed support for permitting reform and LNG exports. She argued that the pay to play policies in the bill, however, have never been policies discussed by the Committee. She sought clarity from counsel whether it is the case that, once the permitting fee is paid, there is no other review. Counsel said the underlying bill provides that the permitting fee be deemed in the public interest following FERC review. Counsel stated that the public interest payment would fall under DOE while FERC continues with its standard review. Rep. Fletcher then asked if it could be deemed in the public interest if LNG export permits are pursued for countries like China and Iran. Counsel stated that sanctions and tariffs would likely prevent this anyway. Rep. Fletcher then asked if there is language in the bill which would prevent LNG companies from using forms of payment like Trump coin. Counsel said he believe the bill did not prohibit this.

Rep. Peters said that it would be easy to just say you pay \$10 million to expedite the process, and that would put more lawyers out of work than AI.

Rep. Ocasio-Cortez clarified her amendment's intention. She discussed how the unamended bill authorizes oil and gas companies to pay a certain amount of money to waive regular permit processes for the reason of "public interest." She asserted that her amendment only authorized the General Inspector to certify that permitting processes by companies are not at risk of corruption. She questioned if the "public interest" reasoning outlined in the original bill also applied to potential environmental or health concerns that may result in waiving permitting to establish construction in certain areas. She argued that dissenters were claiming that her amendment interfered with more sections of the bill than it does.

Rep. Fletcher said that it should be easy to support this amendment and make sure that we have vetted this concept thoroughly. She talked about how there will be a lot of litigation involved, because people will be nervous to take up this proposal anyways. She added that you shouldn't have to pay millions of dollars just to get your permits reviewed.

Rep. Landsman asked Counsel if they could confirm that the language as written will prevent corruption. Counsel indicated that this would be a policy question.

Rep. Carter asked counsel whether the language in the underlying bill allows entities to bypass permitting. Counsel said that is incorrect and explained that it is two tracked, noting that one track involves the payment and ensures that the LNG exports are in the public interest and the other maintains FERCs review. Rep. Carter argued that the \$10 million fee creates an unfair advantage for certain companies. He argued that the amendment would purely ensure that the underlying bill does not lead to corruption and adverse effects from that.

Rep. Dan Crenshaw (R-TX) said that he feels his Democratic colleagues are "clutching their pearls" too hard when they are just talking about user fees. He said that the same exact thing exists with the FDA, so they should stop throwing around the term "corruption". He said that it is hypocritical for his Democratic colleagues to talk about money being thrown out the door when hundreds of billions of dollars went to third-party NGOs through the IRA who supposedly used that money on clean energy projects. He said that the former EPA Inspector General came before the committee and told them that there was no way of knowing where that money went.

Rep. McClellan argued that the bill was not referring to a user fee. She stated that specific text in the bill authorized companies to pay for project establishment without the approval of federal or state laws, which is not a user fee or an aspect of permitting reform.



Rep. August Pfluger (R-TX) argued that Democrats should read the Natural Gas Act and stated that the underlying bill does not allow LNG companies to bypass the review process when seeking export permits. He argued that the FERC process provides a rigorous environmental process which includes NEPA. Rep. Pfluger argued that the Natural Gas Act assumes that the Secretary of Energy will automatically approve the export of LNG to non-FTA countries.

Rep. Ocasio-Cortez asked Rep. Pfluger why Republicans are only singling out oil and gas companies with the user fee option.

Rep. Pfluger said that there are two key points to address- the public interest and the permitting process. He encouraged Rep. Ocasio-Cortez to come see West Texas and how safe and environmentally secure the process is. He said that on the issue of corruption, this is a process that is taking in revenue for the federal government and following all of the necessary permitting requirements.

Rep. McClellan asked the counsel if he agreed with a phrase in the majority memorandum referring to waiving permitting requirements under state or federal law. The counsel stated that an analysis of that text should be discussed by a legal expert.

Ocasio-Cortez Amendment 97AU7 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-28N.

Auchincloss Amendment 14UK301 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy

Rep. Auchincloss explained that his amendment would prevent the underlying language from taking effect until the Trump administration returns tariff levels on energy products to their levels on January 19th of this year. Rep. Auchincloss criticized the administrations tariff policies on other nations and noted the impact that the resulting uncertainty has had on the energy sector. Rep. Auchincloss argued that tariffs will lead the U.S. towards greater energy scarcity and dependence. He argued that this would have further impacts on the country's ability to build-out future forms of energy such as geothermal and nuclear as well as other technologies like AI.

Rep. Latta said that this amendment adds a new section relating to tariffs that does not relate to the underlying purpose of this legislation. He urged his colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Rep. Carter discussed a mother and son from his district that benefited from Medicaid. He emphasized the human motivation behind Medicaid. He thanked these constituents for coming to the hearing and highlighted the House of Representatives' duty to fight for those who may not be able to fight for themselves.

Rep. Veasey highlighted the impact of tariffs on small businesses. He additionally argued that the underlying bill ignores the real impacts of the current tariff agenda on the price of natural gas, solar panels, and critical minerals

Rep. Raul Ruiz (D-CA) said that Republicans promised to bring down the costs of living for Americans amid high inflation, however they are doing the exact opposite. He said that Trump's tariffs are estimated to lead to an average annual increase of \$5,000 in household expenses for everyday Americans. He said that this bill adds more instability to an already volatile situation. He said the DOE's LPO has played a key role in turning part of his district into "lithium valley", a region with the 5th largest lithium deposit in



the world, and they are doing so with cutting edge clean energy technologies. He talked about how these projects are about national security, as they reduce our dependence on China and help build up the infrastructure for the clean energy economy.

Auchincloss Amendment 14UK301 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-29N.

H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle A-Energy was favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 29Y-24N.

H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment

Ranking Member Pallone argued that this portion of the underlying bill would gut critical environmental protections and programs, including those in the IRA. He explained that the bill would seek to repeal clean vehicle standards and noted that Republicans have targeted IRA provisions like these for months. He argued that IRA funds have already been invested in communities across the country and are working. He claimed that the bill would target the greenhouse gas reduction fund, environmental justice block grants, climate pollution reduction grants, the clean ports program, and clean heavy vehicle program. Ranking Member Pallone argued that the IRA prioritized clean energy to ensure a clean future for new generations and reiterated that the underlying bill would dismantle those efforts and ultimately raise prices.

Rep. Tonko noted his own work on the IRA and questioned the majority's efforts to eliminate policies aiming to reduce air pollution, train contractor to retrofit home appliances, upgrade ports, and environmental legislation like the AIM Act. Rep. Tonko noted that the underlying bill would fund tax cuts and argued that these provisions will greatly hamper the United States ability to research and assess the impacts of climate change.

Rep. Ruiz talked about how individuals in air polluted communities live on average 10 years less than those who do not. He said that this is just one of many examples of how this bill would impact vulnerable populations, just like cuts to Medicare. He raised concerns about how many of the children in his district are disproportionately affected by air pollution, with heightened rates of Asthma and other conditions. He urged his colleagues to support the amendment for the sake of providing healthy environments for our children.

Rep. Dingell said that this bill causes total chaos for the auto industry. She criticized the repeal of EPA's emission standards for light and medium duty vehicles and NHTSA's corporate average fuel economy standards. She said that the domestic auto industry needs certainty above all, emphasizing the importance of protecting American jobs, maintaining an edge in automotive manufacturing and ensuring the U.S. leads in technology and innovation. She said that our policies need to reflect what is happening on the ground and prioritize consumer choice. She said that we need harmonized emissions and fuel economy standards and must preserve the IRA's tax incentives to remain globally competitive. She said that the global auto market demands EVs and we cannot let China get ahead of us. She urged her colleagues to oppose repeal of the EPA's and NHTSA's emission standards.

Carter Amendment ENVGN3 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment



Rep. Carter (D-LA) discussed EPA grants including the Environmental and Climate Justice Block Grant Program. Rep. Carter noted that the underlying bill claws back grants in this program which help low-income American access HVAC and train local workforces. He explained that his amendment would ensure that Environmental and Climate Justice Block Grant Program grants that improve health outcomes in low-income communities do not lose critical funding.

Carter Amendment ENVGN3 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-28N.

Dingell Amendment ENV59 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment

Rep. Dingell discussed her amendment and explained that it would delay implementation of language in the underlying text which repeals the Greenhouse Reduction Fund until the comptroller certifies to Congress that doing so will not increase costs to consumers. She noted the need to invest in clean energy, especially in underserved communities. She noted Republicans efforts to repeal this program and emphasized that no waste or abuse has been found within the program since its enactment in the IRA. She argued that repealing this program would eliminate 40,000 jobs, \$20 billion in wages, and higher energy bills for American families.

Rep. Griffith noted an instance of fraud and waste in his own district related to the Greenhouse Reduction Fund at the end of the Biden administration. He argued that the comptroller may or may not be able to guarantee that prices will increase but argued that there needs be better stewardship of taxpayers money. He urged his colleagues to vote no on the amendment.

Rep. Tonko noted the challenges many Americans face in affording energy bills. Rep. Tonko noted that, since the President's election, energy costs have only increased and argued that Congress should not be prioritizing any policies which increase financial strain on Americans. He noted the Rep. Dingell's amendment would ensure this does not happen by directing the comptroller to assess whether repealing GGRF funds would increase costs. Rep. Tonko noted that the GGRF investments could help save upwards of \$50 billion in energy costs over the next 20 years and generate enough electricity though solar project to power over 2 million homes per year. Rep. Tonko noted that the program has little unobligated funding left and argued that it has merely been a political football.

Rep. Buddy Carter (R-GA) criticized the Biden administration's implementation of the GGRF.

Rep. Ruiz expressed support for the amendment and argued that the GGRF helps provide funding for clean energy projects such as solar panel installation on homes. He noted the economic impact of these projects for local communities as well and highlighted projects in Texas and Georgia which helped create thousands of jobs.

Rep. Barragan spoke in support of the amendment and questioned her Republican colleagues claims that the GGRF has been wasteful.

Rep. Dingell echoed Rep. Barragan's comments and argued that neither Republican member provided any real evidence of fraud within GGRF.

Rep. Crenshaw discussed the Biden tailpipe rule and methane tax. Rep. Crenshaw questioned claims that EVs are getting cheaper and noted that, in 2022, EVs on average cost \$20,000 more than standard engine



vehicles. He also added that Volvo's own life cycle study found that its C40 EV is 70% more carbon intensive to build and that you have to drive it over 68,000 miles to breakeven on those emissions. He also argued that EV batteries require significant mining and noted that gas cars are already 90% cleaner than their counterparts in the 1990s. Rep. Crenshaw then mentioned the methane gas rule, highlighting that the U.S. has been able to provide cleaner forms of gas without mandates such as the one referenced.

Rep. Soto noted the increasing impact of extreme weather events and noted that the GGRF is intended to reduce the frequency of these events.

Rep. Barragan again criticized claims around waste and fraud, claiming that DOGE is also an example of fraud.

Rep. Menendez noted the White House's event showcasing Tesla EVs.

Rep. Fedorchak discussed her past as a utility regulator and noted discussions over lowering energy costs. Rep. Fedorchak argued that Democrats approach to solving energy price issues is through government regulations such as carbon free deadlines. She highlighted that these types of deadlines and the subsequent transition and infrastructure investments that need to be made all increase prices of energy. She argued that the U.S. should allow technology to guide energy development and reduce regulations so that energy production can flourish.

Rep. Fletcher argued that there needs to be more scrutiny of the administration's actions around rescinding IRA programs and grants.

Rep. Peters responded to comments around the methane tax from the IRA. Rep. Peters noted that methane gas has incredible greenhouse potential and noted its impact on public health as well. He highlighted that the methane fee is not a tax on energy production and, instead, only targets the largest producers and encourages companies to capture more methane. He added that this fee also helps make U.S. gas more competitive globally because it improves how clean U.S. gas is. He argued that to maintain U.S. LNG competitiveness, there needs to be cleaner methane practices.

Ranking Member Pallone noted that the methane program was created with industry and provided producers with funding so that they could upgrade their facilities.

Rep. Palmer also sought to provide examples of potential fraud within the GGRF. He also questioned claims that extreme weather is increasing.

Rep. Menendez expressed his support for the amendment and highlighted the benefits which the IRA provided to many states, including through the creation of clean energy jobs.

Rep. Palmer emphasized the importance of extending tax policies passed under TCJA.

Dingell Amendment ENV59 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 23Y-29N.

Menendez Amendment ENV 49 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment



Rep. Menendez explained that his amendment would strike language in the underlying bill which seeks to repeal and rescinds funding intended to reduce air pollution at schools. Rep. Menendez argued that the bill would reduce protections for kids at school to their bare minimums. He noted the impact of heightened pollution on kids school attendance and performance.

Menendez Amendment ENV_49 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 23Y-28N.

H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle B-Environment was favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 29Y-24N.

H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications

Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ) discussed the bipartisan work over the past few years to restore the FCC's spectrum auction authority which would help raise revenue to improve connectivity throughout the U.S. Ranking Member Pallone expressed disappointment with the underlying language and argued that Republicans abandoned commitments to fund greater connectivity and telecom projects with the proceeds from spectrum auctions. Ranking Member Pallone noted the need to modernize telecom systems like 911 centers and expressed support for the amendments his colleagues planned to introduce.

Rep. Matsui (D-CA) & Rep. Kelly (D-IL) echoed the Ranking Members comments about spectrum's bipartisan support and argued that that auction revenue should be invested in the public good. They also discussed the need to ensure deliberate spectrum authority review, the National Spectrum Strategy, broadband affordability, and concerns around the AI Information and Technology Modernization Initiative.

Carter Amendment COMM4 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications

Rep. Carter (D-LA) discussed his amendment and explained that it would add the text of the Next Generation 911 Act to the underlying bill, using the revenue from spectrum auctions to fund it. He noted the importance of modernizing 911 call centers and argued that first responders should and could have the best possible tools to better respond to emergencies.

Rep. Barragan (D-CA), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Soto (D-FL) spoke in support of the amendment, echoing concerns around outdated and lacking emergency services. They argued that the amendment would help improve response times and first responder safety.

Rep. Richard Hudson (R-NC) spoke against the amendment but acknowledged the need to modernize 911 systems and committed to work with his colleagues on the matter going forward.

Carter Amendment COMM4 to Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-28N.

Clarke Amendment COMM9 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications



Rep. Yvette Clark (D-NY) said that her amendment would put Spectrum auction proceeds towards reestablishing a broadband affordability program. She said that these proceeds should be reinvested for the public good rather than going towards tax cuts that support the wealthy. She said that the Affordable Connectivity Program brought millions of Americans online, but Republicans let funding lapse last year. She also criticized the President for calling to repeal the Digital Equity Act and claw back the money that Congress appropriated. She urged her colleagues to support the amendment.

Rep. Hudson (R-NC), Rep. Cammack (R-FL) and Rep. Houchin (R-IN) spoke against the amendment. Rep. Hudson explained that the Lifeline program already provides connectivity to Americans, Spectrum proceeds will run out anyway, and the Amendment doesn't do anything to address waste, fraud and abuse. He also made a comment on how more money needs to be deployed with the BEAD Program to lay down more lines. They said that it would make it more expensive for everyday Americans, with Rep. Cammack citing an analysis by the JCT that found Americans would pay 15% less under the Republican plan. Rep. Hudson said that he is glad there is bipartisan support of the BEAD Program.

Rep. Dingell (D-MI), Rep. Peters (D-CA), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Soto (D-FL), Rep. Carter (D-LA), Rep. Barragan (D-CA), Rep. Landsman (D-OH), Rep. McClellan (D-VA) and Rep. Menendez (D-NJ) spoke in support of the amendment and expressed the importance of investing in affordable connectivity. Rep. Ruiz said that this amendment would support the BEAD Program.

Clarke Amendment COMM9 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications was not favorably reported by a vote of 24Y-29N

Matsui Amendment COMM8 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications

Rep. Matsui (D-CA) explained that her amendment would seek to ensure that Secretaries in the administration have adequate cybersecurity training before spectrum is auctioned. Rep. Matsui expressed concern over recent cyber attacks and the breach of protocols which certain administration officials have committed. Rep. Matsui urged her colleagues to support the amendment.

Rep. Hudson (R-NC) spoke in opposition to the amendment but indicated his openness to improve cybersecurity in the future.

Rep. Menendez (D-NJ) expressed his support for the amendment and echoed concerns around the administrations efforts to reduce and slash the federal cyber-workforce

Matsui Amendment COMM8 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-29N.

McClellan Amendment COMM13 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications

Rep. McClellan stated that her amendment would forbid spectrum auction proceeds from going towards the president, government officials, special government officials, and their family members. She argued that this amendment would ensure that these groups could not benefit from auction profits stemming from assets that they may have partial ownership of. The amendment would also ensure that the FCC could not confer with the president or government officials to influence the outcome of legal battles. The Rep.



argued that spectrum proceeds should be used to benefit the public by investing in cybersecurity, infrastructure, and improving 911 deployment. She noted that her amendment is a bipartisanship effort to ensure that the FCC remains a neutral entity to avoid corruption in the present and future presidential administrations. She discussed Elon Musk and his affiliation with Starlink as an example of the amendment's pertinence.

Rep. Hudson (R-NC), spoke in opposition to the amendment, asserting that it was a partisan effort to establish jurisdiction in areas that Congress is not involved in.

Rep. Castor (D-FL), Rep. Barragan (D-CA), and Rep. Kelly (D-IL) supported the amendment, arguing that broadband spectrum needed to be utilized as a public good. They noted Elon Musk's involvement in cancelling funds to expand broadband spectrum in underserved communities. They pushed back against the notion that the amendment was politically biased by discussing the monetary corruption in the Trump administration.

McClellan Amendment COMM13 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-29N.

Pallone Amendment COMM19 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications

Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ) argued that Republicans want to limit states ability to impose their own laws protecting consumers against AI. He argued that this 10-year ban on state action would allow big tech companies utilize AI without critical guardrails and protections for Americans. Ranking Member Pallone argued that the federal government should use states as examples for new federal policy and emphasized that this ban would prevent states from acting on AI risks which haven't been identified yet. He explained that his amendment would strip the ban from the underlying legislation.

Rep. Obernolte (R-CA), Rep. Lee (R-FL) spoke in opposition to the amendment, arguing that the \$500 million worth of funding provided to federal agencies to modernize their systems using AI would be hindered by the variety of state regulations which could be drafted. They argued that they support responsible AI regulation but emphasized the need to establish preemption so that AI innovation can flourish. They expressed concern that patchwork state regulations will negatively impact small AI companies ability to innovate as well. Rep. Obernolte argued that Congress could pass new AI regulations and frameworks before the end of the moratorium.

Rep. Peters (D-CA), Rep. Matsui (D-CA), Rep. Castor (D-FL), Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Schakowsky (D-IL), Rep. Clarke (D-NY), Rep. Soto (D-FL), Rep. Trahan (D-MA), Rep. Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. Schrier (D-WA) Rep. Fletcher (D-TX), Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-CA), Rep. McClellan (D-VA), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA) spoke in support of the amendment, criticizing the lack of federal action on AI and social media thus far and arguing that the moratorium in the underlying bill is too long, provides no federal privacy standard in states place, and allows big tech companies to ignore responsible AI development and potentially exploit American consumers, including in healthcare and health coverage. They argued that the amendment would help reign in these companies. Some members, including Rep. Peters, expressed support for federal preemption with adequate user protections more broadly.

Pallone Amendment COMM19 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-29N.



H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle C-Communications was favorably reported by a vote of 29Y-24N.

H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. DeGette (D-CO), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Barragan (D-CA), and Rep. Schrier (D-WA) talked about how cutting funding for Medicaid makes healthcare more expensive for everyday Americans and gives tax cuts to the rich. They talked about how Medicaid is a critical part of our healthcare system that people rely on across the country, and will raise costs for states, providers and low-income households. They said that these cuts will destabilize our entire healthcare system and is both cruel and immoral.

DeGette Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_007 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. DeGette (D-CO) said her amendment states that the provisions of this subtitle should not be made effective unless and until the date in which the Secretary of Health and Human Services submits to Congress a certification that such provisions will not have the effect of reducing benefits provided under state plans or waivers of such plans. She said that her Republican colleagues have claimed that the provisions will not impact hospitals and beneficiaries, but went on to name several ways in which they will be impacted, including the closure of rural hospitals and rural healthcare access. She said that 8 million people will be cut off Medicaid if this bill goes through.

Rep. Carter (R-GA) talked about how the President and House Republicans have made it very clear that they will not touch essential healthcare for vulnerable populations while simultaneously preventing waste, fraud and abuse.

Rep. Landsman (D-OH), Rep. McClellan (D-VA), Rep. DeGette, Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA), Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ), Rep. Barragan (D-CA), Rep. Troy Carter (D-LA), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Trahan (D-MA), Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), Rep. Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. Clarke (D-NY), Rep. Soto (D-FL) and Rep. Schrier (D-WA) expressed concern for how the cuts would impact vulnerable populations. They emphasized that this bill was adding a co-pay for low-income individuals for doctor visits and said that they didn't understand how this protected people on Medicaid or address waste, fraud and abuse. They also raised concerns over the complicated paperwork process and how it can kick off individuals who really are eligible. They talked about how the money being used to support these cuts could instead go towards increased benefits and things like the Child Tax Credit.

Rep. Carter, Chairman Guthrie (R-KY), Rep. Hudson (R-NC), Rep. Pfluger (R-TX), Rep. Miller-Meeks (R-IA), Rep. Allen (R-GA), Rep. Morgan Griffith (R-VA), Rep. Crenshaw (R-TX), Rep. Palmer (R-AL) and Rep. Bentz (R-OR) explained that it would only take off illegal immigrants, duplicate beneficiaries and those not meeting the work requirement. They said that these are reasonable approaches that cut out waste, fraud and abuse. They rejected the idea that the Republicans were trying to help the rich, emphasizing that they were trying to preserve the program and said that Democrats were misleading the public.

DeGette Amendment HEALTH7 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported 24Y-29N



Menendez Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_222 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Menendez (D-NJ) explained that his amendment would prevent the implementation of the bill if any of the provisions result in the death of individuals stemming from reduced access to healthcare services. Rep. Menendez argued that the underlying bill would leave millions of people without healthcare coverage, including the most vulnerable Americans.

Chair Guthrie (R-KY) argued that the bill would ensure Americans aren't needlessly dying, highlighting the text's reductions of nursing home staffing requirements which he claimed would ensure nursing homes remain open.

Rep. Matsui (D-CA), Rep. Veasey (D-TX), Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Schrier (D-WA) expressed support for the amendment and highlighted constituent stories emphasizing the critical role that Medicaid plays in allowing Americans to afford and access life-saving care. They expressed concern over the shifting burden to states and the cuts that they will have to make to services due to a lower federal match, patients ability to seek preventive care without coverage and the resulting health impacts, and diabetes management for those who lose coverage.

Menendez Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_222 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-27N.

Veasey Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_406 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Veasey (D-TX) said his proposed amendment would strike a provision in the current bill that prohibits states from providing provider tax for existing ones. He asserted that provider taxes prevent healthcare prices for taxpayers from being raised and allow federal tax dollars to be allocated to states. The Rep. stated that provider taxes are crucial assets in the fabric of state healthcare and Medicaid programs. He argued that the current provision would devastate his state's proficient healthcare programs. In addition, Rep. Veasey discussed how provider taxes are a long-standing method used by 49 states to tailor services to local communities and vulnerable populations. Rep. Veasey said that this bill had a shortsighted method that would prevent states from responding to arising or future healthcare needs. He discussed his fears over the long-lasting, large impact the provision would have on millions of individuals.

Chairman Guthrie (R-KY), Rep. Obernolte (R-CA), Rep. Palmer (R-AL) opposed the amendment. They argued that the provision would allow the government to better control the drawdown of federal dollars. The Representatives stated that the system of provision taxes has been abused and disproportionately places healthcare costs on the federal level. They observed how various Democratic leaders, such as President Biden, had also critiqued the disproportionate responsibility that provider taxes placed on federal taxes to pay for healthcare services in states. Chairman Guthrie stated that tax providers irresponsibly took large amounts of federal taxpayer's money to fund state-based projects. He asserted this phenomenon is the reason behind Medicaid's high costs. They argued that the provision would protect federal taxpayer dollars and that healthcare centers would receive the same amount of money that they currently have. They also noted that they are only placing a cap on current provision taxes, which means that the impact would not be particularly large.



Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Dingell (D-MI), Rep. Barragan (D-CA), Rep. Carter (D-LA), Rep. Kelly (D-IL), Rep. Trahan (D-MA), Rep. Castor (D-FL), Rep. Soto (D-FL), Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA), Rep. Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. Mullin (D-CA) supported the amendment. They argued that states heavily rely on provider taxes as supplementary revenue to compensate for chronic Medicaid underfunding and that the provision would place a significant financial burden on them. This would cause various healthcare centers to reduce services or close, particularly in rural areas. They argued that this decrease in services and healthcare benefits would affect individuals both on Medicaid and other healthcare plans because of physician access issues. The Representatives discussed how freezing the system without providing exceptions would limit states from responding to future obstacles such as inflation, economic recession, or natural disasters. Therefore, this provision would limit state rights. These members also expressed their worries over the potential of individuals losing their Medicaid coverage due to states limiting healthcare benefits. They also pointed out that while their Republican colleagues' criticism of the current utilization of provider taxes was valid, enacting the provision without constructing another system would be detrimental.

Veasey Amendment FCD-AMD_406 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-27N.

Castor Amendment HEALTH FCD-AMD_047 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Castor discussed state directed payments and noted the importance of these payments to providers such as hospitals and nursing homes which provide services to high volumes of Medicaid beneficiaries. Rep. Castor noted the thin margins that many of these facilities operate on and argued that state directed payments help them continue operations and provide services which would otherwise be too expensive and difficult to provide.

Chairman Guthrie (R-KY) expressed opposition to the amendment, noting a Biden administration policy which allowed state directed payments to match commercial rates and exceed Medicaid rates. He argued that, because of this, Medicaid spending has drastically increased. He explained that the underlying bill would simply limit state directed payments for services furnished following the bills enactment from exceeding Medicaid rates.

Rep. Matsui (D-CA) expressed support for the amendment, noting her concern over the potential viability of many hospitals and health facilities which treat significant Medicaid populations.

Castor Amendment HEALTH FCD-AMD_047 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 23Y-28N.

Carter Amendment HEALTH FCD-AMD_008 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Carter (D-LA) explained that his amendment would require 100% of any reduction in state expenditures resulting from reduced enrollment must be reinvested to provide medical assistance for those eligible for Medicaid, including those needing home and community based services.

Rep. Joyce (R-PA), Rep. Lee (R-FL), Rep. Langworthy (R-NY), Rep. Griffith (R-VA) signaled his opposition to the amendment, arguing that it would only increase Medicaid spending and threaten the long-term viability of the program. They emphasized the need to ensure people who are able are working



and not taking Medicaid money from those that cannot. They also sought to clarify that the \$35 copay would be applied to those on Medicaid expansion and who are 100-133% of the poverty level, adding that this copay is intended to be returned to the state to reinvest.

Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Clarke (D-NY), Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), Rep. Landsman (D-OH), Rep. McClellan (D-VA), Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA) expressed support for the amendment and highlighted constituents who are concerned about loss of coverage and jobs due to Medicaid cuts. They criticized policies included in the underlying legislation, including work requirements, bans on ACA marketplace access for Medicaid ineligible, prohibitions on increased provider taxes, and the \$35 copay for visits. They argued that these policies and the resulting paperwork will lead to millions more uninsured. Rep. McClellan additionally argued that the bill does nothing to address cuts to R&D funding through the NIH.

Carter Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_008 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 24Y-30N.

Ruiz Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_203 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Ruiz (D-CA) said that this amendment would require states to produce an assessment of the effects of the coverage losses from this Medicaid title on rates of uncompensated care as defined in Section 923 and emergency department wait times for each hospital that receives a disproportionate share hospital payment. He talked about how cuts to Medicaid will not only make the wait times in these hospitals worse but also will make it more difficult for everyone to access healthcare. He added that many rural hospitals would have to cut back on services or close their doors entirely due to these cuts. He said that his Republican colleagues want to slash Medicaid benefits to help the uber-wealthy, and they can prove him wrong by supporting this amendment.

Chairman Guthrie (R-KY) said that Republicans have made it very clear that coverage losses are due to removing ineligible individuals, able-bodied adults and illegal immigrants. He urged his colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Rep. Clarke (D-NY) expressed her support for the amendment, emphasizing the disproportionate impacts of these cuts on African Americans.

Ruiz Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_203 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 23Y-29N.

Peters Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_039 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Peters (D-CA) discussed the broad benefits Medicaid provides to patients and providers. Rep. Peters discussed the underlying bills provisions around work requirements, highlighting the difficulty which many working Medicaid beneficiaries may have in simply providing and completing the necessary paperwork to remain eligible. He highlighted the greater system impacts of higher uninsured rates and highlighted that states who have implemented these requirements have seen these very impacts. He argued that his amendment would ensure people with disabilities or those who are vulnerable are not kicked off Medicaid.



Chairman Guthrie (R-KY), Rep. Crenshaw (R-TX), Rep. Griffith (R-VA), Rep. Bentz (R-OR), Rep. Pfluger (R-TX) Rep. Weber (R-TX) urged colleagues to vote against the amendment, arguing in favor of work requirements and explaining that the bill requires able bodied Medicaid beneficiaries to log 80-hours a month of work, training programs, or school to satisfy the work requirements. They emphasized that the bill would not remove those with disabilities from Medicaid.

Rep. DeGette (D-CO), Rep. Matsui (D-CA), Rep. Castor (D-FL), Rep. Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. Trahan (D-MA), Rep. McClellan (D-VA), Rep. Schrier (D-WA), Rep. Landsman (D-OH), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA) expressed support for the amendment, arguing that the underlying bill provides no guarantees that vulnerable or disabled Americans won't be kicked off of their healthcare due to burdensome paperwork or lack of eligibility. They highlighted work requirement policies implemented at the state level and provided examples of individuals losing healthcare coverage due to burdensome paper work. They questioned the majority on how many Americans would lose coverage due to the work requirements included in the underlying bill.

Peters Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_039 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 23Y-28N.

Kelly Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_053 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Kelly (D-IL) said her amendment would require an annual audit of employment requirements to show who is losing coverage and why. She talked about how people are losing coverage because it is a confusing system, not because they shouldn't be on it. She urged her colleagues to support the amendment.

Rep. Carter (R-GA) expressed frustration with his Democratic colleagues that they kept on saying the same thing, when Republicans have already explained who the cuts impact. He said everything has been laid out in detail and urged his colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Kelly Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_053 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 23Y-26N.

Landsman Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_053 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Landsman (D-OH) said that his amendment would strike Section 44142 of this bill which implements a mandatory cost sharing for people in the Medicaid expansion population making \$1,800/month. He said that currently co-pays and co-insurance are only permitted for certain services and in normal amounts, but now Republicans are raising healthcare costs by adding this new mandatory requirement for the most vulnerable populations. He said that people just above the federal poverty line would have to pay up to \$35 for all non-exempt services. He said that under the Republican plan, while someone making \$5 million/year gets a \$500,000 tax cut, someone making \$16,000/year has to now pay more for their healthcare. He said that this will force low-income families to choose between healthcare or groceries and rent. He urged his colleagues to support the amendment.

Rep. Griffith (R-VA), Rep. Joyce (R-PA) and Rep. Houchin (R-IN) clarified that there is a cap of \$35, but many people will be paying much lower than that. They said that there was no cap under Obamacare



and that we need to give more leeway to the states to make more decisions and give them the tools they need. They said that these reforms can make healthcare better, and the proposed \$35 number is a reduced cap.

Rep. DeGette (D-CO), Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ), Rep. Dingell (R-MI), Rep. Barragan (D-CA) and Rep. Menendez (D-NJ) said that if the incentive is for states to make money, they will impose \$35 co-pays on everyone. They said that ultimately, this is raising the healthcare costs of millions of people and that it is cruel to “tax” the working class when they get sick.

Landsman Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_053 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 24Y-28N

Barragan Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_088 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Barragan (D-CA) argued that the underlying bill would reduce access to coverage for children, noting a provision which would institute a 10-year delay on a Biden administration regulation aimed to remove healthcare access barriers in CHIP. Rep. Barragan highlighted the high volume of CHIP recipients and explained that her amendment would provide three protections for children on CHIP, including prohibition on lock-out periods, prohibitions on waiting periods, and prohibitions on annual and lifetime limits on certain benefits.

Chairman Guthrie (R-KY) opposed the amendment, expressing concern over the costs of the Biden administration regulation on states and the federal Medicaid program.

Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Trahan (D-MA), Rep. Barragan (D-CA) expressed support for the amendment, highlighting the intent of the Biden administration rule which was to remove barriers to CHIP. He criticized the barriers which the underlying bill would preserve and argued that states would face increased bureaucracy as well. Rep. Trahan mentioned the Accelerating Kids Access to Care Act’s inclusion in the underlying bill but argued that this legislation is being used as a political cover for the bills other provisions which devastate the very program it aims to fix. She argued that AKACA is a smart and simple fix but questioned how effective the legislation could ultimately be if states are forced to cut critical specialty care and services due to the language in the underlying bill. She argued that helping kids in one paragraph should not absolve other policies which take care away.

Barragan Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_088 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 23Y-28N.

Tonko Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_055 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Tonko (D-NY) explained that his amendment would require that states stop implementation of the underlying bills red tape requirements if they are found to reduce access to substance use disorder treatment services among low-income adults. He highlighted the support that Medicaid provides those suffering from substance use treatment and expressed concern that the policies within the bill will force states to direct valuable resources to other services, leaving substance use services lacking.



Rep. Griffith (R-VA) expressed opposition to the amendment and referenced the recent passage of the SUPPORT Act. They argued that the underlying bill provides exemptions to substance use disorder services from community engagement standards and those recently incarcerated from losing substance use services.

Rep. Matsui (D-CA) expressed support for the amendment, arguing that resources for mental health and substance use disorder should be maximized. They expressed concern over the possibility of those suffering from mental health challenges having difficulty adhering to the eligibility requirement paper work and remaining covered.

Tonko Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_055 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 23Y-29N.

Fletcher Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_104 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Fletcher (D-TX) explained that her amendment would strike a section in the bill which implements a 10-year ban on payments to any non-profit organization that is an essential community provider and is primarily engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and provides for abortions. She noted that there is only one non-profit which qualifies under these factors and noted that it is planned parenthood. She highlighted the positive benefits that planned parenthood provides to patients, especially women, throughout the U.S. and warned against the negative health repercussions that could stem from reducing funding.

Rep. Harshbarger (R-TN), Rep. Houchin (R-IN), Rep. Fedorchak (R-ND), Rep. Lee (R-FL) expressed opposition to the amendment, arguing that the underlying bill prevents Medicaid funds from being allocated to large abortion providers if they continue to provide the service outside of Hyde amendment requirements. They sought to emphasize that the bill would not remove funding from other services provided by Planned Parenthood and noted that the organization would be eligible for Medicaid dollars if they end abortion services. They also reiterated that the Medicaid provisions included in the underlying bill are intended to protect the programs long-term viability.

Rep. DeGette (D-CO), Rep. Matsui (D-CA), Rep. Kelly (D-IL), Rep. Schrier (D-WA), Rep. Trahan (D-MA), Rep. Fletcher (D-TX), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Menendez (D-NJ), Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ), Rep. McClellan (D-VA), Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Peters (D-CA) expressed support for the amendment, arguing that the underlying bill would defund planned parenthood based on a service which is privately funded. They argued that this funding cut would critically impact the organizations ability to provide specialty women's healthcare, primary care in rural areas, family planning services, contraception, cancer screenings, pediatric care services, and vaccinations.

Fletcher Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_104 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 24Y-28N.

Kelly Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_94XML to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Kelly (D-IL) introduced her amendment, which would require twelve months of Medicaid and CHIP coverage with full benefits for pregnant and postpartum women. She argued that postpartum care is



a necessary right. She also discussed the high maternal death rates that the United States maintains compared to other developed countries, particularly for American women of color. Rep. Kelly asserted that Medicaid access would help alleviate these rates. The Rep. justified her length of Medicaid coverage by emphasizing that most maternal deaths occur in the postpartum period.

Rep. Harshbarger (R-TN) opposed the amendment. She stated that the Appropriations Act of 2023 already gave pregnant and postpartum woman the option of coverage with full benefits under CHIP and Medicaid.

Rep. Castor (D-FL), Rep. McClellan (D-VA) expressed their support for the amendment. The Representatives also argued that Medicaid continues to be a primary provider for pregnant and postpartum women, and that cutting the program would increase maternal mortality rates. The committee members also emphasized bipartisan efforts Congress has made in the past to provide care for pregnant women in. They argued that extensive research has identified the causes of maternal deaths and that medical care before, during, and after pregnancy are all critical. In addition, they criticized the Trump administration for making it more difficult for pregnant and postpartum women to receive medical care. The Representatives called for Republican and Democratic members to work together to address this issue.

Kelly Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_94XML to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 23Y-28N.

Dingell Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_161 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Dingell (D-MI) argued that her amendment would ensure the U.S. doesn't pay more for drugs that can be purchased overseas. She expressed support for the Trump administration's MFN efforts but noted Republicans have not moved to legislate on this issue. She then discussed PBMs and highlighted the reforms that were almost passed late last year which would have address PBM practices which impact local pharmacies and distort prices for patients. She argued that the underlying bill provides no meaningful policy solution for rising drug costs.

Chairman Guthrie (R-KY), Rep. Hudson (R-NC) spoke in opposition to the amendment but agreed that Americans primarily subsidize research which benefits other developed nations. Chair Guthrie argued, however, that this research is vitally important and should take place in the U.S., expressing concern with imposing foreign price controls. He argued that this would ultimately benefit countries like China who are working to beat out the U.S. in biomedical innovation.

Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA), Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ) expressed his support for the amendment and criticized the administration's budget proposal to cut 50% of the NIH's budget. He questioned the United States' ability to continue leading in this space with these cuts and encourage his colleagues to advance China Task Force recommendations to double funding into R&D.

Dingell Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_161 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 24Y-29N.

Schrier Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_128 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health



Rep. Schrier (R-WA) said that her amendment would cap the cost of Insulin at \$35 for those with private health insurance. She said that it was life changing and lifesaving when they did this for Medicare recipients. She said that the least her Republican colleagues can do is agree that we should lower the cost of Insulin for everyday Americans.

Chairman Guthrie (R-KY) said that sweeping commercial market mandates are not the best pathway forward, which is why they included several Medicaid and Medicare PBM reforms in this bill which will lower drug prices for patients and improve the Medicaid system. He urged his colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Schrier Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_128 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 22Y-27N

Pallone HEALTH-FCD-AMD_121 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ) said that his amendment would establish a \$2,000 out of pocket cap on prescription drug quotes for consumers with private insurance. He talked about how prescription drug prices are rising at an alarming pace and how the problem is widespread. He added that 1 in 4 Americans are not able to afford the cost of their prescription drugs. He praised the Inflation Reduction Act which helped lower the cost of prescription drugs for seniors. He said that the actions of Republicans show that they don't care about affordability, while his amendment helps carry on the strengths of the Inflation Reduction Act.

Rep. Auchincloss (D-MA) expressed his support of the amendment.

Rep. Carter (R-GA) said that this policy is not the best path forward and explained that they had already included provisions within this bill that would result in lower drug costs and eliminate spread pricing. He urged his colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Pallone Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_121 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably voted by a vote of 24Y-28N.

Soto Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_221 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Soto (D-FL) discussed the ACA Enhancement Act, which helped make Obamacare more affordable to middle class families. He said that the premium tax credits stemming from this Act boosted Obamacare membership, particularly in Florida. However, he stated that this tax credit will lapse at the end of the year, profoundly affecting individuals across the country. He discussed specific constituents who would face twenty-thousand dollar increases to their health care plan without the tax credit. While he said that this Act was being discussed in the Ways and Means Committee, he wanted to highlight its importance. He ultimately withdrew the amendment.

Soto Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_221 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was withdrawn.

Ocasio-Cortez Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_220 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health



Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) said that we have heard Republicans talk about waste, fraud and abuse but it interestingly seems to omit corporate waste, corporate fraud and corporate profiteering and abuse of public tax dollars. She said that this can particularly be found with Medicare Advantage, because unlike Medicare, it is for-profit insurance. She called out companies like Signa, Humana and United Healthcare for taking advantage of taxpayer dollars via Medicare Advantage to yield profit for shareholders. She said that her amendment would go after the corporate waste, fraud and abuse and use that money to reinvest in Medicare and healthcare and enhance benefits for everyday Americans.

Rep. Carter agreed that we need to take a deeper look at Medicare Advantage, but said that the amendment was outside the scope of the markup, and was an issue that needed deeper attention outside of Reconciliation. He opposed the amendment for that reason.

Rep. Ruiz (D-CA) and Rep. Schrier (D-WA) said that this amendment would reign in real fraud and require reinvestment to Medicare. They said that we need to do more to fully take care of Medicare patients. They emphasized the need for reinvestment to support doctors and expand Medicare access, especially given reduced compensation for doctors, who have been retiring earlier and earlier.

Ocasio-Cortez Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_220 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably reported by a vote of 24Y-28N

Ocasio-Cortez Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_085 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) introduced her amendment, which would reestablish safe staffing ratios in nursing homes. She discussed how many for-profit and private equity owned nursing crews maintain skeleton crews and reduced quality of care. She said that this issue does not stem from a lack of funding, but from nursing home owners taking the money given to them from the federal government for themselves. According to Rep. Ocasio-Cortez, the results in lessened pay for employees and subpar conditions for residents. The Representative called for more federal oversight in these matters.

Rep. Carter (R-GA), Rep. Griffith (R-VA) opposed the amendment. Rep. Carter cited research stating that reinstating safer staffing ratios suggested by the Biden administration did not significantly improve nursing home conditions. The representatives argued that reinstating the guidelines of this amendment would be expensive and worsen the issue by causing more nursing home closures. They stated that this issue should be addressed in a more comprehensive manner than the nature of the current meeting.

Ranking Member Pallone, Rep. Dingell (D-MI), Rep. McClellan (D-VA) supported the amendment. The committee members said that nursing home conditions have been a consistent issue in the United States and that ensuring more staffing is a great pathway to improving quality of care for residents. Ranking Member Pallone argued that rejecting the amendment would erode the advances that nursing homes have made over the past decades. He argued that the actual intention for opposing the bill is an attempt to funnel money into tax cuts. The representatives argued that caregiving is a core aspect of society, and that this crisis should be addressed now in comparison to a decade later to prevent more preventable deaths. Rep. McClellan also asserted that society should encourage more individuals to pursue nursing home positions as a long-term solution.



Ocasio-Cortez Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_085 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health not favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 23Y-29N.

Dingell Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_228 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Dingell (D-MI) discussed long-term care and explained that her amendment would ensure that home and community based services wouldn't be reduced under current laws. She explained that the amendment would specifically not impose stricter eligibility standards or methodology then were in place and would ensure HCBS provider rates do not decrease beyond their levels in April of 2025.

Rep. Carter (R-GA) opposed the amendment and argued that waste and fraud are at fault for the instability of these services. He argued that stabilizing Medicaid will help ensure these services continue to be provided.

Rep. Carter (D-LA), Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ), Rep. Tonko (D-NY) expressed support for the amendment, reiterating that the bill does nothing to protect those with disabilities from losing services like HCBS. They argued that there is no reason HCBS should not be mandated under the bill if there is no risk to its availability.

Dingell Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_228 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably voted by a vote of 24Y-28N.

Ruiz Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_212 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Ruiz (D-CA) explained that his amendment would require CBO to certify that the underlying bill will not worsen medical debt before it can be implemented. He discussed medical debt and noted the positive impact that the ACA has had on reducing medical debt. Rep. Ruiz argued that, by increasing uninsured rates, the underlying bill will only drive medical debt and families being financially unable to seek care.

Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ) expressed his support for the amendment and noted his concern that the underlying bill would increase costs on families, especially those who lose insurance coverage, and therefore raise medical debt.

Ruiz Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_212 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably voted by a vote of 24Y-27N.

Castor Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_126 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Rep. Castor explained that her amendment would delay the implementation of the bill if any of the provisions result in reduced access to coverage under the health title. Rep. Castor criticized the underlying bill, arguing that it would add to the debt, bury people in costly paperwork, raise premiums, raise eligibility standards, and more. Rep. Castor highlighted Democrats work to expand healthcare coverage and provide more care for Americans.



Chairman Guthrie (R-KY), Rep. Crenshaw (R-TX), Rep. Weber (R-TX), Rep. Hudson (R-NC), Rep. James (R-MI), Rep. Palmer (R-AL), Rep. Obernolte (R-CA) Rep. Carter (R-GA) reiterated that waste, fraud, and abuse threaten the stability of Medicaid and those who are truly eligible for the program. They argued that the underlying bill would ensure Medicaid's long-term viability.

Ranking Member Pallone (D-NJ), Rep. Barragan (D-CA), Rep. Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), Rep. Matsui (D-CA), Rep. Tonko (D-NY), Rep. Ruiz (D-CA), Rep. Clarke (D-NY), Rep. DeGette (D-CO), Rep. Schrier (D-WA), Rep. Fletcher (D-TX), Rep. Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. Veasey (D-TX), Rep. Landsman (D-OH) expressed support for the amendment, criticizing red tape and eligibility standards included in the bill and arguing that the burden brought on by increased paperwork will lead to people being adversely impacted. They emphasized that the bill will eliminate healthcare coverage for millions of Americans.

Castor Amendment HEALTH-FCD-AMD_126 to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was not favorably voted by a vote of 24Y-30N.

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health was favorably agreed to by voice vote.

H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, Subtitle D-Health, as amended, was favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 30Y-24N.

Energy and Commerce Recommendations on H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, including Subtitle A-Energy, Subtitle B-Environment, Subtitle C-Communications, & Subtitle D-Health

Energy and Commerce Recommendations on H. Con. Res. 14, Committee Print, Title IV-Energy and Commerce Committee, including Subtitle A-Energy, Subtitle B-Environment, Subtitle C-Communications, & Subtitle D-Health, as amended, was favorably agreed to by a roll call vote of 30Y-24N.

Markup was brought to a close by Chairman Guthrie