

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1745

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOLINARO) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

#### LOUISIANA HAS BRAVE FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Louisiana's brave first responders who valiantly rose to the occasion this summer as our State was hit with unprecedented wildfires, the largest of which is still burning today.

We had tens of thousands of acres that have been charred. Nearly half of the parishes in my district were ablaze. At one time, parts of Sabine, Beauregard, Allen, Vernon, Natchitoches, Grant, Caddo, and DeSoto Parishes were all on fire.

Our communities received support from the State fire marshal, the State police, the National Guard, as well as nearly every local police and fire department in the region. The U.S. Forestry Service dispatched firefighters from many States around the country to help.

Many of the first responders have been volunteers, Louisianians who donated time, money, and shelter to their neighbors in need. This disaster tested our State more than ever, but we responded.

Louisiana is home to the most resilient people you will ever meet, and we will bounce back from these wildfires just as we have done after every disaster we have ever faced. It is a great honor to represent so many of these heroic individuals in Congress.

#### SUPPORTING THE IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY OF PRESIDENT BIDEN

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of the House Republicans' formal impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden.

Several months ago, House Republicans returned oversight to the people's House. We worked consistently day after day to make our government more accountable, as promised in our Commitment to America.

Since January, concerning and credible allegations against President Joe Biden have emerged, including abuse of power, obstruction of justice, corrupt

foreign business dealings, and influence peddling schemes that led to tens of millions of dollars in the pockets of several members of the Biden family.

I think we can all agree: Americans deserve accountability from our President. Our impeachment inquiry is not a political ploy. It is an opportunity for Congress to continue its duty, digging into the potential of corruption and bringing facts to light.

The evidence is deeply troubling. Our witnesses have testified to President Biden's involvement in phone calls, interactions, and dinners that resulted in significant financial gains for his son and his son's business partners.

The Treasury Department alone has more than 150 transactions involving the Biden family and other business associates that were flagged as suspicious activity by U.S. banks.

#### PRESIDENT BIDEN'S CULTURE OF CORRUPTION

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

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for the impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden.

House Republicans have uncovered serious and credible allegations of his conduct, a culture of corruption.

We now know this to be true:

The Biden family received more than \$20 million in foreign payments from China, Russia, Ukraine, and Romania.

That 10 percent cut for the big guy, well, yes, that was for Joe Biden.

The Bidens created over 20-plus shell companies to conceal the money.

Joe Biden joined 20 phone calls with Hunter Biden's business partners.

Texts invoked Biden to shake down a Chinese business partner for cash.

Joe Biden used pseudonyms on emails.

There are at least 150 suspicious activity reports.

Joe Biden's pattern of behavior is deeply disturbing and concerning for our national security.

Mr. Speaker, we need answers. We need those bank records. We need the truth.

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

#### IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY NEEDED TO COMPLETE INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, barring declarations of war, impeachment is the most awesome power that Congress has. It shouldn't be a threat. It shouldn't be a political exercise. It is certainly not a pledge to be made on the campaign trail.

This is the most serious business that we can engage in. No one should want to impeach a President or take any pleasure in that. However, after months of blocked investigations by agencies in this administration, it became clear that an impeachment inquiry was the only course of action to complete our necessary and important investigations.

Let me explain why because there has been some confusion and some controversy about this.

Mr. Speaker, there are three irrefutable facts that have taken us to this point.

One, President Biden lied directly to the American people.

Two, President Biden's family and their associates profited millions through shell companies.

Three, President Biden's Federal agencies are stonewalling our legitimate congressional inquiry.

That is just the tip of the iceberg. There are so many scandals. There is so much corruption that is being uncovered. Every stone that we overturn leads to more and more corruption.

Because of that, Mr. Speaker, a lot of the American people are simply getting lost in the barrage of evidence, in the barrage of allegations of corruption, and the evidence itself.

Let me go through just a couple of highlights here to bring everybody's attention to this to help explain why we are doing what we are doing.

In August 2019, President Biden said: "I have never discussed with my son or my brother or anyone else anything having to do with their businesses, period."

Two months later, he said: "I never discussed a single thing with my son about anything having to do with Ukraine. No one has indicated I have. We have always kept everything separate."

He then doubled down on those claims during the debates, and both Jen Psaki and Karine Jean-Pierre have echoed that straight from the White House press briefing room.

Make no mistake about this: Everyone now knows those were all bald-faced lies.

While President Biden was Vice President, we know now that he had dinner at least twice with his son, Hunter, and Russian and Kazakhstani oligarchs. He spoke on the phone at least 20 times with Hunter's associates.

He met with CEFC, a Chinese energy company, while Hunter was working on their behalf.

Here is a text message from Hunter Biden that alone is justification for an inquiry: “Z—Please have the director call me, not James or Tony or Jim. Have him call me tonight. I am sitting here with my father, and we would like to understand why the commitment made has not been fulfilled.”

A confidential human source, known well to the FBI and relied upon often, alleged that President Biden received a \$5 million bribe for services rendered.

The House Oversight Committee investigation has been going on for a while, and the investigation has yielded many important facts. Here are a couple of examples the investigators have found.

They found that Hunter Biden flew on Air Force Two at least 15 times and engaged in activities that Devon Archer testified were to sell the brand and enrich the Biden family.

They found an email from Biden associate James Gillar that breaks down the profit agreement for a deal involving the Chinese Communist Party-linked CEFC, including “10 held by H for the big guy.”

They found a text message later that month from Gillar to Tony Bobulinski, which read: “Don’t mention Joe being involved. It is only when you are face-to-face. I know you know that, but they are paranoid.”

This is just a sampling of what we already know. This impeachment inquiry will offer House investigators greater subpoena authority to receive information from evasive Federal agencies.

We have been impeded in the collection of all this evidence because the Federal agencies under the executive branch are openly, aggressively trying to protect the President. We are going to have advanced authority now and a larger platform to share this information with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, remember how we arrived here. When the New York Post reported the existence of the Hunter Biden laptop, now-Secretary of State Anthony Blinken organized a group of 51 former intelligence officials to claim the laptop was Russian disinformation. Social media accounts were banned from sharing the story, and individuals who believed it were labeled Russian assets and conspiracy theorists.

We now know that not only was the laptop not Russian disinformation, of course, but it was known previously to the intel community and many of the individuals who signed that letter. They knew it was legitimate. They knew it was not Russian disinformation. They knew it came from Hunter Biden, and they hid it from the American people.

On July Fourth, just a couple of months ago, the Federal district court in the Western District of Louisiana, my home State, issued a 155-page court opinion. The State of Louisiana and State of Missouri sued the Biden ad-

ministration because they had a hunch and knew that the White House and its agencies, including the FBI, the DOJ, and other Federal agencies, were engaged in a coverup. They were censoring and silencing the viewpoints of Americans they disagreed with. They would not allow conservative speech on the social media platforms.

We know from the evidence produced in that case and listed in the 155-page court opinion that issued an injunction against the White House. By the way, just last Saturday, that was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The court points out that Elvis Chan, the FBI official in the San Francisco field office, was meeting regularly with the Big Tech platforms in Silicon Valley leading up to the election and telling them things that they had to pull off the internet, conservative voices and social media postings that they didn’t want people to see. The FBI coerced, the court said, and then coordinated with the Big Tech giants to make sure that on Facebook, Google, and Twitter at the time, and all these other platforms, you couldn’t see that information.

It wasn’t just the Hunter Biden laptop story. It was a lot of categories of things. It included negative information about the economy. It included people’s opinions, conservative’s opinions about the efficacy of COVID vaccines and the lockdowns, how crazy that was, and what they were doing to schoolchildren. All that was censored.

They even took down jokes about the President. If you posted a parody about President Biden, even as a candidate or after he was elected, it was pulled off the internet.

It is unbelievable. It is staggering. The judge’s words in the court that this is arguably the largest and the greatest attack on free speech in U.S. history. He called it Orwellian. He said it was dystopian.

This is what we are facing. This is what this White House has been involved in. They did not want the American people to have the facts, and that is one of the reasons that we have to go to this next step.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have to follow these facts where they lead. The facts are irrefutable. They have understandably set Washington ablaze, even though the American people weren’t able to see it. The judge said that millions of free-speech-protected postings were taken down from the internet and not seen. Yet, it has set Washington ablaze. Why? Because we are bringing these facts to bear. We are laying them out for people to see.

Our colleagues here, some of them, don’t want to see it. As John Adams said, “Facts are stubborn things.” As expected, the D.C. and national press corps have blindly accepted the White House’s spin and are trying to convince the American people that our inquiry, even the impeachment inquiry, is illegitimate just 3 years after they carried the water for ADAM SCHIFF and the

Democrats on their crazy impeachment quests against Donald Trump.

Here is a sampling of the headlines so far. Now, remember, we just announced the impeachment inquiry step yesterday. Here it is so far.

From Time magazine: “Biden inquiry may be weakest in history.”

From CNN: “The most predictable impeachment investigation in American history.”

From Reuters: “McCarthy opens long-shot impeachment probe of Biden.”

From MSNBC: “McCarthy’s Biden impeachment inquiry is the Benghazi investigation on steroids.”

These headlines are going to increase. We know it is coming. We know that they are working against us, against the American people, in this case, and for the White House. They are on their team. We get it.

CNN is reporting this week that the White House is urging news executives to ramp up scrutiny of our investigation. In fact, now there is a memo going around that they sent to all the big news agencies. As if weaponizing the Federal agencies wasn’t enough, President Biden is now publicly directing the free press to play defense for him. Do you know what? They are willingly going along with it.

Mr. Speaker, why? I am just going to ask this question. It is a rhetorical one. Nobody can answer it here, of course, but we are trying to seek the answer to this. I think we know. If there was no impropriety, why wouldn’t the President provide congressional investigators with all the information we have requested? What do they have to hide?

The President could make the short trip from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue tomorrow. He could sit down with our committees. He could clear his name. We could do that behind closed doors. We could do it very discreetly, with all the protection he needs. In fact, we would welcome it.

Let this be an open invitation to President Biden. I know the White House is recording all this. They are watching what we do here. Here is the open invitation: President Biden, Secretary Blinken, any of the Biden family members and associates, or anyone who seeks to clear their name, anybody involved in this investigation at all, you can come right here. You are welcome here in Congress to our committees.

□ 1800

We on the House Judiciary Committee, House Oversight Committee, Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government, the Ways and Means Committee, any of them—pick your committee—and we will bring you in and you can clear your name.

Mr. Speaker, we would love to return our full focus to our regular and important work here, but the fact is our sworn oath to defend the Constitution

requires this inquiry. I will close with this—and I am going to bring up a couple of my colleagues who will share their thoughts, as well—but remember that Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution itself expressly states that the sole power of impeachment belongs here to this House. Then Article II, Section 4 says—listen to the language carefully. It is expressly written in the Constitution. These are not political talking points. We are not making this up. It says in Article II, Section 4 that the President shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. Speaker, I listed just a small sampling, just the tip of the iceberg of the credible allegations and the mounting evidence that shows that Joseph Biden has engaged in bribery schemes, pay-to-play schemes. This is what the evidence shows.

We have to follow it. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution. The Constitution requires this action. The inquiry is the appropriate step. We have no choice but to pursue the facts wherever they lead, and we will leave no stone unturned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the great gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), not only a Super Bowl champion but also a wonderful Congressman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me the time.

I rise today in full support of House Republicans' formal impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden.

Seven months ago, House Republicans returned oversight to the people's House. We have worked consistently day after day to make your government more accountable as promised in our Commitment to America.

Since January, concerning and credible allegations against President Joe Biden have emerged, including abuse of power, obstruction of justice, corrupt foreign business dealings, and influence-peddling schemes that led to tens of millions of dollars in the pockets of several members of the Biden family—so far \$20 million in profits to a family that has nothing to do with our government at this point.

I think we can all agree Americans deserve accountability from our President. Our impeachment inquiry is not a political play—it is an opportunity for Congress to continue its duty, digging into the potential of corruption and bringing facts to light.

The evidence is very troubling. Our witnesses have testified about President Biden's involvement in phone calls, interactions, and dinners that resulted in significant financial gains to his son and his son's business partners.

The Treasury Department alone has flagged more than 150 transactions involving the Biden family and other business associates as suspicious activity by U.S. banks.

Even a trusted FBI informant has alleged a bribe to the Biden family.

There is evidence that President Biden used his official office to coordinate with Hunter Biden's business partners regarding Hunter's role with Burisma, a Ukrainian energy company.

These actions, and more, raise serious questions about the integrity of our highest office. Our government serves the interests of all Americans, not just a select few.

Rest assured, House Republicans will follow the evidence wherever it leads, and the truth will come to light.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON, for yielding and for bringing this team together tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

This is an important week when it comes to the vehicles that we have and the access to those vehicles.

To that end, I rise in support of an upcoming bill, H.R. 1435, Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

If the leftist central planners get their way, the internal combustion engine could be outlawed by 2035 or sooner.

The Biden administration and big city do-gooders want to ban the internal combustion engine with climate change as the excuse, but the facts speak otherwise. In 2021, 93 percent of light-duty vehicles sold were powered by gasoline or flex-fuel variants.

From cleaner technologies, advanced fuels, and lower carbon emissions, the internal combustion engine continues to be valued by consumers from all walks of life.

Consumer choice is essential in rural areas where farmers, ranchers, and small towns need access to reliable transportation and fuel. Forcing electric vehicles on the masses through compulsion defeats the very purpose of the consumer marketplace.

H.R. 1435 stops the attack on reliable and affordable transportation options. Consumer choice in vehicles keeps education accessible, employment a reality, and healthcare options in reach.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 1435.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman before he leaves the podium today: I was told by automobile dealers who were in my office from the district that the State of California has banned the combustion engine. Is that a rumor or is that true?

Mr. FULCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, only in California can something like that be brought up, but, yes, that is my understanding. That is the direction they are going.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Isn't it true then that if California, which is one of the largest markets for vehicles, bans the sale of the combustion engine,

then the car manufacturers, if they want to do business in California, are going to have to shift lots of their production lines to these vehicles that, by the way, no one wants, and they are not affordable or maintainable. As I understand it, if the battery goes it costs you another \$100,000 for an already overpriced vehicle that no one wants or can charge up. Isn't that then going to affect the automobile market in every other State, and your ability to get a truck or a car?

Mr. FULCHER. That affects everyone else. We didn't even get into the whole topic of just the overall economic and environmental impact, and the resources necessary to build these electric cars. The resources need to be sourced in unfriendly areas because we don't allow ourselves to produce those components here. We are talking about lead, we are talking about lithium, we are talking about the things that those vehicles need. You probably know this, but if not, the places where they get sourced are not exactly economically or environmentally friendly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Exactly.

Mr. FULCHER. This is a very bad situation, and it is up to us to try to do something about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I think the people are calling upon us to bring common sense to this equation because this team on the other side who is pushing this radical climate agenda is engaged in fantasy economics.

The people in my State of Louisiana need their trucks and cars. They are not going to buy electric vehicles. They can't afford them, first of all. It is not practical because there is nowhere to charge them in my State.

If we have a shortage of vehicles on the market that is going to be a real problem. I am told delivery trucks are involved in this in California, and if you can't get the fruit shipped from California, that means the prices at the grocery store are going to go up, as well. Everyone is going to suffer from this; isn't that true?

Mr. FULCHER. That is true. H.R. 1435 is not the only answer, but it certainly is a step in the right direction. Just keep our internal combustion engines alive and going.

By the way, the cleanliness of the vehicles that we have, the internal combustion engines we have now have been getting continually better and better and better and more efficient. So this whole ruse about climate change being the purpose that this needs to happen is just totally flawed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is about government control. I thank the gentleman for his work on that, and we urge our colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), the gentleman from the northern portion of California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just happen to be speaking about the subject of California.

Now, California is a beautiful place, beautiful climate and terrain and territory. It is just that its politics have gotten so upside down in the last—pick a number of years—40 years, 50 years. I am not really there to serve the people anymore but to serve climate agendas and other crazy agendas I will not go into here tonight.

I live in the rural part of California. I like to say, I live in the normal part still in the far north where we farm and we ranch—we still attempt to do mining—in order to produce the products that city people need. If they didn't have us around to do those things then, I don't know—they want to, I guess, import all of it, which seems to be the direction here. Let's import it all from China.

One of the interesting things—I won't say funny, although the people watching might think it is funny because we do this to ourselves—but our California Air Resources Board released a rule requiring all new cars in California that will be sold new to be zero-emission vehicles by 2035.

Now, this was tried back in the eighties where they said, well, we want—I believe maybe it was 1990—10 percent of all cars sold by the year 2000, if my memory is correct, to be zero-emission vehicles.

So what did we end up with? Car companies are trying to make battery-powered vehicles that look like glorified golf carts or maybe those little rigs you saw on "Fantasy Island" that Tattoo was driving around in to be legitimate vehicles you would have out on the roadway. You saw basically oversized golf carts with license plates on them trying to somehow meet this mandate.

Well, CARB figured out at the time it wasn't going to get there so they relented on it, but now they are not relenting.

So we have this mandate—not actually passed by legislature, signed by the governor but made by the California Air Resources Board, which is famous around the country for being heavy-handed on truckers and off-road vehicles and everything else.

Here is the funny part: Just a few days after this mandate came out, our esteemed Governor Newsom had to publicly beg electric vehicle owners to not charge their cars due to concerns about the power grid and blackouts. He told them, hey, please don't charge your cars right now because our grid is overstretched during that particular time.

You have also a few months later when the winter came in residents in Sierra Nevada lost power for many days due to heavy snowstorms knocking the power out, so they couldn't heat their homes and do normal things there. But if they had also had an electric vehicle they couldn't even have

gotten out of there to go someplace where it was warm or for other needs, maybe emergency medical care or what have you.

We also have rolling blackouts that are common in the State due to overuse and not enough power on the grid to keep things going. Industries in California, many of them have agreements with the utilities that they will voluntarily shut down if they are called upon if the grid looks like it is going to be overtaxed at a particular point. So you have manufacturers that have to lay off their workers for the rest of the day, stop production in order to pull off-line and not use power because we don't have enough of a power grid in California.

Then up in my area because we have a forest issue—which our forests aren't managed as well as they should be, especially Federal land by the U.S. Forest Service—where the power lines have been run through for many decades, where there is hydrogeneration, et cetera, power may be coming in from another State, we don't get to maintain around the power lines like we used to because it might be an environmental concern. We can't take the trees down that you need to to make sure that they can't swing if they are falling; they might fall within the path of those power lines if the tree, you know, is taller than what the clearance is, right?

So I had to pass a bill a couple years ago to make the process just a little bit easier to get a permit from the Forest Service to do that on Federal land. It is still not easy, and it is not very timely, but it got a little bit better. So we have that to deal with. They call it a public safety power shutoff.

It especially affects part of my district. It seems like when I drive through Tehama County sometimes during that time of year—now, they have improved it a little bit—the whole county would be shut off because the wind blew, and it might cause branches to blow into the power lines, therefore, bad things happen such as the Camp fire, which 85 people died in Paradise, California, due to a power line problem a few miles east of there with the wind blowing through. Then other fires like the Carr fire near Redding, the Zogg fire, and many others.

Then we saw, of course, the effects, tragically, in Hawaii that we just mourned this week—and that is what this red ribbon represents—because we are not managing the lands around power lines.

This is happening right in California at the same time they are mandating more and more electricity use, forcing us into vehicles we can't afford or don't want. Also, they want to ban gas stoves and gas water heaters and make them be on the grid, as well. I mean, you couldn't get any dumber with the stuff we are doing in my home State, my beautiful home State of California. Rolling blackouts.

By a miracle last year they decided we have to keep the Diablo Canyon nu-

clear power plant going for another 5 years instead of maybe a 40-year permit—it was put in in about 1982 when I was going to school down there in San Luis Obispo. It had a much longer life than what they were allowing because, oh, we don't like nukes, nukes are scary, even though they make zero CO<sub>2</sub>, as does hydropower.

Right now they are in the process of tearing dams out to make hydroelectric power in my district, and they have their eyes on more up in Washington and other areas because, oh, it might be an environmental issue. It is really absurd what we are doing to ourselves. We are putting ourselves into the Stone Age so we can go live in caves and eat insects that these guys are prescribing for us, you know. It is disgusting.

□ 1815

Now, they want to apply this toward our vehicles. We have got the cleanest burning, most efficient vehicles ever being put out by the car manufacturers, but they don't look at it that way. They don't give credit for how much better and cleaner it is. The Los Angeles Basin's air is cleaner than it has been. You remember the 1950s and 1960s and all that. It is so much cleaner now. We have made so much progress on this, yet they want to because they have the power to or arbitrarily think it is a feel-good policy to take these vehicles away, to take car choice away from people.

I remember the EPA under Andy Wheeler, just a few years ago, was trying to make it where people could have more affordable cars and not have this 54.5-mile-per-gallon mandate. What does a 54.5-mile-per-gallon vehicle look like to you? Is that a car choice to you when that mandate was going to be fully fleshed out?

I mean, most cars that get pretty good gas mileage get 30, 35, somewhere around there. A lot of others get 20, 25, depending on what you want, but it isn't about your choice. It is about government deciding what you need or what you should have; what is your neighborhood going to look like; how much do you get to travel anymore, all of these massive control issues.

We have public safety power shutoffs. We have them tearing down the hydroelectric dams. The dams they still do have, they are requiring more and more of the water to go out in such a way that they don't even turn the turbines. Instead, we want the cold water to go out to lower the temperature of the river maybe by 1 degree and it will be a little bit better for the fish in the river or we want the water to come off the top of the lake that can't go through the turbines because we want to save that colder water for later in the season so it can be 1 degree colder down the river for the fish. I mean, it is crazy.

When this first was announced by CARB, the Governor of California, we sent him a letter and his CARB chair,

Liane Randolph, asking them to consider alternate policies to reduce emissions that do not add additional strain to the State's energy grid or restrictions on consumer choice. Choice, we all like that around here, don't we?

I thank my California Republican colleagues for joining me on sending a unified message, and I believe that this letter has helped us get a bill on the floor this week, which is known as H.R. 1435. The bill would prevent the U.S. EPA from issuing a waiver to California Air Resources Board in order to enact that rule the State is trying to do, without, again, legislation by the elected legislators.

This is what they have been using for a lot of years to put California even under a tighter scrutiny than a lot of the rest of the country, and it makes us uncompetitive in many aspects.

Though 95 percent of the vehicles on America roads are run on internal combustion engines—they are using the acronym ICE these days—States like California are trying to pass these egregiously unrealistic emissions mandates to force American car manufacturers, and foreign ones, too, to prioritize EV manufacturing.

Where are we going to mine the materials to make these? Are we going to have the power on the grid to run them? You are going to change the power grid in neighborhoods to have the massive amounts of transformers and the wires and the poles and insulators and all of that in order to have these charging units inside people's homes and in their garages. They aren't taking that into account. It is just that la-di-da, pie-in-the-sky deal. We will just mandate it, and it will be great by 2035.

The idea that people just can't afford these vehicles, as many of them are sometimes \$17,000 to \$20,000 more for the equivalent, same size, same usage type vehicle, they don't care.

A whole bunch of the country's economy would be affected by this because probably a bunch of other States would follow California's ideas on this, with this waiver that they are seeking.

It is a real market manipulation that nobody has asked for other than the do-gooders in Congress, at the State level, and others that are forcing us in many ways in our lives. They want to force what kind of home we live in, what we eat, what we drive, and how we power our stoves and our water heaters.

Now, I mentioned a little bit ago how the grid got knocked out in some of the mountainous areas after the storm there. You think, well, at least people can go turn on their generator in order to provide some electricity and some heat in their home perhaps. No, no, they want to ban gas-powered or fuel-powered generators, too. I am wondering: What are you supposed to run a generator on if you can't run it on gas or diesel or natural gas or a propane tank or something you might have nearby? What are you supposed to run it on when the power goes out?

If you live in a rural area where there are frequent public safety power shut-offs or fire or other things happen that knock out the grid, what are you supposed to do? They just make up the mandates. Governor Newsom, who is maybe inspiring to be President—I warn people across the country who are watching, don't fall for this stuff.

I like to joke around a little bit. I am from California. People, don't do what we do, okay? It is going to affect your privacy. It is going to affect your freedom. It will affect basic choices. It will affect your economy of your household and of your State.

We don't even nearly have the EV charging systems that it would take to have them close enough or enough of them onsite. You ought to see the lines there. There is one place down in San Luis Obispo where you can see the cars all lined up, all the Teslas and all these other folks lined up waiting for the opportunity to plug onto one of these things for 2 hours and then go on about their way, about their business as they travel.

Mr. Speaker, you probably heard the story about the guy from, I think, Michigan who bought the new Ford electric truck and was going to go camping with it. He made it about one or two States away and finally had to give up on it. I think he went and bought a Dodge Cummins diesel in order to complete his family camping trip, because it was way oversold as to what it could do versus what it could actually do.

Getting back to the bill. We don't want to empower California, and perhaps up to 17 other States, with this EPA waiver, that they can force this stuff upon the people and take away their choices, their mobility to do what they need to do.

Ask a guy who is a contractor or a roofing company or a farmer or a rancher or a miner or a logger if they need their F-250 or if they want to get a fleet of five Priuses to go do the same job. They need to have choices. This is at a time when we have got, as I said, the cleanest running, most efficient vehicles we have ever made.

Oh, we have got to cut down on the CO<sub>2</sub>. Climate change. Climate change, give me a break. CO<sub>2</sub> is only 0.04 percent of our atmosphere. They act like it is the end of the world. CO<sub>2</sub> is an important building block for plant life. Everything is made out of carbon. They act like, because they have been able to dream this up as a killer, that we have to stop all things that make CO<sub>2</sub>.

I tell you what, if we are too good at this and we go below 0.2 percent, plant life starts dying off. Now, we will never be that good getting rid of CO<sub>2</sub>, but we are going to spend trillions doing it, and we are going to make ourselves a Third World country here while China and others keep going ahead.

Our Governor Newsom is running over to China for a visit to talk about climate change. Meanwhile, we have

one of the worst homeless problems in the State of California, and our economy and our water isn't that greater either. Even though we were blessed with so much rain this year, we need to build water storage for people. We need to build that for our agriculture so we can supply this Nation with the food it needs from California, with so many of our crops, 90-plus percent, coming from California.

You wouldn't have your almonds. You wouldn't have your tomatoes. You wouldn't have your pistachios. You wouldn't have many things that come from California, but we are prioritizing this nonsense of taking away people's vehicles.

Climate change gets preached on half the time around here, and every policy in this place has to be run through a climate change filter, even though it is nonsense that CO<sub>2</sub>, once again, is only .04 percent of our atmosphere and it is not a killer, because carbon is a building block of everything we live off of.

Please, call your Congress Member and tell them to support H.R. 1435. Don't empower California to control your State and your economy by mandating what kind of vehicles you can drive because it is going to affect you and it will ripple out from our whacked-out State to your State what vehicles you are going to drive and how you are going to do your business. Please check that out and support the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his remarks.

Sadly, what happens in California, that giant market out there, affects the entire country. I appreciate him shining light on that.

Mr. Speaker, I will wind down our Special Order hour just by returning to the issue of the impeachment inquiry.

Even as I have been sitting here, I got a question from a Hill reporter about some of the Senators in the other Chamber and their reaction to our bringing forward the impeachment inquiry.

I just want to say that, to speak very frankly, whether or not the Senate is courageous enough to confront the alleged corruption of President Biden is not really the House's concern.

As I mentioned earlier, it is Article I of the Constitution, Section 2, that gives the sole power of impeachment to us in the House. We are supposed to investigate these things. We have to do it. It is our constitutional responsibility. They will later try the matter, if it comes to them.

If our committee uncovers evidence, if our investigations uncover evidence that lead to an impeachment vote indeed, then it will be incumbent, when we send it over to the Senate, to decide if they want to engage with those facts. They will have to answer to their own constituents and voters and the American people, but we will have done our job here.

If the inquiry comes up fruitless, say some evidence is determined and uncovered that completely exonerates

President Biden, then we will have concluded a legitimate congressional inquiry as directed by the Constitution, and we will be satisfied with that and the American people will be satisfied. Some will be frustrated whatever happens at the outcome of this, but the Constitution will have been followed and upheld. On our side, that is the most important thing here.

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

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

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 117TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today, we have once again seen the majority party unable to govern. The defense bill was scheduled today, and apparently the majority party cannot get its act together, so we are not considering the defense bill today. Unfortunately, the Republicans seem to be frozen by their own dysfunction.

It is interesting that we have scheduled today to show the work that the 117th Congress did that is making such a positive effect today in America. Today, we ought to reflect on what Democrats accomplished by standing together last Congress, with some bipartisan support.

The 117th Congress was one of the most productive in American history because Democrats united behind a common cause: investing in America, making us stronger, safer, healthier, and more competitive in the 21st century.

Now, the historic investments we made to create jobs, lower costs, and build the economy from the bottom and middle out are coming to fruition. Conveying the scale of these laws' positive impact on our country is no easy task, especially in a single hour, and we do not expect to do it in this hour alone.

We can look at the past 32 months of consecutive job growth in America. We can point to the 13.5 million new jobs, including 800,000 new manufacturing jobs in the last 2½ years, added to our economy under the Biden-Harris administration.

□ 1830

The previous administration, by comparison, Mr. Speaker, added 500,000 manufacturing jobs to the economy in the first 3 years before the pandemic. Indeed, we created more jobs in 2 years than any prior administration has added in a single 4-year term.

We pushed the unemployment rate to a generational low, with more Americans working today than at any point in our Nation's history.

Rather than stalling out into a recession, our economy continues to boom because Democrats put people over politics to invest in America.

Goldman Sachs just put out a report estimating that we will see another 200,000 manufacturing jobs in the next 2 years alone. That makes a million new manufacturing jobs incorporated into what will then be a 15 million new jobs accomplishment.

With inflation threatening to eat into more take-home pay for working Americans last Congress, Democrats stepped up to pass policies to reduce costs, raise wages, and create jobs.

The results are now in: It worked, and it is still working. Wages continue to go up; inflation continues to go down; and our economy continues to grow at a steady pace.

There are many factors at play, Mr. Speaker, in the global economy, but we owe these strong economic trends in no small part to the laws we enacted in the last Congress.

Economic strength alone, however, doesn't capture all that these laws are accomplishing for the American people.

The best way to understand how these laws are transforming our Nation for all Americans is to meet Americans where they are to hear firsthand how these policies are making a difference in their lives and the lives of their families.

This year, Mr. Speaker, members of the Regional Leadership Council appointed by minority Democratic Leader JEFFRIES have had those conversations with countless Americans at schools, hospitals, union halls, small businesses, VA clinics, farms, and factories across the country.

We have also sought to identify further funding opportunities, implement these policies, and inform the public about how they can access these programs and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we want to show Americans how their tax dollars are building a better future for their families and communities.

We are working with Democrats to ensure that those investments reach every community in every corner of the country, and we look forward to working with Republicans to do the same. It doesn't seem to be their focus right now, but maybe it will be.

All Americans deserve to feel the impact of these policies, whether they live on the quietest country road or the loudest city street, because investing in America, Mr. Speaker, means investing in all of America.

Over the next hour, the members of the Regional Leadership Council will detail our implementation progress and show how investing in America's agenda is changing lives.

Mr. Speaker, I will now turn to my colleagues, and I yield first to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for this great opportunity.

Last Congress was the most productive in over 50 years. With the leadership of President Biden and Democrats in the House and Senate, and with the help of some moderate Republicans, we were able to pass landmark legislation, the core of which in our economic agenda was the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which had a bipartisan vote; the CHIPS Act, also a bipartisan vote; and the Inflation Reduction Act.

I am honored to serve on the Regional Leadership Council as we talk about investing in America. This is about progress, and I am honored to represent on that council both my home State of Florida and Georgia.

In Florida, we are slated for up to \$50 billion in infrastructure improvements. It means roads and bridges in places like I-4 in central Florida, which has been mired in traffic for years because of our great growth. It means a new airport tower in Tampa that Representative CASTRO worked on for their growing city. Across the State, we literally quadrupled the budget for ports in Florida because of these efforts.

I got to visit Cape Canaveral and see the work they are doing there in the top cruise line destination port in the world, the expansions there.

In south Florida, water projects to help with clean water as well as ports have also been huge, and we see these types of expansions at our airports, like Orlando International Airport with a new Terminal C and expansions there.

We have seen hundreds of thousands of jobs created in Florida because of these infrastructure projects. We are seeing local ironworkers, electrical workers, and local operating engineers working on these major projects as central Floridians are gathering together as well as Floridians from across the State.

A surprising fact: Florida had more lead pipes than any other State. That was a big surprise. Now, we have funding coming in to help out everything from schoolkids to seniors who live in mobile home developments.

We are also seeing a huge amount of work around the Inflation Reduction Act. Georgia is cleaning up right now in making electric vehicles, electric batteries, and even recycling EV batteries, with both Hyundai and Rivian joining in those areas.

In fact, when we were in our Energy and Commerce Committee, we had gentlemen from Georgia who had to change their tune on the very bill attacking EVs that was being discussed