

□ 1215

IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES IN LAHAINA

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has a proud immigrant tradition, with many of us able to trace our roots across the globe.

Few places in Hawaii exemplify our diversity more than Lahaina, where nearly a third of the residents are foreign-born. They came from the Philippines, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and more. They are the backbone of Maui's economy, working in hotels, restaurants, retail shops, and golf courses. They clean homes and are caregivers for "keiki," "children," and "kupuna," "elders," alike.

On a day when fire did not discriminate what it took, Lahaina's immigrant community bore more than its fair share of loss. A quarter of the deceased had ties to the Philippines. Too many lost documents and lifesavings.

Now, immigrants in Lahaina face impossible decisions. They are too scared to seek out the help that they need, and they are afraid to travel or relocate due to their legal status.

They need our help, and we have to meet them where they are through trusted partners so they can focus on healing and rebuilding.

Four generations ago, my family immigrated to Hawaii with the same hopes and dreams many in our Lahaina "ohana," "family," have. We can't forget our roots, and we must meet this moment with the aloha that they would have wanted.

HONORING MICHAEL MORAN

(Ms. BOEBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life, sacrifice, and service of Cortez Police Sergeant Michael Moran, a true American hero who laid down his life in service to our great country and his community.

Sergeant Moran was fatally shot during a traffic stop on November 29, providing a tragic end to a life of dedication and service.

Sergeant Moran answered the call to serve our Nation as a marine for 9 years before joining the Cortez Police Department in 2012. His life was marked with selfless courage and love, always putting others before himself.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Moran was a shining example for all Americans. His passing is an immeasurable loss for us all, and he was the best that Colorado's Third District had to offer.

My prayers go out to his family, his loved ones, and the community of Cortez. I pray for God's wraparound presence to surround them, comfort them, and heal them in this time of mourning.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sergeant Moran for his selfless service.

HIGHLIGHTING LACK OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN RURAL AMERICA

(Ms. SALINAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the lack of mental health services in rural America.

As facilities close their doors and providers leave town, many people in our rural communities are forced to travel for miles to get care or forgo care altogether. That is harmful and unfair, which is why I introduced a bipartisan bill to expand access to telemental health services in rural areas.

This legislation will specifically help folks working in farming, fishing, and forestry. These industries are critical to our economy and way of life in my district. In fact, Oregon has the second-largest number of Triple-F workers per capita in the entire country. These jobs can also be very stressful, and few seek help due to stigma.

Improving telehealth access will take away that stigma, save folks time and resources, and get more Oregonians the help they need when they need it.

Congress has left rural America behind for far too long. It is time we change that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this very important bill.

CELEBRATING DONALD LEWIS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, FLETC, chief financial officer, Donald Lewis, who is retiring after 40 years of Federal service.

Mr. Lewis started his Federal career when he was just a student back in 1983 as an audit assistant for the Federal Junior Fellowship Program at Kings Bay Naval Base in Georgia. From there, he was able to move up into the procurement career field by taking on different positions with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the Strategic Weapons Facility.

In 2004, Donald joined FLETC and worked in different positions before becoming the current assistant director and chief financial officer. As assistant director and chief financial officer, he provides strategic direction and executive oversight of FLETC business activities, which include executing and overseeing an annual budget of over \$600 million.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Lewis on his remarkable achievements and on his upcoming retirement. His years of distinguished service are extremely admirable.

CONGRATULATING VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY TROJAN EXPLOSION MARCHING BAND

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

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing Virginia State University, an esteemed historically Black college and university founded in Petersburg, Virginia, in 1882.

I rise today to congratulate the Virginia State Trojan Explosion Marching Band, which was recently recognized as the Nation's top Division II HBCU band in 2023. The band was judged on important components, including auxiliaries, drum majors, musicality, percussion, and marching maneuvers. They will now compete in ESPN's inaugural HBCU Band of the Year competition.

Throughout the year, the VSU Trojan Explosion was also invited to perform at the White House, NBC's "TODAY," and the National Battle of the Bands competition in Houston.

I commend Dr. Taylor Whitehead, VSU's director of marching and pep bands, and every member of the Trojan Explosion for their hard work and dedication. They are proof that greatness happens at Virginia State University. They have made their school, their community, and their Congresswoman proud. I will be cheering for them in their upcoming competition.

CHOICE IN AUTOMOBILE RETAIL SALES ACT OF 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 906, I call up the bill (H.R. 4468) to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing a proposed rule with respect to emissions from vehicles, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4468

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING, IMPLEMENTING, OR ENFORCING A PROPOSED RULE WITH RESPECT TO EMISSIONS FROM VEHICLES.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on May 5, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 29184).

SEC. 3. ENSURING TAILPIPE REGULATIONS DO NOT LIMIT THE AVAILABILITY OF NEW MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2) Any regulation” and inserting “(2)(A) Any regulation”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this subparagraph, any regulation prescribed under paragraph (1) (and any revision thereof), including any such regulation or revision prescribed before the date of enactment of this subparagraph, shall not—

“(i) mandate the use of any specific technology; or

“(ii) result in limited availability of new motor vehicles based on the type of new motor vehicle engine in such new motor vehicles.”

(b) NECESSARY REVISIONS TO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate such revisions to regulations as may be necessary to conform such regulations to section 202(a)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act, as added by subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part A of House Report 118-298, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 4468.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, and I urge all Members to support its passage.

America's economy is at its best when innovation, free enterprise, and consumer choice rule the day. This formula once made America a world leader in the automotive sector. Unfortunately, some key decisionmakers have forgotten that. Elected officials, government regulators, and auto manufacturers eager to appease their liberal overlords, especially those in the Biden administration, need a reminder of that fact.

It is troubling that this administration, in a faltering economy, would try to replace reliable, available, functional, and affordable transportation for hardworking Americans with something far less reliable, far less available, far less functional, and far less affordable.

Under EPA's recent tailpipe proposal, two-thirds of all new cars being sold in America must be electric-powered vehicles by 2032. That is only 8 years from now.

The American people did not ask for this.

While the average price of an EV reportedly fell 22.4 percent in the last year in response to lack of demand and government subsidies, they are still far more expensive than a liquid fuel vehicle.

There are also hidden costs: \$500 extra annually for insurance; at least \$4,000 for battery replacement, and that is the bottom; \$1,200 to \$2,500 for home charging equipment. That is after you pay to rewire your home.

Range anxiety is still a real concern. EVs need more frequent and much longer stops for charges. The average EV gets about 234 miles per charge compared to 403 miles with a gas fill-up. Plus, cold weather, battery size, and towing weight can shrink battery range significantly.

Any way you look at it, working-class Americans who need reliable and affordable transportation would take a hit from a mandate eliminating their options.

This bill protects our constituents, allowing them to buy the automobile that makes the most sense for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 4468, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. Instead of working with us on legislation to lower costs for consumers, protect public health, drive innovation, and grow the economy, the Republican majority is once again bringing an anti-clean vehicle bill to the floor as part of their polluters over people agenda.

H.R. 4468 would block the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing its proposed light- and medium-duty vehicle rule. It would also block the Agency from finalizing any future standard to cut greenhouse gas pollution from vehicles. This bill would simply prevent the EPA from doing its job.

House Republicans are trying to legislate away years of innovation in cleaner transportation to put polluters over people.

The Clean Air Act is clear, Mr. Speaker. EPA has the authority and obligation to protect American communities from air pollution that would cause harm to public health and welfare. That includes pollution from the transportation sector, the single-largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air pollution in the United States.

This pollution affects more than 100 million Americans who live in counties with unhealthy air, and air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths each year.

The EPA's proposed emissions standards for manufacturers of cars and light-duty trucks is intended to tackle this pollution head-on. The result: The new rule is projected to deliver \$1 trillion in net public health benefits.

Cleaner cars are also a win for consumers who can expect to save an average of \$12,000 in fuel and maintenance costs over the lifetime of a light-duty vehicle once EPA standards are in effect.

I will stress that EPA's proposal is achievable. It will save consumers money and bolster jobs and our economy by promoting American manufacturing. It will reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

With this bill, House Republicans are denying the American people all of these benefits.

The bill is also a direct assault on our domestic auto industry. Decades of innovation spurred by ambitious EPA standards have led to a growing fleet of cleaner, more affordable cars for all Americans.

I have to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the bill's reference to choice is a misnomer. EPA's proposed standards are key to expanding vehicle choice for American drivers. More than 100 electric vehicle models are now available in U.S. markets alongside many hybrid and gas-powered options, giving Americans unprecedented flexibility in where and how they choose to fuel. This incredible innovation is the main reason why the United States is a global leader in the transportation sector.

□ 1230

H.R. 4468 would stifle this innovation and cause detrimental uncertainty for American automakers. The bill includes vague language that will prevent the EPA from ever finalizing vehicle standards for any type of motor vehicle. The bill would lock auto manufacturers in today's technology in perpetuity, chilling potential advancements in new hybrids, flex fuel, fuel cell, and even internal combustion engines.

None of this makes any sense, Mr. Speaker. This extreme bill would hurt our ability to harness new technologies, which would only weaken our ability to compete with China.

With this legislation, Republicans are telling the American industry to stand down to China in a global challenge. That is just wrong. Rather than ceding that role to China, House Democrats delivered real solutions with the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act. These laws are investing in America's ability to beat our economic competitors, including China, ensuring the United States is the global leader on clean transportation.

H.R. 4468 would seriously hamper the EPA's ability to address the worsening

climate crisis and air pollution for vehicles. It would also limit consumer choice, stifle innovation, create uncertainty for American automakers, hurt American global leadership, weaken our ability to compete with China, and deny Americans the immense public health and environmental benefits of EPA's proposed standards.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, this bill does not prevent the EPA from finalizing a rule. It only tells the EPA that it cannot mandate a specific technology and prevents the EPA from issuing rules that limit a vehicle's availability based on engine type.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the full committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

President Biden's rush-to-green agenda is failing. Just last week, nearly 4,000 auto dealers all across this country sent a letter to President Biden urging him to stop his EV mandates. They said demand isn't there and the EVs are just sitting on their lots.

The administration has allocated billions for EV charging, yet not a single charger has come online as a result. All of this failed central planning is shipping our auto future and jobs to China. This is not the future Americans want or deserve.

For more than a century, affordable transportation has helped drive America's economic success. Our cars have allowed people all across this Nation and around the world to increase our mobility and raise our standard of living.

H.R. 4468 ensures that we can keep building on this legacy of American leadership and prosperity. Let's stop President Biden. He wants us all driving EVs, 100 percent battery electric, not plug-in, not hybrid, not plug-in hybrid. We don't agree. Vote for the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, when Americans get behind the wheel, when they want to drive their cars, they put it in "R" to go reverse and then they put it in "D" to go forward. Just as in the House here, the Rs want to take us backward, and the Ds want to drive us forward.

That is why I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. This bill would block the EPA from finalizing its proposed medium- and light-duty vehicle rule to strengthen tailpipe standards for future model years.

As we know, the transportation sector is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, and it is also a major emitter of other harmful air pollution.

It should not surprise anyone that the EPA is working to fulfill its obligation to protect Americans from harmful air pollution.

This bill prejudices the outcome of that process and will stifle technological innovation, despite the fact that the proposal will save lives, save consumers money, and bolster American manufacturing.

More and more Americans are choosing to go electric. They realize that EVs are not only good for the environment but also provide major consumer savings over the life of the vehicle.

Thanks in large part to the incentives included in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, even more of these vehicles and their components will be made here in America.

The legislation before us will undermine the tens of billions of dollars of planned investments to develop and produce American-made clean vehicle technologies by injecting uncertainty into these standards.

For over 100 years, America has been the greatest auto manufacturing nation in the world. If we want to continue to retain that title, we need to embrace the changes that are occurring in the sector. That means supporting the regulatory policies and incentives that would drive us forward to a cleaner and healthier future.

Unfortunately, this bill will stifle America's next great industrial revolution before we even seriously get into the race with China and dozens of other foreign competitors.

For the sake of promoting American innovation and to address our pollution challenges and supporting our long-term national economic competitiveness, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Put it in "D" to go forward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the author of the bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or the CARS Act.

In April, the Biden administration's EPA opposed a rule setting light- and medium-duty tailpipe emissions standards so stringently that the EPA expects the proposal would force two-thirds of new light- and medium-duty vehicles sold in 2032 to be electric.

There is no hiding that the proposed rule is an electric vehicle mandate. Not only does this EV mandate display breathtaking government overreach into the auto industry, but it is also unaffordable, unattainable, and unrealistic for American consumers.

EVs are \$13,000 more expensive than the average, gas-fueled vehicle. Repairs to an EV cost \$2,300 more on average, leading to higher insurance costs, over \$500 annually.

The proposed standards are also unattainable. Our grid cannot handle the power load that is required, plus most

of the country lacks the charging infrastructure needed for the mandate.

We also don't have access to all the critical minerals to produce the vehicles or the capacity to refine those minerals for use in batteries. China controls most critical mineral mines, processing, and manufacturing for EVs. China has 78 percent of the world's cell manufacturing capacity for EV batteries.

Have we already forgotten the disastrous realities of overreliance on China for our supply chain? I have yet to hear a constituent say we need our supply chains to be more reliant on China.

Opponents of the CARS Act argue that EVs are growing in popularity and prices are dropping. If that is the case, why is the mandate necessary? Just last week, nearly 4,000 car dealers sent a letter to the administration pleading with them to pump the brakes on the proposed rule, citing lack of demand.

The range of EVs is another concern. Currently, one charge couldn't even get me across my district. EVs have almost 80 percent more issues and are less reliable than other vehicles.

Let me be clear: I am not against EVs. I am against EV mandates. A single EV battery requires the mining of hundreds of thousands of pounds of minerals. Those minerals are then refined using energy from China's coal plants. Ironically, an EV mandate is not a silver bullet to reduce global emissions.

Sadly, the biggest loser for this mandate may be the American autoworker, since significantly less labor is required to assemble EVs. The future of those working at engine plants, like the one in my district, are now in peril, too. The administration should side with consumers and innovators, not pick winners and losers.

EVs will play a significant role in the future of the industry, but so should hybrids and other solutions as they become more functional, reliable, affordable, and chosen by the consumer.

Madam Speaker, let's allow consumers to have access to affordable and reliable cars, encourage American innovation, and set us up to prevail over China.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, a bill that would undermine the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to prohibit the EPA from implementing emissions regulations and their ability to protect our air quality and our climate.

I thank our ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, and, of course, my great colleague, Congresswoman DINGELL, from the State of Michigan.

The auto industry relies on the EPA and their emissions standards to successfully compete. When the GOP shut down the Federal Government in 2018, our automakers could not roll new automobiles off the line because they

needed the EPA to do the emissions testing.

This is dangerous legislation, particularly because the EPA serves as a critical partner to our automakers during this very transformative time.

No fear-mongering. People will have a choice. They will continue to have a choice, and they will work with their dealers. People do not have the choice of the air they breathe.

The United States is poised, through our manufacturing base, to lead the world in innovation, safety, and clean technology. Not only does H.R. 4468 jeopardize public health and the environment, it hurts our economy and global competitiveness.

Let us not cede technology to China. Let us create, develop and manufacture it here in the United States of America.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted it, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would strike the language that blocks EPA regulations based on the limited availability of new motor vehicles. This amendment would restore the EPA's authority and responsibility to set science-based standards that protect our health and climate while supporting American innovation and leadership in the automotive and manufacturing sector.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, my amendment would ensure the EPA can continue to drive progress in reducing vehicle emissions and advancing clean transportation technology.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), the co-lead for this bill.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or CARS Act, that I proudly co-led with Representative WALBERG.

This important legislation would prohibit the Biden administration's EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing its radical proposed rule that seeks to eliminate gas-powered vehicles. Additionally, the CARS Act would restrict the EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to pro-

mulgate similar rules moving forward. Hallelujah.

In April, President Biden's EPA proposed this radical rule that would set emission standards so high for light-and medium-duty vehicles that auto manufacturers would be forced to produce a higher percentage of electric vehicles just to comply. This is a de facto electric vehicle mandate on the American people. With this rule's implementation, the EPA projects that EVs could account for as much as 67 percent of new light-duty vehicle sales by 2032, as compared to electric vehicle sales of only 6 percent last year.

From assaulting the American people's Second Amendment liberties to the online censoring of free speech, the Biden administration is routinely abusing its power in order to further control Americans' everyday lives. With this new EPA rule, it is very clear that President Biden is now coming for our combustion engine car keys in his war against our personal freedoms.

Restricting consumer choice in the name of the left's Green New Deal garbage agenda represents an illegitimate power grab that hardworking Americans simply cannot afford.

One thing is clear. The American people already burdened by soaring energy prices and record-high inflation cannot be further burdened by this disastrous EV mandate.

□ 1245

I urge my colleagues to support the CARS Act, our commonsense legislation that would help save the American energy sector. It would protect both American consumers and auto manufacturers, and it would stop Biden's authoritarian government overreach in its tracks.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the ranking member of our Commerce and Consumer Protection Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, it is known that the transportation sector is responsible for the single largest greenhouse gas emissions. I choose not to contribute to that. I am the proud owner of a Chevy Volt, which is a very affordable, all electric vehicle—not one of the expensive ones that the Republicans like to talk about. It has zero emissions from the pipe. It is a beautiful little car that most families could afford.

I would say that the legislation that has been proposed actually takes choice away from Americans because it says that the EPA will no longer have the authority to regulate the emissions that are allowed. This will save lives.

This legislation that has been proposed is absolutely dangerous. What we know is that if the EPA can conduct its mission, then we would see 7 billion tons of greenhouse gases that would not be in the air. Lives would be saved.

This legislation is so important. The legislation that Republicans have proposed would take away the right of

Americans to have a safe environment and health. We say that this legislation is going in absolutely the wrong direction. We want to be sure that no one will vote for it. We will protect the lives of Americans, the right of the mission of the Environmental Protection Agency, and that we will have a better world to live in. That should be the right that is given to Americans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have tremendous respect for my colleague that just spoke, but I have to say that this idea that electric vehicles are emission-free is totally unfounded.

In fact, it is totally false. All you have to do is look at where the raw materials come from. Look at how China produces those materials. There are lots of emissions. If the argument is legitimate that we are going to save lives here, we are going to cost lives over there because they are not concerned about the climate. They are not concerned with the environment, they are not concerned about the people that they use—slave labor in many cases—to try to harvest the materials that make these electric vehicles in the first place.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I support EVs, but this administration continues to push a rush-to-green agenda that prioritizes government mandates over the American people.

The American people have spoken through their shopping habits. EVs sit unsold on lots nearly twice as long as internal combustion engine vehicles due to a lack of charging infrastructure and high costs. On average, EVs cost \$16,000 more than internal combustion engine vehicles.

We all want to reduce emissions, but EVs are not the solution that the administration says they are. The amount of raw materials in one long-range battery EV could instead be used to make 90 hybrid electric vehicles. The overall carbon reduction of those 90 hybrids over their lifetimes is 37 times as much as a single battery EV.

Where are the raw materials developed?

Mostly in China.

Should we be dependent on them?

Preserving consumer choice is critical to maintaining competition in the automotive markets and ensuring access to reliable and affordable cars for all Americans.

You cannot force Americans to buy cars they do not want any more than you can force energy transitions that can't be accomplished.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468.

I am frustrated and disappointed but not surprised to see my Republican colleagues bring yet another bill to the floor that puts polluters over people.

Scientists continue to warn us that the world is on its way to getting warmer and warmer and increasing global warming temperatures. If we want to avoid the worst climate changes and the worst disasters, we must reduce our air pollution.

Why, when we know that the transportation sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, would we limit the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to carry out its authority to improve transportation emissions?

Yet, today's bill would kill our chance of getting on the right track and put us on the wrong track. Poor air quality and ever-worsening climate disasters are increasing. Our constituents are already facing these major problems all over our country.

More than 45 million Americans, including many of my constituents, live within 300 feet of major roadways or corridors that contribute directly to negative health effects like asthma, cardiovascular disease, and premature death.

That is right, air pollution is a matter of life and death. Our work here in Congress will determine how liveable our planet is, whether our neighborhoods will be liveable or not for generations to come.

Today, my Republican colleagues have chosen to abandon a healthy and prosperous future for Americans. Republicans choose Big Oil companies and their profits over people. This is reckless, and I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 4468.

Madam Speaker, I wasn't here when my Republican colleagues were against Social Security, against Medicare, and now they are against making sure that we have a liveable planet. Please vote "no" on H.R. 4468.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we actually agree on some things with our Democrat colleagues. We agree that we ought to keep the environment clean: the air, water, and land. But throwing money at it, like my Democrat colleagues are trying to do, is not the answer to the problem.

This rule would result in lost middle-class jobs in the United States because we can't get new facilities and infrastructure even permitted to do these things under the current administration. Until that happens, America will be heavily reliant on China.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, do we live in Communist China?

Really, do we live in Communist China?

I can't believe that the Biden administration first wants to ban gas stoves—we had to do legislation to prevent that. Now, they want to ban 67 percent of the manufacturing of regular gas-powered cars by 2032. That is insane.

President Biden and my Democratic colleagues claim they are for the mid-

dle class. They always say: We are for the middle class. Well, no, they are not because who can afford these electric cars?

It is the people with a bunch of money. That is who can afford it. Not the middle class. Not the lower class.

I am in strong support of this bill to prohibit and prevent this radical regulation against common Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I had to come down to the floor to speak out strongly against the Republican's pro-China bill.

The Republican Party wants to take us backwards. They want to raise costs on American families, and, in doing so, a lot of people ask why? Why would you attack American auto companies and American workers? Why would you work against the best interests of the American people, putting money back into their pockets?

It has become clear to me, serving here, especially this Congress this year, that my good friends on the GOP side are shills for polluters. It is to the detriment of the people that we represent back home.

American workers and automakers have made huge innovations in the cars and trucks that we drive. Now, electric vehicles being built in America, rather than China and other parts of the world, are more energy efficient, they are fun to drive, and that is why American demand for EVs has jumped 350 percent over the past 2 years alone.

U.S. electric vehicles have now zipped past a major milestone. There have been 1 million battery electric vehicles sold in a single year. This year's sales suggest that a rising number of consumers are making that jump. Why?

Because you don't have the maintenance costs and you don't have to stop at the gas station. We have a lot of work to do on electric vehicle charging.

It has been the Clean Air Act that has helped American innovators and automakers and workers make our cars more fuel efficient over time. Now, with the historic Inflation Reduction Act passed by a Democratic-led Congress, signed by President Biden, we are bringing those manufacturers and the batteries and the assembly here in America.

It has been announced there is \$150 billion in investments across nearly 400 new facilities in U.S. electric vehicle and battery manufacturing in Ohio, in South Carolina, mostly in these red districts. This is a Made in America moment, and we have to reject these kind of take-us-backward attempts offered by the grand oil party, the GOP. Why did they do this?

Because they are so tied to fossil fuels and gas and oil that they cannot see what lies ahead of us. That means

investing in America for a change. That means having these vehicles manufactured here in America and not being worried about China eating our lunch.

They are the ones that are trying to flood the EU market. Do you think our European allies want to buy Chinese-made vehicles?

No, they want to buy American-made vehicles because they are our allies. Please vote against this pro-China GOP bill. Vote for America and vote "no."

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, again, I agree, vote America. I urge my Democrat colleagues to remember that fossil fuels have raised more people around this planet across the globe out of poverty than any other fuel source on the planet, and America knows how to do that best.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague's legislation, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act.

I thank my colleague, Congressman WALBERG, for leading on this important legislation. After 3 years, it has become abundantly clear that the administration's approach is bad for my Hoosiers and bad for the Nation.

You can't create demand by forcing supply. EVs continue to pile up on dealer lots across the country and in my district.

Almost daily, we hear of auto manufacturers that are tempering investor expectations because of underwhelming sales. The money is leaving.

Simply put, people are not buying EVs.

EPA's aggressive rule is a de facto mandate on Hoosiers to switch to EVs.

This legislation would curb EPA's electrification-or-nothing approach and allow consumers to choose the best type of vehicle that fits the needs of their family.

As I have repeatedly stated, this administration is fundamentally ignoring the reality of energy distribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. EVs may make sense for densely populated areas, but the lack of range and insufficient towing capabilities do not meet the needs of rural Indiana's Sixth District.

The CARS Act will begin to bring sensible policy back to the forefront and allow American innovation to lead the way to the next generation of transportation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1300

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), who is a member of our committee.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, last week, the Department of Energy's Geothermal Technologies Office released the most comprehensive analysis to date, quantifying the domestic lithium resources in the Salton Sea region of Imperial Valley, also known as Lithium Valley in my district.

The analysis found that Lithium Valley's total resources could produce enough lithium to manufacture over 375 million total electric vehicle batteries. This is more than the total number of cars currently on the road in the United States today. That is a lot of lithium and a lot of electric vehicles, and that will lower the cost of electric vehicles for everyone in our Nation.

Lithium Valley is a great example of how domestic solutions exist for our domestic and global supply chains, and my Republican colleagues should be as excited about this analysis as I am. Given their critical mineral supply chain concerns, I would think this is welcome news. However, instead of focusing our efforts on how to best leverage this report to further our domestic lithium production, we are here debating a bill that will do the exact opposite and harm our domestic supply chain efforts.

H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, would prohibit the EPA from finalizing their proposed rule on multipollutant emissions standards, drastically cutting into the development and production of domestic technological innovations, such as electric vehicles and battery manufacturing, that our Nation needs.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill in its entirety. In addition to slowing down our country's ability to compete with China on electric vehicles in the global market, it is a direct attack on our Nation's ability to curb vehicle emissions and help rural and marginalized communities in their own districts suffering from the highest pollution.

My home State of California and, in particular, my district, California's 25th, have significant air pollution challenges.

As a physician, I have seen the public health impacts of air pollution firsthand. These consequences are serious and have very real bad effects on the lives of my constituents. From having to skip work to deal with air pollution-associated health challenges to spending money on unexpected healthcare costs, my constituents are experiencing the negative impacts of air pollution every day.

Recently, the American Thoracic Society released its latest "Health of the Air" report, which estimated that we can prevent over 21,000 deaths by cleaning up our air, and a major step in doing so is by reducing vehicle emissions, which this bill will not do.

What we should be doing is following California's lead by taking concrete steps to reduce dangerous air pollution from transportation modalities. In-

stead, this bill specifically punishes California for its efforts, and that is unacceptable.

California has chosen to make the health of Californians a priority. This bill should do the same for all Americans, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this environmentally unfriendly and disastrous polluter-over-people bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, we are seeing President Biden put Green New Deal priorities ahead of Pennsylvania families. By proposing to eliminate gas-powered cars from our roads, the Biden administration is attempting to fundamentally change how Americans drive.

The proposed rule from the EPA assumes that battery electric vehicles will make up 60 percent of new cars in 2030 and almost two-thirds by 2032. The basic facts show us that this assumption is simply wrong and that attempting to ban the sale of internal combustion engine cars, internal combustion engine trucks, and internal combustion engine SUVs that families in Pennsylvania rely on is dangerous.

This legislation is a vital part of stopping the Biden administration's far-left, Green New Deal agenda from being implemented.

In tandem with my legislation, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, the CARS Act would help to ensure that the Clean Air Act, which is a 51-year-old piece of legislation, is not manipulated to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we have heard testimony from experts across the political spectrum, including members of the Biden administration, who say that transitioning to EVs would be costly and ineffective. Just this month, we heard from more than 4,000 car dealers, including 70 from Pennsylvania, who say that transitioning to battery vehicles would be a disaster for drivers across our country.

More than 95 percent of Americans use gas-powered vehicles. Demanding that they transition to battery electric vehicles in the next decade would be disastrous for our economy, unsustainable for our electric grid, and devastating to American families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and put a stop to President Biden's reckless use of agency rulemaking.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), who is a member of our committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I love my colleagues on the other side, but it is just disappointing that,

yet again, another Republican messaging bill is coming to the floor intentionally to mislead and harm the American people.

Even the United Auto Workers, who my colleagues say they are helping, say that this bill seeks to inject American union-made vehicles as a wedge issue in the culture war.

I remind my colleagues, some of whom are young while some of us are seasoned, that it was years ago when gas prices went up and consumers wanted smaller cars. Japanese carmakers were prepared, and our domestic auto industry was flatfooted. We weren't ready to build small cars, and we took a beating.

We cannot make that mistake again. We need to be ready to innovate, build these electric vehicles now, and do so in a competitive way.

This bill is a blatant attack on the EPA and on our ability to, and how we will and must, compete in a global marketplace. It prevents the EPA from finalizing recently proposed new standards for light- and medium-duty vehicles, which will save consumers up to \$12,000 over the lifetime of their vehicles. It will also reduce fine particle pollution that not only harms our environment but leads to increased asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, lung cancer, and premature death.

To be really clear, EPA is not imposing an electric vehicle mandate. EPA's standards actually would expand vehicle choice by accelerating innovation in hybrid and fully electric vehicles and promote American manufacturing to keep us from relying on our adversaries. In total, EPA estimates that the net benefits of these standards would exceed \$1 trillion.

The bill we are debating will have widespread harmful effects on the future of our auto industry. What scares me the most is this is going to enable China even more to potentially lead the global EV transition.

I ask my colleagues, are we going to help China do anything? I am not. I will not cede American leadership to anyone. We cannot let future mobility be dictated to us by foreign competitors when we are the ones who put the world on wheels.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to invest in our EV transition so we don't lose to China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have talked to those dealers. The dealers aren't opposed to EV vehicles. There is a rulemaking, and the rulemaking needs to take their input into consideration.

I am a car girl. I was born one, raised one, worked in it, and my district depends on it.

Let's get serious. We need to get to work, and blocking our domestic auto

industry from innovating is no way to lead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this crazy push to make EVs the only choice for U.S. car buyers without first building out our domestic supply chains for critical minerals is a recipe for dependence on China and, by extension, defaulting to China's filthy environmental practices.

Aren't we already too beholden to China? It really stinks, but, yes, we are.

Moreover, China's EV companies have announced significant investments to manufacture EVs in Mexico, presumably to gain access to the North American car market.

Why is the Biden White House hell-bent on shoving their EV mandates down Americans' throats?

China is not our friend, Mr. Speaker, and unlike China's treatment of their very own citizens, we should not be dictating to Americans what they can or cannot drive. In America, we let consumers choose the cars they drive. It is that simple. Even one of our speakers over there said that she chose to drive an EV.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. This legislation is misguided and will take us backward in combating climate change and air pollution.

If I may offer some brief history from my home State, for much of the mid-20th century, California was plagued by smog. Thankfully, the Clean Air Act allowed California to establish stronger vehicle emission standards than those at the Federal level. Standards like those in my home State empowered the auto industry to produce better, cleaner cars, which expanded American manufacturing and reduced our reliance on foreign oil.

These standards were a win for consumers, for our domestic auto industry, and for meeting our air quality and climate goals. However, H.R. 4468 would erase the decades of progress we have made by blocking EPA from reducing air and climate pollution.

In fact, the only party that would benefit from rolling back EPA's efforts to slash air pollution is the fossil fuel industry.

This bill isn't based in science, and it fails to recognize the climate impacts our constituents are already feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mr. Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or CARS Act.

The American people shouldn't be told by unelected bureaucrats which car best suits their needs and the needs of their families, but the Biden administration is seeking to do so through some backdoor policymaking aimed at taking gas-powered engines off the market.

Let me be clear: This is not about being anti-electric vehicle. This is about being pro-consumer choice. Demand should be driven by consumer preferences and budgets.

Let's look at the facts. According to a report from the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, gasoline-powered cars and trucks represented 93 percent of all new vehicle sales in 2022. According to Congressional Budget Office projections, electric vehicles will account for only 30 to 56 percent of new car sales by 2032.

Even with the outrageous incentives for electric vehicles that are being subsidized by taxpayers, which are included in Biden's so-called Inflation Reduction Act, this policy will fall well short of EPA's goal of two-thirds of new car sales being electric vehicles.

No matter how much the government floods the market with requirements that squeeze out internal combustion engines and require electric vehicles, if consumers don't want to buy the cars, then they should not be forced to do so.

The CARS Act will stop the EPA's current light- and medium-duty vehicle regulations and, instead, allow consumers and the market to determine the cars and engine technology needed and save billions in taxpayer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill and consumer choice.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, House Republican's latest attempt to undermine climate change action taken by the Biden administration and dismiss the high risks presented by air pollution for communities like mine.

My district falls within the South Coast Air Basin, which has the worst air pollution in the entire country. Inland Empire residents have higher levels of cardiovascular disease, childhood asthma, and other respiratory diseases compared to the national average as a result.

□ 1315

The EPA's proposed rule, which this bill would inhibit, reduces car emissions, drives innovation of clean technologies, and improves public health in my district and across the country.

My constituents deserve to breathe clean air and live healthy lives. We should all support EPA's efforts to address health disparities and combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), my friend, colleague, and neighbor.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

President Biden has made it clear since day one that he will use the full weight and power of his office to push a radical climate agenda at the expense of consumer choice and American energy security.

His rush-to-green agenda, drawn up and enforced by Washington bureaucrats, pushes for a one-size-fits-all approach to vehicle purchases.

The Biden administration's standards would mandate that two-thirds of all new vehicles sold by 2032 be electric. The standards strong-arm manufacturers into building cars that simply do not reflect market demand.

In fact, last month nearly 4,000 car dealers from all 50 States joined a letter to President Biden urging him to slow down the EPA's proposed rule.

Just last week, Consumer Reports released a survey showing that electric vehicles proved far less reliable than internal combustion engine counterparts.

The survey found that EV model years 2021 through 2023 encountered nearly 80 percent more problems compared to the conventional vehicles. It is no wonder Ford and GM recently announced they are cutting back investments in EV production and reassessing their EV production goals for the first half of 2024. The American people just aren't buying them.

Furthermore, the EPA's rule, if implemented, will increase the strain on our electric grid at a time when misguided State and Federal energy policies are already driving power plants to retirement.

With the passage of this legislation today, we can reaffirm our support of the free market and consumer choice.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of the CARES Act today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the California Air Resources Board having been a Republican appointee by Governor Pete Wilson and having served under two Republicans and one Democratic Governor, I have seen the modeling firsthand to know the importance of reducing our transportation omissions. It is through this lens that I strongly oppose H.R. 4468.

This bill would not only prevent the EPA from implementing its newest and strongest emission standards, but it would also block EPA from finalizing vehicle emission standards that indirectly result in the phasing out of any specific engine technology, which could deal a fatal blow to innovation and the deployment of alternative fuel energies, including electric vehicles.

EPA's proposed standards that this bill would eliminate, reduces 7.3 billion metric tons of carbon pollution and 15,000 tons of particulate matter pollution, which would provide between \$63 and \$280 billion in health benefits to Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill and partisan efforts to thwart EV development and hinder emissions reductions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill because American consumers are directly impacted by the cost of vehicles.

Unfortunately, the EPA is trying to force Americans into only being able to pick from some of the most expensive vehicles on the market—electric vehicles.

The Energy and Commerce Committee received testimony in April that the average price of an EV is \$13,000 more than the average price of an internal combustion engine vehicle.

Detroit News Editorial Board reported last week that the new average EV list price was 28 percent higher than a gasoline vehicle last month, according to CarGurus.

In addition, insurance for an EV is also \$44 more expensive per month versus \$528 more expensive per year than insurance for gas-powered cars. EVs are 50 percent more expensive to fix in the case of an accident, according to Forbes.

The price of a vehicle is incredibly important to my constituents and those of my colleagues because access to a car is tied to improved economic outcomes for low-income households.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill to preserve affordable vehicle choices for Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. McCLELLAN).

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468. I have listened as the party that is actively trying to strip away America's personal freedoms and rights is disguising its antiscience, anticlimate legislation as protecting choice and personal freedom. That is rich.

House Republicans are putting polluters over people, yet again prioritizing special interests over the health and well-being of Americans.

This deeply harmful bill would undermine the EPA's authority to finalize proposed emission standards and prevent the agency from taking future action to protect the public from dangerous air pollution.

Their opposition to the rule has very real impacts for historically marginalized environmental justice communities, most often low-income communities of color, many of which I represent, who live near the roadways.

We know greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants can cause a host of adverse public health impacts, including higher rates of cancer, respiratory illness, and preterm births, which is why we cannot stand by while House Republicans work to curtail EPA's authority.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this irresponsible bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, the EPA is forcing electric vehicles upon Americans by using a tailpipe emissions rule designed to phase out vehicles with internal combustion engines. In so doing, the EPA imposes an unwise restrictive policy and eliminates consumer choice.

The Clean Air Act directs the EPA to reduce pollutant emissions from vehicles themselves; however, electric vehicles are entirely separate products. They are not emission-controlled devices like catalytic converters in combustion engine cars.

By setting emission standards at a stringent rate, the EPA is essentially mandating substitution of a different product to comply with tailpipe standards.

This goes beyond existing authority and tries to circumvent congressional powers, and that is illegal.

Instead of ripping away consumer choice, the EPA should do its job and stop enforcing irrelevant rules to meet political objectives. Those in favor of the EPA's rules here use the term "sound science." Well, cutting off vehicles that have shown tremendous improvements in efficiency with less emissions is denying scientific gains.

What would actually help Americans is driving lower fuel prices through domestic production with reliable base-load energy sources like nuclear, hydro, geothermal, natural gas, and clean burning coal.

We need to stop attempting to control what vehicle drivers can purchase and instead focus on what the people elected them to do.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect people's rights and choices, and pass H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my friend and outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, if this was a "Jeopardy!" game, it would be called: Here we go again for a thousand.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at what the EPA has done to overreach, we are

talking hundreds of proposed rules that they have overreached on telling the American public what they can and can't do.

Mr. Speaker, if it were allowed under House rules, I would address the gallery and I would ask the gallery, raise your hand if you like the fact that the President of the United States is going to tell you what kind of vehicle you can and cannot drive.

It is not necessarily allowed under House rules, but I am guessing, because my district doesn't like it, that most Americans don't like it either.

Today, we are going to stop the EPA from outlawing gas-powered vehicles. The CARS Act places a critical stop sign on this failed path toward forcing all Americans to own electric vehicles. Not only does this legislation prohibit the EPA from enforcing a ban, but it also acknowledges the abuse that the EPA has done.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I thank Mr. WALBERG for leading this legislation. The Energy and Commerce Committee is leading the way to energy dominance and allowing Americans to make their own choices that they very much need to be able to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from referencing the occupants in the gallery.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automotive Retail Sales Act.

A few months ago, the EPA proposed a new rule that would effectively require the vast majority of automobiles sold in the United States to be electric within just a few years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against electric vehicles, but I feel very strongly that American families should be empowered to choose the vehicle that best meets their needs rather than having their government make that decision for them.

Mr. Speaker, I represent over 100,000 people who commute from my rural California district back and forth into Los Angeles every single day. For those people, an electric vehicle is not only unaffordable, it is also impractical.

Preserving their ability to make their own choice on this issue also preserves the market forces that incentivize manufacturers to continue to lower the cost of electric vehicles and increase their quality.

Mr. Speaker, that is good not only for families, but also for the environment. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act.

The out-of-touch government dictated EV mandates pushed by this administration are an attack on our way of life in northern Minnesota and across this country.

Many of my constituents not only can't afford an EV, they don't want to purchase an EV because they are not compatible with our daily lives. How are we supposed to reliably drive an EV when its battery has the potential to lose 50 percent of its range in Minnesota's subzero temperatures?

Let's not forget that the critical minerals used to make these EVs are sourced from Chinese Communist Party-controlled mines in places like the Congo and Indonesia—mines that have zero environmental standards, mines that have zero labor standards, and mines that use child slave labor.

Thanks to this administration's refusal to support responsible, domestic mining, their EV mandate will only increase our reliance on the Chinese Communist Party for critical minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind you and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the biggest copper nickel find is in northern Minnesota, the Duluth Complex—95 percent of our nickel reserve, over 88 percent of our cobalt, and a third of our copper and other platinum group metals that help make electric vehicles—and this administration just pulled the leases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 4468.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), an auto dealer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, and in full disclosure, I am a car dealer. I am, frankly, the expert in the room.

This legislation would stop the EPA from implementing a rule that is an attack on hardworking Americans and, if implemented, would decimate small businesses and wreak havoc on the pocketbooks of families.

As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and owner and operator and expert in car dealerships in Texas for over 52 years, I have seen firsthand the impact that overregulation can have on small businesses. Competition drives my industry, not government innovations. By the way, no one wants to buy an EV vehicle.

We are a country of competition, of risk and reward, and the Federal Government should not be in the car business. We must allow individuals to choose the vehicle that best suits their

needs, not the government or Joe Biden.

The EPA's proposed rule would have heightened impact on hardworking American families with an estimated increase in costs from maintenance to interest costs to lack of equity. It is clear President Biden's EPA are out of touch with the American people by ignoring out-of-control inflation while pushing a green energy bailout.

The customer is getting hammered again and your local car dealer is getting hammered again. The proposed rule would also increase our dependency on China, something the administration seems determined to ensure happens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and Main Street America and vote for H.R. 4468.

□ 1330

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The amazing thing to me is that today during the debate, I heard very few statements on the part of the Republicans about clean air.

This is all about the Clean Air Act and the fact that the EPA is trying to set standards that will eliminate pollution and make it easier for people to breathe and not be negatively impacted by pollution that is in the air. What the Republicans want to do is gut the Clean Air Act so those standards cannot be put in place.

Now, they also mentioned China constantly, over and over again. The fact of the matter is that with this bill, they would be putting China in charge. China is the country—Beijing—that imposes the mandates. What the EPA does is basically say in order to achieve cleaner air, we are saying to the car manufacturers, they have to do certain things, but they still have the choice of what kind of vehicles to produce, whether it be a hybrid, an electric, or a gasoline-combustion vehicle.

All those vehicles are still going to be available, are still going to be manufactured. It is just that they are going to have fewer or no emissions, and the air will be cleaner for Americans to breathe.

Now, the ultimate thing is when the Republicans talk about the workers and the jobs. The fact of the matter is, the United Auto Workers—which represents most of the car makers, or all of them as far as I know—are opposed to this bill. The reason for their opposition is because they want to continue to manufacture cars.

They don't want China to continue to innovate and essentially start to corner the world market on electric vehicles or even other vehicles. If that happens, the number of jobs here in the United States will be diminished. They are saying we oppose this bill because we want to create more cars and create more jobs, and we want the United States to continue to be the leader.

For all these reasons—for cleaner air, to keep American leadership above any

competition with China, to make sure there continue to be choices with the cars that you buy through your manufacturers—I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this bill, which I think is going to take away the American leadership in car manufacturing and innovation and so many other things.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my friend and colleague, to close.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, what it really boils down to is choice for Americans, affordable choices. Just because we want to be part of this green agenda here, constantly crying about climate change doesn't mean it is going to be good for Americans.

These mandates, for example, on trucks will add 16,000 pounds of weight that is no longer part of the cargo capacity for trucks. On automobiles, it is adding about \$13,000 to the price of a car.

Little credit has been given for how efficient and clean internal combustion engines run these days. This is all a big CO₂ scam. I remind you; CO₂ is only 0.04 percent of our atmosphere.

Let's go back in the direction of allowing people to have choices of the best manufactured cars that come from right here in America instead of giving it over to China, which is what will happen on the mined products, the labor, so many other things.

Americans can figure out what they like. They certainly don't need California mandates that have already failed in the past and the Federal Government dictating to them what their choices are in driving.

H.R. 4468 is a good, righteous bill. Let's support that and help people continue to have the choices they want in this country and not be mandated by Congress or certainly California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that was my closing, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118-298.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Washington, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

“(B) Any regulation proposed or prescribed, including any revision to a regulation, under paragraph (1) on or after January 1, 2021, shall not—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the CARS Act is to permit Americans, not the executive branch of the Federal Government, to continue deciding what type of car makes the most sense for them.

The purpose is not to reopen decades-old requirements that Americans have become accustomed to with their cars, and which manufacturers consider to be standard—whether it is the catalytic converter or the onboard diagnostic system, especially because those regulations were not trying to do away with an engine type—but, rather, to just address the most harmful pollution coming from that car.

Rather than creating any confusion for EPA, automakers, or the public, or leading to unintended consequences or unnecessary litigation, this amendment sets a limit on how far back in time the provisions of H.R. 4468 apply.

Instead of applying to any regulation ever issued in the history of the authority provided under Clean Air Act section 202(a), the manager's amendment caps the retroactivity of the bill's provisions to section 202(a) regulations, including revisions, proposed or prescribed on or after January 1, 2021.

By adding this date, the legislation focuses on pushing back on regulations that would have the Federal Government, and not Americans, decide what kinds of cars they should be able to drive.

For over 100 years, Americans have been free to buy their own mode of transportation based upon what is available, reliable, affordable, and functional for their lives. Quite frankly, it was because of these criteria that electric vehicles never took off with American consumers, but the Model T did.

The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that adopting this amendment would have an insignificant net effect on the deficit.

I urge all Members to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would revise the look-back portion of the bill that requires EPA to revise all previous regulations to conform with the bill's vague metrics on limiting availability of vehicles.

This amendment would shorten this period to only apply to rules finalized under the Biden administration, so please understand what they are doing here is saying that the only thing we are going to revoke, essentially, are the rules that were finalized under President Biden. I mean, nothing could be clearer that this amendment is

based on politics and not policy by limiting the revocation to the Biden administration.

This amendment does not improve the legislation in any way. It fails to address the fundamental problems with the underlying bill. The amendment is essentially trying to go back in time to the failed policies of the Trump EPA. We would literally be moving backwards in our efforts to address the climate crisis and decarbonize the transportation sector and trying to eliminate pollution that affects Americans.

The amendment doesn't address any of the concerns that my Republican colleagues claim to have about electric vehicles. This amendment simply doubles down on Republicans' attacks on EPA's authority, public health, and regulatory certainty.

It does absolutely nothing to support our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry, like boost American competitiveness, counter China, or strengthen our economy.

This is just blatantly political, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment as well as the underlying bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at what we have heard today. If we want to help America's autoworkers, then let's keep them on the job. It takes a lot less labor to make electric vehicles than it does to make combustion engine vehicles.

If we want to protect the environment, then let's keep China from doing all the mining and refining of the rare earth minerals and critical materials, and supply chain that we actually need to make electric vehicles here in America.

If we want to stop supporting China, rather than buy Chinese cars, which is where this is ultimately going to go if we continue down this road, let's permit mining and refining of critical materials right here in America so when we do make electric vehicles, and we give the American people a choice about purchasing those vehicles, they are made with American materials mined and refined in America by American workers rather than putting money in the pockets of the Chinese Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to think about what the future looks like. We need to rein in the EPA's egregious rule mandating electric vehicles.

Let me remind you, Republicans are not opposed to electric vehicles. I have a lot of friends who own electric vehicles. Not very many of them live in Appalachia, rural communities, where they are impractical and unaffordable, but if we want to empower the American people with choice, then we need to roll back this EV mandate because the day will come when the only choice that people will have is to buy a car

that is manufactured in China by China. That will be the only thing that is going to be available because we can't get permits here in America to do our mining and refining of those critical materials.

China has already sent signals that they are going to start and have already started withholding those critical materials that we need to make electric vehicles.

The Chinese are setting a trap. God forbid if we let the Biden administration force us to fall into that trap.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4468 is postponed.

□ 1345

DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFAIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5933.

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

□ 1346

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, with Mr. MOYLAN in the chair.