

Today marks 100 days since the President took back the White House, and along with the Republican-led House with the leadership of Speaker MIKE JOHNSON and the Senate, immediately began promises made, promises kept, delivering for American families.

In just 100 days, the Trump administration has secured the borders, restored energy independence, begun peace through strength, and brought massive investments and jobs, making America competitive again.

President Trump is keeping his promises to families, making the country strong, safe, and secure.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Open borders for dictators puts all Americans at risk of more 9/11 attacks imminent, as warned by the FBI. Trump is reinstituting existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin's lies with the fake cease-fire of May 8-10 for a military parade, insulting President Trump's good faith efforts for a real cease-fire.

#### CUTS TO VA BENEFITS

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I recently visited the Bronx VA Medical Center in the Bronx, New York. This center serves many in my district, and I am grateful for the quality care they provide and for the groundbreaking research happening at this facility.

When a young person signs up to join the military, Americans make them a promise that we will take care of them for the rest of their lives because they have put on the uniform of this country and risked their lives for all of us.

That is why it is perplexing and unconscionable that this administration has proposed devastating cuts to VA healthcare and benefits, eliminating 80,000 staff who provide healthcare and benefits to veterans who have earned them.

More than a quarter of VA staff are veterans themselves. Cuts to the programs that provide home loan assistance to veterans, even cutting staff of the suicide crisis line that saves lives—for what? This message does not say: Thank you for your service. This is a slap in the face for those who have served.

My Democratic colleagues do not support these cuts, and this is an ideal moment for bipartisanship, where our Republican colleagues can join us in pushing back.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF SAMANTHA "SAMMY" SCHERBA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of

Samantha "Sammy" Scherba. Sammy was just 28 when we lost her, a vibrant, artistic soul whose light touched every life that she encountered.

She had a massive heart, big enough to embrace the entire world. Whether it was people, animals, or even the tiniest of insects, Sammy believed that every living thing deserved love and compassion. She brought life back into withering plants and turned simple stones into stunning works of art.

In the end, she gave the ultimate gift: life to others through organ donation. At her honor walk at the Cleveland Clinic, more than 150 people lined the halls, a testament to her impact.

Sammy was a daughter, a sister, an aunt, and a friend. She loved deeply, and she was loved deeply.

I honor her family who are here today, who flew in from my district, Ohio 7.

May God bless her memory.

#### DEMOCRATS ARE FIGHTING BACK

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

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 100 days since Donald Trump's return to power, 100 days of destruction, chaos, and heartbreak, all rubber-stamped by congressional Republicans.

Trump promised to lower costs. Instead, extreme tariffs have driven up prices and tanked the stock market, gutting retirement savings.

Trump promised to protect Social Security. Instead, he is closing offices, firing workers, and making it harder for seniors to get the benefits that they earned.

Trump promised to fight for hard-working Americans. Instead, he is pushing a cruel budget that rips food and healthcare from children, from seniors, and from veterans, all to hand massive tax breaks to billionaires.

While families struggle, Trump plays golf, and his buddy, Elon Musk, is chainsawing the American Dream.

It has been 100 days of chaos, destruction, and heartbreak, and Democrats are fighting back.

#### FENTANYL AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, today is Fentanyl Awareness Day, a day meant to spread awareness of a ruthless poison that has stolen the lives of too many of our sons, daughters, sisters, and brothers.

My family and I know this pain personally. My brother Luke was taken from us by a single pill laced with illegal fentanyl.

Mr. Speaker, so many families across our country have experienced this same pain. It is a tragedy, but we can-

not let heartache keep us down. Our family and this country, we do not weep in the wake. We rise, we fight, and we prevail.

When America enforces her laws, we win. Fentanyl trafficking is down 54 percent. Border encounters are down 93 percent. Thousands of MS-13 thugs have been thrown out.

This is no accident. It is the result of strong leadership, of resolve, and of putting America first.

I will continue to do my part and fight for families against this poison.

#### RECOGNIZING VIRGIN ISLANDS YOUTH

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize another example of the fierce brilliance of Virgin Islands youth.

This week, the champions of the U.S. Virgin Islands Regional Science Bowl, the St. Croix Educational High School and Church of God Holiness Academy, stand in Washington, D.C., not just as competitors but as symbols of excellence, Caribbean intellect, and Virgin Islands pride. They represent not just their school. They represent the potential and promise of our home.

As always, the small geographic space called the Virgin Islands does big "tings." These students are an example of the potential of the Virgin Islands. These are the future scientists, engineers, and innovators of America.

I thank the coaches and families for supporting our youth. I congratulate the students. I know they will represent us well in this week's competition and will remember to stay VI Strong.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 60, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RELATING TO "GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA: MOTOR VEHICLES"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 78, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RELATING TO "ENDANGERED AND THREATENED WILDLIFE AND PLANTS; ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT OF THE LONGFIN SMELT"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 87, PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; HEAVY-

DUTY VEHICLE AND ENGINE EMISSION WARRANTY AND MAINTENANCE PROVISIONS; ADVANCED CLEAN TRUCKS; ZERO EMISSION AIRPORT SHUTTLE; ZERO-EMISSION POWER TRAIN CERTIFICATION; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 88, PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; ADVANCED CLEAN CARS II; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ENGINE AND NONROAD ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; THE 'OMNIBUS' LOW NO<sub>x</sub> REGULATION; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 354

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The joint resolutions referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Park Service relating to "Glen Canyon National Recreation Area: Motor Vehicles".

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the San Francisco Bay-Delta Distinct Population Segment of the Longfin Smelt".

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 4 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to

final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. The joint resolutions referred to in section 3 of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 87) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions; Advanced Clean Trucks; Zero Emission Airport Shuttle; Zero-Emission Power Train Certification; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

(c) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO<sub>x</sub> Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision".

SEC. 5. Each day during the period from April 29, 2025, through September 30, 2025, shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of West Virginia). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROY. 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 gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

Last night, the Committee on Rules met and produced a rule providing for consideration of five pieces of legislation.

H.J. Res. 60 and H.J. Res. 78 are both considered under a closed rule, each with 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees and provides each a motion to recommit.

Additionally, H.J. Res. 87, H.J. Res. 88, and H.J. Res. 89 are all considered

under a closed rule, each with 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees and provides each a motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule tolls the date counts regarding resolution of inquiry until September 30, 2025.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of this, I will start by saying on the Committee on Rules we tend to get to know each other pretty well in significant late-night engagement in debate. The ranking member of the Committee on Rules, Mr. MCGOVERN from Massachusetts, has had an unfortunate loss that words cannot possibly convey as a dad what he and his wife are going through with the loss of his daughter, Molly.

I say from this side of the aisle, I know speaking for the entire Committee on Rules irrespective of party affiliation, how much JIM, his wife, and his son are in our prayers after losing their daughter and sister, Molly, to cancer.

As a cancer survivor, I have seen firsthand the horrors of the disease. I told my Committee on Rules colleagues last night in committee, in my time in treatment at MD Anderson, going through chemo seemed trivial to me compared to watching the parents at MD Anderson who were watching their children go through treatment.

Molly went to Heaven last week while visiting a friend in Italy, and I think I speak for everybody in this body when we offer our deepest condolences to JIM and to his entire family and to our colleagues who were so close with and knew Molly, who, by the way, from memory I believe worked for JAMIE RASKIN as an intern, and had her own engagements in public service.

When I heard of her passing, I did a little googling about her life, her love for sports and Boston sports, her love of her dad, and how proud she was of her dad.

While, just on occasion, JIM and I might have disagreed here on the House floor—it has been known to happen—we are all united in offering our condolences and prayers for JIM's family, and God bless Molly and his entire family.

Mr. Speaker, on the legislation that is before us, I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are, no doubt, about to launch into how we have had an ineffective first 100 days and Congress is not doing anything.

Let me put in perspective for the American people what we are focusing on.

We are focusing on undoing the damage of the last 4 years of the Biden administration. The President is doing that on a daily basis in the White House today, and then we in Congress are using the powers that we have before us in an obvious narrow majority and in a narrow majority in the Senate, where you have to get things through the Senate with 60 votes. We

are using the tools in front of us to try to limit and minimize the damage caused by the previous administration and, frankly, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle today.

Notably, we are talking about in this situation what we have done so far. We have passed legislation to secure our elections through H.R. 22, the SAVE Act, to guarantee that only American citizens vote in American elections; to hold rogue judges accountable for issuing nationwide injunctions and trying to change the process.

Mr. Speaker, that is not partisan. Justice Elena Kagan talked about the need for injunction relief. The Democratic Solicitor General under the previous administration talked about the need for injunction reform. We offered legislation that would change and reform injunctions. We passed that before Easter so that a single judge won't be legislating and making national policy by granting temporary restraining orders and injunctions.

We made changes on border policy with the Laken Riley Act, which is extremely important; and legislation to combat the flow of fentanyl.

Importantly, what we have been trying to do is undo the damage on the border.

Mr. Speaker, keep in mind what has happened now under the first 100 days. In just 100 days, southwest border apprehensions have decreased by 94 percent year over year.

Mr. Speaker, consider that for a second. They decreased by 94 percent. What changed? Have we passed a massive law? Have we enacted the law that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said last year was necessary, this bipartisan bill which, by the way, would have codified all the bad policies under the Biden administration?

No. The only thing that changed was a White House willing to enforce the law. That is literally it, and now there is a 94 percent reduction in apprehensions at the border.

Keep in mind that we are now at apprehension levels of somewhere around 100 to 200 a day, 3,000 to 6,000 a month. We had 6,000, 8,000, 10,000 apprehensions per day under the Biden administration.

The President has restored common sense by ending DEI in the military and working to keep men from competing in women's sports, affirming that there are two genders. These are common sense. I wouldn't think we would have to spend time on the floor of the House of Representatives doing those things or having the President do it by executive order, but here we are.

The President has unlocked America's energy potential, or at least taken a giant step to doing so, by reopening 625 million acres for drilling, withdrawing from the disastrous Paris climate agreement, and approving new LNG projects.

Mr. Speaker, here before us today, we have what we call CRAs, under the Congressional Review Act. The purpose

of these is to undo burdensome Biden regulations. This is our ability and our prerogative to hold the Biden administration accountable, and that doesn't stop just because the Democrats lost an election and we have a Republican in the White House. We have a duty to undo some of that damage.

Under these bills, we would repeal California's advanced clean trucks waiver, which currently would allow the State to mandate the sale of zero-emission trucks. It would allow the State to mandate the sale of zero-emission trucks.

These bills would repeal the California advanced clean cars waiver allowing the State to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles by 2035; put an end to California's implementation of its most recent nitrogen oxide engine emission standards, which create burdensome and unworkable standards for heavy-duty, on-road engines; nullify a rule by the National Park Service that would infringe on the employment of a recreational area, contravening the agency's own mandate when it was created; and, finally, one that would end an Endangered Species Act designation by the Fish and Wildlife Service that would threaten water resources and other conservation efforts.

Mr. Speaker, these things matter to the average American. My colleagues are going to say that this is small ball, and it doesn't matter.

Every one of these regulations add up to interference with the enjoyment of life by the American people, drive up the price of the goods and services for the average hardworking American family, make vehicles more expensive, make our lives more costly. Then people wonder why they are suffering from inflation and suffering from the inability to afford to live in the modern world.

This Congress is taking steps to undo that damage, working with the White House to restore the ability of the average American family to live and afford the basic necessities of life, including vehicles and the right to be able to choose the vehicle of their choice in an open market.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are going to say that we are infringing on California. Let's remember that California gets treated specially and uniquely and that that then has a domino effect through the rest of the country. That is unique to California based on past precedent involving Los Angeles smog and other things where that is causing a direct impact on other States across the country.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank Representative ROY for acknowledging the tremendous loss that JIM MCGOVERN and his wife, Lisa, suffered this weekend when their daughter, Molly, was taken by cancer, a disease both of us have battled, as well.

With the Speaker's indulgence, I will read a few sentences from the McGovern's own statement because I think this captured a lot of who Molly was:

"Molly radiated pure joy. She lit up every room with her beaming smile—full of laughter, endless warmth, and a sharp wit that could disarm you in an instant. She was unbelievably funny, fiercely loyal, and wise beyond her years. Molly had a rare gift: She made everyone feel special because she genuinely believed everyone was special. She treated people with compassion and kindness—always standing up for the underdog, and making fast friends wherever she went."

Molly was deeply loved by JIM and Lisa, and because of that love, Molly was also loved by many of her colleagues in this House. She grew up here in Capitol Hill with other children of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We have been exchanging and I have been watching these beautiful pictures of Molly growing up with those kids from when she was young to just last August at the convention.

Lisa McGovern dedicated herself to helping families deal with cancer at Prevent Cancer Foundation. Lisa knows directly what it is like to see that terrible disease impact a young and promising life and how it, therefore, impacts the entire family.

JIM has one of the biggest hearts I know. He stands up on this floor every week to ask us to end hunger now because he deeply feels the pains of hunger that too many young children in America suffer from.

Given that huge heart, my colleagues can only imagine the love he poured into Molly. We don't even have to imagine it. We all saw the love he poured into Molly. He worried about her as she sought to live a normal life, studying in Australia and traveling, but he always said "yes" and never missed being by her side for key appointments and scans.

□ 1230

We cry for the things we love, and love always comes with pain. With a love as profound and deep as what Molly had, we know the McGovern's pain will be immeasurable.

To Lisa, JIM, and their son, Patrick, please know that your colleagues on this House floor on both sides of the aisle are in pain with you. Our tears are flowing with yours, and your congressional family stands with you in prayer and support.

Now, standing in JIM's place, I will turn to the business before us.

Representative ROY and I agree on how we opened this, but not on much more this morning because we see a different view on this 100th day that is marking Trump's service in office, 100 days of chaos, corruption, and economic sabotage. After these 100 days, House Republicans are wasting time on cynical Congressional Review Act resolutions instead of addressing the economic and constitutional crisis facing American families.

One hundred days of economic pain, as Trump's on-again, off-again temper tantrum of tariffs tank the dollar, drive up prices, destroy the markets, and threaten a recession.

One hundred days of chaos in the White House, where Secretary Hegseth texts war plans to journalists, and the administration belittles allies while embracing dictators like Putin.

One hundred days of corruption, as billionaires like Musk and DOGE take Americans' personal Social Security data and fired the employees we need to process those Social Security checks. They fired the auditors and inspectors so no one is there to sound the alarm when Musk steers contracts to his own companies. Talk about self-dealing.

One hundred days of courtroom drama, with courts—district, appellate, and even the Supreme Court—saying Trump's actions are likely illegal, unconstitutional, and must be paused to avoid irreparable harm to the American people.

While Trump defies the law and damages our economy, what are House Republicans doing? This week and into the next couple, Republicans are plotting to rip healthcare away from millions of Americans to fund tax cuts for 759 billionaires. Republicans will sacrifice healthcare for 72 million children, pregnant women, seniors, and people with disabilities who rely on Medicaid to give tax cuts to the 759 richest people in America.

When they destroy Medicaid, they destroy rural hospitals, and they destroy healthcare centers that everyone in the community uses, not just those on Medicaid.

Trump and Republicans want to give tax cuts to the biggest corporations, as well, so they have to cut funding from low-income college students trying to get ahead and steal food from the mouths of hungry children, and that hurts our farmers and ranchers, too. These are the hungry children that Ranking Member MCGOVERN fights for every day.

Millions of Americans will suffer so the billionaires and the biggest corporations can get more—more power, more money, more control, and more influence in Washington, D.C.

Americans are tired of how the system is rigged against working- and middle-class families. They know the rich are winning and regular Americans don't seem to have a chance.

The Republican budget ends their reconciliation bill. Their tax cuts are going to make sure the rich always win.

Now, Trump's approval ratings are the lowest of any President in the last 80 years. In the latest poll released today, Americans give him F's. He is getting F's on the economy. He is getting F's all over the place.

Americans disapprove of Trump because he is destroying our economy, and he is betraying his promise to lower costs from day one.

Americans are demanding we put an end to Trump's tyranny. Republican voters are showing up at the few town-halls that Republicans are brave enough to have, and they are yelling at their Representatives. They are saying: Do something.

While Americans want us to have the courage to stand up to Trump, House Republicans are doing the opposite.

Hidden in the rule we are debating today is a provision that will cover up Secretary Hegseth's texting of classified war plans. Republicans won't even let Democrats ask for information about what is happening at the Department of Defense—no courage, just capitulation.

Today, instead of helping lower costs for working families, Republicans are pushing partisan bills to overturn environmental laws that protect our air and water. It is ridiculous.

Costs are going up, markets are tanked, court orders are being ignored, and we are talking about a rule that we will hear about later today that we are going to spend all of this time on the floor of this House, but it is not going anywhere in the Senate. We are wasting the precious time that we have on this House floor to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILL of Texas). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I miss getting that admonition. It was a pretty regular occurrence in my various floor speeches.

With respect to the resolutions of inquiry, let me put out there that it is my strong preference, as I have said multiple times on the floor of the House, that we come up with a system that allows the body to work its will and that we allow individuals to be able to move forward in good faith to get information and ask questions of the executive branch, no matter who is in power.

I introduced the ARTICLE ONE Act to try to restrict Presidential power under the Trump administration the first time and had trouble getting it moved during the Biden administration. I am not really even pointing fingers. I am acknowledging the politics. I had some Democratic colleagues and friends of mine that would say: I like that idea, but I don't know if right now is the time. Okay, but let's have the conversation.

Let's take ROIs, what we call resolutions of inquiry, a tool in which we can specifically go ask for specific information. We have engaged in that effort. I certainly have. For over 600 days in the 116th and 117th Congresses, ROIs, these resolutions of inquiry, were blocked from coming to the floor by the Democratic majority. That is, of course, the "you did it, so we will do it" argument—not particularly satisfying if you want to have an open body.

I think the question would be: What do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to have? What should the rule be? If we want resolutions of inquiry to just be allowed in perpetuity, then maybe we need to come up with a way to try to guarantee that and do that, but that is not what happens. We have turned them off. Both sides have turned them off.

I would also add, for example, for the filibuster rule in the Senate, are we going to abide by the 60-vote threshold in the Senate as a Congress? My colleagues on the other side of the aisle tried to change the filibuster rule for judges and succeeded, and now, we have a 51-vote threshold for judges.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle tried to change the rule for legislation, and but for Kyrsten Sinema and but for Joe Manchin, they would have done so. Then, the Senate would have been operating by a 51-vote threshold for legislation.

Maybe that is good or bad, but maybe we should decide the rules we want to operate under and then apply them to both sides. Right now, we are operating under a 60-vote threshold in the Senate.

I think that is something maybe we ought to put to a vote right here in this body, in the House, and say: Do we believe that the United States Senate should operate under a 60-vote threshold? Because if you go watch the Twitter feed of Kyrsten Sinema, she is pretty explicit about what she is watching and the hypocrisy of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the Senate who now suddenly have newfound love and respect for the 60-vote threshold.

My point being, if we are going to change the body institutionally, then let's have a real conversation about changing the body institutionally.

Closed rules, I get it. In the majority, we are sitting here, and we have more closed rules. Do we want open rules? Then what will happen when the Democrats are in charge? Do you want resolutions of inquiry? What do we do to bind the hands of a future House on those points if not us agreeing to respect each other's ability to do that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), my friend.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule, which includes several Congressional Review Acts against the disastrous Biden-era electric vehicle mandates.

These create undue, burdensome rules, which impact our rural communities. Rural communities are the backbone of our country. They are the farmers, ranchers, teachers, and parents, and they are being crushed by the costly and out-of-touch policies from Washington.

There is no doubt EV mandates only add further financial strain to hard-working Americans, especially in my district.

Have you seen an electric tractor, baler, or plow? I haven't because they

don't work on farms or in the real world. In fact, the heavy-duty trucks in cold weather States lose 20 percent of their battery capacity.

When compared to cities, rural areas have extremely low EV rates, with the vast majority of rural areas having EV registration rates between zero and a half of a percent. This means there are between zero to five EVs registered per 10,000 people in rural areas.

It is simple. EVs are for urban elites in warm-weather States who have no concept of rural America.

A government EV mandate is unjustifiable. Vehicle decisions should be left up to the American consumers, not woke extreme climate activists.

I urge the passage of this rule.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a resolution of inquiry—Congress wants to know. Give us some answers.

It is not that big of a deal, except that, right now, I think they just don't want to have to vote. They don't want to have to vote on Signalgate. They don't want to have to actually take up an issue that they know is controversial, and they don't have a reason to present to the American people of why to shut this inquiry down.

I will acknowledge that we also had resolutions of inquiry, and there was a reason that we explained to the world: There was a pandemic going on. People were dying. The United States Government was in an emergency, and we were trying to save lives. We were trying to make sure that people were safe, not just here but in every single State. In New Mexico, it was devastating. We were trying to deal with this worldwide pandemic.

They have not offered any explanation for shutting down resolutions of inquiry at this time. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me why? Last night, we had an amendment to actually remove this, and we said: Why? Just explain to us why. They could not answer.

I don't think it is a coincidence that the House Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee were set to take up these inquiries about the Secretary of Defense using unclassified Signal chats to share sensitive information about military strikes with his family, his personal lawyer, and a journalist.

They don't want to vote on Signalgate, so they are rigging the rules to block us. They are hoping maybe this issue will pass over. Maybe we will forget about this lapse of judgment, this utter failure, this TV personality who, I guess, still wants everybody to know what he is doing, but when you are Secretary of Defense, you are not supposed to be letting everybody know what we are doing and putting our servicemembers at risk.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOF-

GREN), the ranking member and top Democrat on our Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as chair of the California Democratic congressional delegation in opposition to this rule. It makes in order three resolutions that claim to be pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, but are completely illegitimate.

That is not just my opinion, the non-partisan Government Accountability Office has not once but twice found that waivers California receives under the Clean Air Act are not rules under the CRA.

The Senate Parliamentarian has reached the same conclusion, so if this passes and if the Senate follows its rules, this will not be in order in the Senate.

Now, of course, our current President has taken many actions that we believe are illegal. More than 100 cases have been filed to stop these actions, and he has lost most of them, but it is sad to see the majority here in the House following suit. I will just say this: Abusing the Congressional Review Act is not the slope you want to slide down. You will regret having opened that when you are no longer in the majority.

I also oppose the underlying resolutions because they directly risk our fellow Americans' health. Air pollution is directly linked with increased rates of asthma, cancer, and other diseases. Parental and childhood exposure to pollution is linked to long-term health risks, adversely impacting babies and young children.

Just one of California's standards that would be blocked, the Advanced Clean Cars II, is estimated to reduce healthcare costs by \$13 billion over the next 25 years.

Now, it is important to note that these rules that California has adopted, they are for California. Other States don't have to follow these rules. There is a lot of criticism of California. We are the biggest State. We are the most diverse State. We are a big, sprawling State that has challenges, of course, but we are the most innovative economy. For all of the criticism that the majority sometimes lodges against us, we have just become the fourth biggest economy of the world. The State of California is the fourth biggest economy, and as we meet our challenges, we are also very successful economically.

Mr. Speaker, don't take this step to violate the rules. Don't take this step to cripple California's economy. Vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, a couple quick points on the resolutions of inquiry. I won't waste a whole lot more time on it.

The fact is, one, we have extended this through September 30 only at our request to limit it because we want to be able to get through reconciliation.

Two, my colleagues want to blame COVID. Committees were still in full

operation. The fact of the matter is my colleagues didn't want to answer questions that we were asking about the border because they were unanswerable. The border was wide open. Americans were getting killed. Americans like Jocelyn Nungaray, Americans like Laken Riley, Americans like Rachel Morin, and Americans like Kayla Hamilton. I can keep going down the list of dead Americans at the hands of the foolish, incompetent, and dangerous policies of the Biden administration that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not want to answer. That is the simple truth. When we wanted to get data about the border, they didn't want to answer it. It wasn't because of COVID.

Mr. Speaker, I note with respect to California that California's mandates effectively take away America's ability to buy new gas cars. As I mentioned earlier, California gets some special treatment. It is the only State allowed to seek waivers for its own vehicle policies due to a provision in the Clean Air Act crafted to allow California to address Los Angeles area smog, and so they have an outside impact on our ability to get affordable vehicles, including, by the way, hybrid vehicles which would be unnecessarily impacted by where California wants to go and which we want to try to solve.

Mr. Speaker, I also note that California, as KTLA reported in a January 30 article, continues to lose more people than come into other States because of the tragic and unfortunate policies of the State of California.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has mentioned the fact about a vehicle's expense. Now, let's recognize that used car prices have gone up for the first time in 30 months not because of what California has done but because of Trump's tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article titled: "Used car prices just rose for the first time in 30 months. Here's why and what it could mean for consumers in 2025."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Jackson Sun, Apr. 10, 2025]

USED CAR PRICES JUST ROSE FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 30 MONTHS. HERE'S WHY AND WHAT IT COULD MEAN FOR CONSUMERS IN 2025

(By Charles Singh)

American used car prices haven't increased for over two years, until now. A study conducted by automotive research site iSeeCars concluded that used car prices have risen after months of consistent declines. This could be great news for used car dealers and horrible news for folks looking to purchase a used car in 2025.

Why have used car prices suddenly increased? This deviation from the norm surely isn't coincidental. Tariffs are the culprit, and they could take the average used car price to the moon (in the worst way possible).

After the events of 'Liberation Day', a potential trade war involving multiple world powers is a nightmare-turned-reality. Import tariffs don't just impact new cars and car parts, they cause chaos in the used car market as well.

#### ARE USED CAR PRICES GOING UP?

Used car prices for one to five-year-old models have increased by 1 percent year-over-year as of March, 2025. This equates to an average price bump of \$317 compared to an average price decrease of \$238 in February.

An increase of \$317 may not seem like much, but it's notable at a time when the price of eggs is a topic of economic frustration for consumers. Furthermore, used car prices have been in the red year-over-year for consecutive months since October 2022, this is a huge shock for the used car market.

The tables have turned and this has serious implications for millions of car buyers. Increased demand may give used car dealers sweet relief after a rough post-pandemic reality, but will higher sticker prices prevent some drivers from exploring purchasing opportunities?

#### WHY TARIFFS ARE AFFECTING USED CAR PRICES

We are nearly three months into President Donald Trump's second term in office. In the span of the last few weeks, tariffs have been teased, announced, and paused. Unfortunately for the economy, whether or not certain tariffs are actually in effect, the mere threat of increased trade costs is enough for companies to make major changes. Sometimes these changes will benefit American consumers, other times they'll practically price them out of the market.

The announcement of import tariffs on new vehicles and auto parts was enough for several automakers to entertain the idea of pausing shipments and adapting production strategies. As a result, the supply of affordable new vehicles in America will dwindle because so many automakers rely on foreign labor and supply chains. Less affordable new cars make used cars much more attractive.

#### SHOULD YOU BUY A USED CAR IN 2025?

Used car buyers have found themselves in the eye of a perfect storm created by a post-pandemic economy and a brewing trade war. Used car prices were declining in recent months because dealers were sitting on older inventory, which often gets less desirable over time for the average consumer. Demand drove down prices, which in turn created thousands of dealer lots filled with nameplates and model years folks just weren't interested in buying.

What happens when those models become the only options American car-buyers can afford within reason (due to tariffs)? Prices are expected to increase as demand for new vehicles slows, adding weight to the demand seesaw and bringing used car prices to new heights.

This scenario is music to the ears of used car dealers looking to offload inventory at prices that won't obliterate their profit margins. On the other hand, actual deals could be scarce if prices are inflated due to newfound demand. There will still be plenty of opportunities to score a great new car for the informed consumer in 2025, but don't expect those opportunities to stick around forever.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if they wanted to actually address the rising costs of cars, maybe they would be willing to address the tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the resolutions it advances. Texas is allowed to do what it would like to do. California does not mandate Texas' decisionmaking. We want to make our own decisions. Under the U.S. Clean Air Act, signed by President Richard Nixon, we did that, and we have been leaders since he signed it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to specifically three Congressional Review Act resolutions that are in this rule that illegally take aim at California's legal ability to implement more stringent emission standards under waiver from the Clean Air Act.

In the last 2 months, the Senate Parliamentarian and the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office affirmed that California's Clean Air Act waiver is not subject to the Congressional Review Act. This week's attempt to advance these CRAs anyway is blatantly illegal.

On top of that, these CRAs are another unfounded attempt to limit States from having the choice to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality and their public health. It doesn't mandate any other States to do that. States can choose to join California under the Clean Air Act.

I proudly served on the California Air Resources Board under three Governors, including two Republicans and one Democrat, and I have seen firsthand the benefits of curbing emissions, both for the economy and public health. There is a reason why California is the fourth largest economy in the world and has three times the amount of patents than any other State, that State being Texas.

Republican Governor Ronald Reagan signed into law the creation of the California State Air Resources Board and Republican President Richard Nixon signed into law the California Clean Air Act. This was not a partisan issue then and it should not be now. It is about public health and the economy.

These waivers are an essential tool to give California and other States the choice to prioritize both the health and well-being of their residents and the environment. Modeling has shown that by 2040, all three rules would provide an estimated \$13 billion in health benefits.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will note that neither the GAO nor the Senate Parliamentarian get a vote. It is sort of a shocking news revelation I recognize, but they don't get a vote. We do. The Senate does. We can decide what we think ought to apply.

Number two, if my colleagues want to talk about the high price of vehicles, how about the extent to which the average EV costs \$14,000 more than the average nonluxury vehicle.

According to the latest data from Kelley Blue Book, the average trans-

action price for electric vehicles is \$55,273, 3.7 percent higher than last year. For context, the median household income for the gentlewoman's district is \$62,000.

The fact of the matter is, EVs are expensive. EVs are driving up the price of vehicles. The mandate is taking the power out of the hands of the American people to decide, including, by the way, hybrid vehicles which allow individuals to have more efficient vehicles while being able to travel long distances, as I know the gentlewoman has constituents who need to do so in New Mexico as we need to do in west Texas and throughout the State of Texas.

Additionally, the trucks that are required under California's unrealistic mandates cost two to three times more than a new, safer, and more reliable diesel truck. The fact is, we are driving up the price of goods and services. We are making it more expensive for the American people to live. We are making it almost impossible for people to fix their vehicles and be able to afford their vehicles with every new thing we add to it to make it more complex in the name of safety or the environment.

The fact is, we can't be blind to those realities. That is exactly what is happening. That is why the American people are suffering from the inability to afford to live in this country.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is true in New Mexico, we have all that beautiful land. We have our ranchers. We have our farms. We have those mountains. We love our trucks, but the problem is, Trump's tariffs are making all of that more expensive.

He is raising the cost of trucks. Remember, there was like a \$20,000 hike after one of his first attempts at tariffs before he started flip-flopping. We never know where he is at, right?

His tariffs are raising the costs of housing. In New Mexico, the firing of Federal employees and the domino effects of the economic uncertainty because of his tariffs are making jobs harder to find.

Mr. Speaker, Trump promised to lower prices on day one. Instead, his tariffs are crashing our economy, making those trucks more expensive and houses more expensive. People are out of work. Retirement accounts are destroyed.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and impose tariffs. It is Congress' duty to review whether what he is doing is accurate or not. Even though it is our review, this is another area where Republicans don't want to have the debate on this floor. They are hiding behind these things they stick in these rules.

They actually thought they stopped time. Republicans passed a rule that stops time for the purposes of voting



on whether or not we should have these tariffs. They actually passed a rule that said this: “Each day for the remainder of the first session of the 119th Congress shall not constitute a calendar day for the purposes of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act.”

Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment last night. I offered an amendment last time we met in rules. We will keep offering amendments to say you can’t stop time. If you believe in these tariffs, be willing to debate them, to stand up on this floor and say we think the tariffs are good, we think the tariffs are bad. Make Trump defend those tariffs.

Why is he doing this to us? Why is he creating this disaster? This is a disaster of Trump’s own creation. We are seeking four Republicans to join us to stop this. They already have some Republicans over on the Senate side. We have some that might be moving here. Let’s stop this craziness of the tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker emerita.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership in making the case.

Mr. Speaker, yes, we are talking about something being expensive. Don’t say clean air for our children to breathe is too expensive for us after all the things that the President has done to make things more expensive in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to all of the Republican resolutions on the floor today, one of which takes away the right of California or any State to protect residents from dangerous pollution.

The illegal attack on the vital clean air protection set by California would choke our communities with smog. We are used to that. Over time, Californians have seen and felt the impact of smog on our lives. The gentleman even referenced it in his comments, and we will relentlessly defend our State’s right to protect the air our children breathe with robust fuel economy and pollution standards when Federal standards fall short.

With these resolutions, Republicans are exposing their cynical, special-interest agenda that endangers public health in every community in our country by dismantling our protections for clean air, clean air for our children to breathe.

They put the American peoples’ health, economic security, and futures under direct dire threat as Republicans and their donor-driven cronies funnel billions into the pockets of guess who? Big polluters. Today, they want us to favor big polluters over clean air for our children to breathe.

Democrats will never stop fighting to defend lifesaving protections for America’s clean air. For the children, Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong “no” on this resolution.

□ 1300

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

I am always amazed when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle ignore the fact that these EVs require power. Somehow they get charged from the magic fairy dust of the magic energy tree? I mean, what are we talking about here?

How do you power up an electric vehicle? It is done by burning coal, burning gas, or the nuclear plants that we are not actually permitting or building in the United States, while China builds two coal-fired plants virtually every week. We are building none. Well, good for us.

The vast majority of the world is producing power with coal and natural gas, and it is growing exponentially. Meanwhile, we are crushing our grid, the reliability of American power, making it more expensive for the average American and doing really nothing about worldwide CO<sub>2</sub> production. That is the truth. China and India are pumping it out.

Meanwhile, my colleagues love to ignore the slave labor in China to produce the batteries that they drive around in their EVs while they pat themselves on the back and go to cocktail parties talking about how fantastic it is that they drive their EVs and how enlightened they are.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD three articles: “‘Like slave and master’: DRC miners toil for 30p an hour to fuel electric cars” in the Guardian; “EV makers’ use of Chinese suppliers raises concerns about forced labor”; “U.S. says Chinese lithium-ion batteries are made with child labour as trade war spills into EVs.”

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

There was no objection.

[From the Guardian, Nov. 8, 2021]

‘LIKE SLAVE AND MASTER’: DRC MINERS TOIL FOR 30P AN HOUR TO FUEL ELECTRIC CARS

(By Pete Pattison in Kolwezi)

The names Tesla, Renault and Volvo mean nothing to Pierre\*. He has never heard of an electric car. But as he heads out to work each morning in the bustling, dusty town of Fungurume, in the Democratic Republic of Congo’s southern mining belt, he is the first link in a supply chain that is fuelling the electric vehicle revolution and its promise of a decarbonised future.

Pierre is mining for cobalt, one of the world’s most sought-after minerals, and a key ingredient in the batteries that power most electric vehicles (EVs).

He says his basic wage is the equivalent of £2.60 (\$3.50) a day, but if he works through lunch and puts in hours of overtime, he can make up to about £3.70.

Not that lunch is worth waiting for: he claims he is given just two small bread rolls and a carton of juice.

“The salary is very, very small. It gives me a headache . . . The mine makes so much and we make so little,” he says.

If he takes a day off, he says money is deducted from his wages. If he is sick and misses more than two days in a month, more

money is cut. “You can’t even argue. If you do, you’ll be fired,” he says, squatting on the dirt floor of the bare brick shack he rents.

“The relationship between us and the [mine] is like a slave and a master,” says Pierre.

Stories of the harsh and dangerous working conditions endured by miners in the DRC’s informal, or artisanal, cobalt mines—of child labour and miners being buried alive as tunnels cave in—have provoked an international outcry in recent years, forcing the western technology and automotive brands that rely on the mineral to look for ways to source “clean” cobalt, free from human rights abuses.

Some companies in the cobalt supply chain have promised to stop sourcing from artisanal mines and instead get the mineral from large-scale industrial mines, which are seen as a safer option both for workers and corporate reputations.

Pierre is not working at an artisanal mine, however. He is employed, via a subcontractor, at Tenke Fungurume mine (TFM), one of the country’s biggest industrial mines, which is 80 percent owned by the Chinese company China Molybdenum (CMOC).

An investigation by the Guardian has found that some workers, often employed through subcontractors, allege they are victims of severe exploitation, including wages as low as 30p an hour, precarious employment with no contracts, and paltry food rations. In a number of mines run by Chinese companies, workers made allegations of discrimination and racism reminiscent of the colonial era.

The Guardian has tracked the cobalt supply chain from TFM and other industrial mines through a number of refiners and battery makers to some of the world’s leading electric car manufacturers, including Tesla, VW, Volvo, Renault and Mercedes-Benz.

While the cobalt supply chain is highly complex, all these car manufacturers identified by the Guardian can be linked to one or more of the industrial mines named by the Guardian through a small number of key refineries and battery makers.

Many EV brands have made public commitments to “responsible sourcing” of minerals, and some—notably Tesla—are using innovative ways to achieve this. Nevertheless, the Guardian’s findings suggest how far the sector still has to go to ensure the shift to clean energy is not tainted by claims of workers’ rights abuses.

As delegates meet at Cop26, the UN climate change conference in Glasgow, the transition from petrol to EVs is being talked about as a key step in reducing carbon emissions. Global sales of passenger EVs—excluding hybrids—are expected to soar from 3.3m in 2021 to 66m in 2040. In the UK, that growth will be driven by the government’s ban on the sale of petrol and diesel cars from 2030.

Last year, about 70 percent of the world’s cobalt came from the DRC and the vast majority of that—93,000 out of 100,000 tonnes, according to Benchmark Mineral Intelligence (BMI)—came from large-scale industrial mines.

Although some battery and car manufacturers have reduced the amount of cobalt in their batteries, BMI says the volume of sales of cobalt into the sector will rise four or fivefold over the coming decade. The World Bank estimates that demand for cobalt production will increase 585 percent by 2050.

That should be good news for people in southern DRC, where the majority of the cobalt mines are located, but a report launched today by UK-based corporate watchdog Raid and Congolese lawyers from the Centre d’Aide Juridico-Judiciaire, says many multinational mining companies—and the subcontractors they hire—create poorly paid jobs that keep workers in poverty.

“Cobalt is an essential mineral for the green transition, but we must not turn away from the abusive labour conditions that taint the lithium-ion batteries needed for millions of electric vehicles,” said Raid director Anneke Van Woudenberg.

Kolwezi is the DRC's cobalt capital, a city so defined by mining that some communities sit on the rim of the giant craters that have been excavated in search of copper and cobalt. It is mining on a massive scale, highly mechanised and dependent on cutting-edge technology but powered by thousands of workers—more than 10,000 at TFM—who, like Pierre, are employed as mineral processors, drivers, mechanics, welders, security guards and general workers.

In the last 15 years, Chinese companies have begun to enter the mining business, buying out North American and European companies so that they now control the majority of the cobalt and copper mines in southern DRC.

And with this change, Congolese workers say, has come abuse, discrimination and racism. They say they are insulted, in some cases beaten, and claim they are paid less than Chinese workers who do the same job. They allege that Chinese supervisors disregard their experience and put production before safety.

“We’re being treated in a very bad way by the Chinese. I’m a victim of assault myself. I was slapped across the face four times,” says Mutamba, another worker at TFM.

One Congolese worker at TFM described sitting through a two-hour meeting in Chinese, only to be given a two-minute translation at the end.

“We feel humiliated and embarrassed,” he says. “The way they are treating our people, you can’t believe. We are just expecting them to have respect for human life, instead of using people like slaves.”

Over the course of the investigation, workers interviewed by the Guardian said they deeply resented the way they were treated, but felt powerless to protest. “It’s a shocking situation, but I can’t leave the job because there is no other choice,” says one. “Where can I get another job?”

A spokesperson for CMOC, which majority owns TFM, said the company adheres to a number of international labour conventions and local labour laws. Since it acquired the mine in 2016, CMOC said it has contributed an average of £296m a year to the country’s revenue. “We are devoted to providing a safe, healthy and decent work environment to all employees and attach great importance to protecting the rights of employees,” the spokesperson said.

Mining for cobalt and copper is a vital source of income for DRC’s government and creates tens of thousands of jobs—with good wages for many—in a region with few other employment opportunities. But in some mines the majority of workers—almost 70 percent at TFM, for example—are hired through sub-contractors.

The use of subcontractors can leave workers in an extremely precarious position: often hired on short-term contracts, or no contract at all, with limited benefits, low pay and the threat of termination always hanging over them.

Josué Kashaal, a lawyer for Centre d’Aide Juridico-Judiciaire, a local organisation that represents miners, says the use of subcontractors can lead to the big mines being able to avoid accountability.

In his small office in Kolwezi, Kashaal shows the Guardian a list of what he claims are more than 50 subcontractors that have been used by the Kamoto Copper Company (KCC) mine, which is owned by the Swiss commodities and mining giant Glencore.

“Glencore is using many subcontracted workers, so employees depend on the subcon-

tractor, not Glencore. This way they don’t have responsibility and can end a contract at any time,” says Kashaal.

While some workers said they hoped to get hired directly by KCC, saying it offered better wages than other mines, 44 percent of KCC’s workers are employed through subcontractors. The price is paid by men like Luc. “I started on £80 a month while working as a security guard at KCC. Then KCC terminated the contract with the subcontractor and I suddenly lost my job, along with 600 other guards,” he says.

Luc was recently rehired by another security firm at the mine, but says he is still earning less than £140 a month. “The main companies are treating the subcontractors well, but the subcontractors don’t treat workers well. The mining companies are benefiting a lot, not the local people,” he says.

Glencore said KCC only uses subcontractors for specialist work or temporary contracts and monitors compliance with the terms of its contracts. “In 2021, KCC became aware that employees of a global contractor company, whose contract ceased due to the reduction of project activities during the Covid-19 pandemic, did not receive their wages to the end of their employment term. In this instance, KCC engaged with the contractor . . . and the employees received the correct payment,” a spokesperson said.

In June 2020, Tesla signed a long-term deal to source cobalt from Glencore for its new “giga-factories” in Berlin and Shanghai. Tesla did not respond to multiple requests for comment, but in its latest impact report, the company says it procures cobalt only from producers in the DRC that meet its responsible sourcing standards. To avoid its material being “contaminated” by cobalt from other sources as it passes along the supply chain, it is “stored in clearly marked, segregated areas of the plant and is toll processed on lines dedicated for Tesla”, the report says. Two mineral experts told the Guardian this process is likely to be rigorous.

Covid has compounded the already poor labour conditions endured by many workers. The community of Kawama stretches along one side of the main road south of Lubumbashi. On the other side stands the Congo Dongfang International Mining (CDM) mine and refinery.

When the pandemic started, many CDM workers were confined to the mine for three months until the Congolese government compelled the company to release them. Koffi, who worked at the mine as a security guard, told the Guardian he shared a hall with 80 others, with two workers sharing a mattress laid on a wooden board and propped up on bricks. “I felt like a prisoner. I didn’t have any freedom,” he says.

In interviews with the Guardian, some CDM workers say they are employed for as little as £88 a month. “Payslips” seen by the Guardian were written only in Chinese on a pencil-thin strip of paper.

CDM is wholly owned by Huayou Cobalt, a Chinese conglomerate with interests in every step of the cobalt supply chain, from mining to cathode production. Renault and Daimler, the parent company of Mercedes-Benz, name CDM among their suppliers.

Huayou Cobalt said CDM “adopted a policy of healthy and safe operation” at the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic until the government put forward its own pandemic prevention policies. It said all workers were paid in line with local labour laws. CDM has made significant contributions to the local community, Huayou Cobalt said, including organising agricultural education, building and renovating schools, setting up medical clinics and providing water and electricity to local villages.

But there appears to be little sign of that in Kawama, a collection of red brick shacks with corrugated iron roofs held down by rocks. A woman heaves a bicycle laden with yellow water drums along a dry dirt track, a young boy helping to push from behind.

“There is no drinking water, no electricity, no school, no healthcare,” claims Koffi. “Our community is right next to CDM, but they don’t do anything for us.”

Renault, Volvo VW and Daimler, the parent company of Mercedes-Benz, responded saying they recognised the importance of responsible mineral sourcing, took the allegations seriously and would discuss the findings with their suppliers.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 2023]

#### EV MAKERS’ USE OF CHINESE SUPPLIERS RAISES CONCERNS ABOUT FORCED LABOR

(By Evan Halper)

Tesla boasts that its electric vehicles are a marvel not just of innovation but also ethics, pledging in annual reports that it will “not knowingly accept products or services from suppliers that include forced labour or human trafficking in any form.” The carmaker touts its teams of monitors that travel to mining operations around the world, and has pledged to mount a camera at an African mine to prevent the use of underage or slave labor.

But Tesla has been conspicuously silent when it comes to China, despite evidence that materials that go into its vehicles come from the Xinjiang region, where forced labor has been rampant. Firms that appear to undermine a U.S. ban on products made in Xinjiang emerge near the top of Tesla’s sprawling network of suppliers, according to a Washington Post examination of corporate records and Chinese media reports. Among them are companies that have openly complied with China’s quotas for moving minority Muslim Uyghurs out of rural villages and into factory towns through what Chinese authorities call “labor transfers” or “surplus labor employment.”

Tesla is among several EV companies that have suppliers with Xinjiang connections, records show. Ford has a deal with a battery maker that congressional investigators allege has ties to vast lithium mining and processing operations in Xinjiang, and Volkswagen operates a factory in the region with a Chinese partner.

Though not all labor in Xinjiang is forced, China’s lockdown on information flowing from the region led the U.S. government last year to bar the import of any Xinjiang-made parts and products out of a concern they could be made with coerced labor.

The companies’ kid-glove approach on China and potential violations of U.S. law come as the White House and powerful congressional committees scrutinize the EV industry, which is booming as automakers race to gain the upper hand in the transition to climate-friendly battery-powered engines. The situation in Xinjiang is a key point of tension in the strained relationship between China and the West, as the United States and allies step up enforcement of penalties on industries operating there.

EVs are widely considered vital for confronting climate change, and the companies that make them are at an inflection point. The contracts and accountability measures they lock in now could affect communities around the world for decades. Many experts warn that companies are failing to ensure that their supply chains are free of forced labor, washing their hands of responsibility for upstream suppliers they shrug off as out of their managerial reach.

“We know from every other industry there is that if we don’t fix this now, in the early



days of this transition, it will be a massive mistake,” said Duncan Jepson, a lawyer and supply-chain management expert. “But the auto companies are not giving much hope they are willing to do anything to make a difference.”

[From the Financial Post, Oct. 17, 2022]

# U.S. SAYS CHINESE LITHIUM-ION BATTERIES ARE MADE WITH CHILD LABOUR AS TRADE WAR SPILLS INTO EVs

(By Naimul Karim)

The U.S. government's decision to tie a generous electric-vehicle subsidy to inputs from friendly countries was an obvious attempt to shift the EV supply chains away from China.

But the power of the purse isn't the only strategy available to Washington. The Biden administration in late September added lithium-ion batteries from China to the U.S. Labor Department's list of products derived from child and forced labour, a more subtle example of how the United States intends to offset Beijing's influence over a once-in-a-lifetime technological change, some industry insiders say.

The Labor Department said China imports almost 90 percent of its cobalt from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), where a significant amount of the mineral is produced through informal mines that employ children. The Asian powerhouse uses about 50 to 80 percent of its cobalt imports to make battery chemicals and components, justification enough for including Chinese batteries among items produced with child labour, the Labor Department said.

It's been known for years that child labour is prevalent among DRC's artisanal and small-scale mines, yet this is the first time the U.S. government has chosen to include Chinese batteries, which dominate the market. Companies that use products from the list are in no danger of prosecution, but they might face uncomfortable questions from customers, activists and politicians.

The compendium, which also linked solar cells from China and crude palm oil from Indonesia to forced labour, “can be considered a risk radar used to raise public awareness” on labour exploitation, said Christine Feroli, a spokesperson for the U.S. Labor Department.

The addition of lithium-ion batteries to the list comes at a time when the U.S. is looking to diversify its supply chain away from China, which has a strong grasp of the EV sector, and toward its allies, a trend known as “friendshoring.” In a speech in Washington, D.C., last week, Canada's deputy prime minister, Chrystia Freeland, also emphasized the practice, stressing the need to speed up the development of energy projects in Canada so that the nation can support allies in need.

“It feels like the latest chapter in the U.S. versus China trade war has spilled over into the EVs and lithium-ion batteries,” said Simon Moores, CEO of Benchmark Mineral Intelligence, a research group based in London, in an interview. “The U.S. will still rely on supply chains that pass through China for its lithium-ion batteries for some time, so it's a high risk strategy until the U.S. builds its own lithium-ion economy.”

Moores added that while DRC produces more than 70 per cent of the world's cobalt, “not all” of it is produced using illegal practices.

China leads the global EV Industry and last year accounted for about half of all EV sales, according to the International Energy Agency. It also dominates the supply of metals required to make batteries that drive EVs.

Washington appears intent on building a “lithium-ion economy,” which could benefit

Canada and other U.S. trading partners. In August, the U.S. passed the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), which states that EVs containing batteries assembled in North America and made up of critical minerals sourced from the region could receive up to US \$7,500 worth of tax credits, which could offset some of China's advantages in the field.

According to Moores, steps like these could cause a “generational shift” and Canadian miners would have to be ready to take advantage because “Canada has the potential to be the gatekeeper for the North America electric vehicle boom, a key pillar of the Inflation Reduction Act,” he said.

In a similar vein, Theo Yameogo, head of mining and metals at global accounting firm Ernst & Young Global Ltd., said the latest step was taken due to “concern around security of the battery minerals supply chain.” However, the supply chain for minerals is “very complex” and focusing on cobalt alone would not solve the issue for the U.S., Yameogo said.

Troy Nazarewicz, a spokesperson for Fortune Minerals Ltd., a company that's closing in on beginning construction of a cobalt mine and a refinery in Canada, said the U.S. was taking steps to “diversify and reduce its reliance” on China. “It is basically to encourage and perhaps force companies to move away from Chinese sources of critical minerals,” he said of the Labor Department's decision to link Chinese batteries to child labour in Africa. Toronto-based Electra Battery Materials Corp.'s Joe Racanelli, however, said he doesn't think there's a “direct correlation” between the list and the geopolitical motives of the Inflation Reduction Act. He said that the industry has been trying to deal with the labour exploitation in DRC's informal mines for quite some time. “People want to make sure that as you are driving an electric vehicle where there is no child labour involved,” said Racanelli, Electra's vice president of investor relations.

Electra recently inked a deal to supply global lithium-ion battery maker LG Energy Solution Ltd. with 7,000 tonnes of cobalt from its Ontario refinery and will be importing feed for the mineral from DRC mines that meet global ethical standards.

Toronto-based Sherritt International Corp., which refines cobalt in Canada, echoed that sentiment. Lucy Chitilian, Sherritt's director of investor relations, said that while the step by the U.S. may provide “greater impetus” for Canada to build its own supply chain, the company doubts that “singling out” China as a consumer of cobalt mined by children is a move to push an agenda.

The demand for electric vehicles, which contain lithium-ion batteries, has been on the rise as countries look to accelerate their net-zero climate plans. The world will need more than 20 times the amount of lithium that was mined last year to meet demand by mid-century, due to growth in energy storage and electric vehicles, analysts from Benchmark Mineral Intelligence said on Oct. 13.

Freeland said last week in a speech at the Brookings Institution, a think-tank based in Washington, D.C., that democratic allies should embrace “friendshoring,” the practice of building supply chains through each other's economies.

“If we are to tie our economies even more closely together, we must be confident that we will all follow the rules in our trade with each other, even and especially when it would be easier not to,” said Freeland.

She added that Canada needed to show “generosity in fast-tracking” energy and mining projects for its allies that need to “heat their homes and to manufacture electric vehicles.”

“I cite these examples because, critically, friendshoring must be green. The curse of oil

is real, and so is the dependence of many of the world's democracies on the world's petrotyrants.”

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to parade around EV mandates like they are somehow going to magically create power out of thin air, ignoring the fact we are empowering China, ignoring the fact we are empowering Chinese child laborers while we destroy the cost of living for the average American family, take away choice, take away the ability of an American citizen to be able to go out into the market and buy a hybrid vehicle or another vehicle that they can use to travel long distances, do their job, whether they are a plumber, an electrician, or carrying goods and services in a truck, and then they wonder why the cost of goods and services go up. Then they want to blame tariffs when we are 90 days in, and we had massive and rampant inflation under the Biden administration as a direct consequence of the regulatory policies and the failed policies of the previous administration.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Mexico has 8½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asks where would we get this electricity. In New Mexico as well as in Texas, we have amazing wind power and amazing solar power. There are many ways of generating electricity. The problem is that with a policy of “drill, baby, drill,” they don't want to look at all of the opportunities, even though Americans know that looking at energy independence means looking at all of the beautiful ways in which we can generate power in the United States.

However, a more important question that is before us is: What is happening with Medicaid and SNAP? Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2753, the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act, which will prevent the Republican budget from cutting Medicaid or SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans are continuing full-speed ahead with their disastrous plan to cut the social safety net and blow up the deficit to give billionaires tax cuts. It is shameful. It is wrong. Under their plan, they will have to cut \$880 billion from Medicaid and \$230 billion in food assistance just to make the math work.

Mr. Speaker, what is worse is they continue to argue they are not doing that, but the math doesn't lie. They can't reach the levels of billionaire tax cuts they want without completely

gutting vital programs like Medicaid and SNAP, programs that the most vulnerable in our country rely on.

Republicans claim they won't make these cuts, so today I will give them a chance to put their money where their mouth is and vote to ensure those devastating cuts can't move forward in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I had the honor to visit a number of senior centers in my district. I saw seniors having a meal at lunchtime paid for by SNAP, seniors that have relied on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP, seniors that have worked all their lives to build America, and all they want to do is have a peaceful retirement.

I rise today because my colleagues across the aisle are looking to cut Medicaid and SNAP, programs that hundreds of millions of Americans rely on to keep food on their table and their families healthy.

My colleagues are targeting almost \$900 billion in cuts to Medicaid, threatening to take away healthcare for some 80 million Americans who rely on this program. That would strip away healthcare from millions, including children, seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans.

They are targeting SNAP, a vital food assistance program that provides food to 40 million people: seniors, children, and veterans.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up H.R. 2753, the Hands Off Medicaid and SNAP Act, to stop our colleagues from taking away healthcare from Americans and making a big mistake.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address this issue of the Clean Air Act and the fact that Republicans often say they believe in States' rights, but when a State like California actually chooses a policy they don't like, they throw that principle out the window.

When Congress passed the Clean Air Act, it gave States that had standards before 1966 the right to apply for a waiver. Congress decided that. For 50 years, California has used that waiver to clean up its air. It is not just California. Other States have chosen to adopt these standards, too.

Across America, we can breathe cleaner air. That is why our children

can go out and play in the park and can run around. They don't have to stay indoors like they have to in Beijing or New Delhi or other countries that are polluted from the cars that clog their cities.

Clean air isn't just about the environment. We heard the Speaker Emerita talking about the cost, the cost to the children, but it is also about economic prosperity. When people breathe the clean air, they miss fewer work and school days, companies are more productive, kids learn more, families save on healthcare costs because fewer people go to the hospital for asthma and heart disease.

It doesn't stop there. To meet California's emission standards, carmakers have built more fuel-efficient vehicles. That means we are saving money at the pump. Republicans love to talk about energy dominance, but for them, as I noted, it is just "drill, baby, drill." Improving fuel efficiency is cheaper, smarter, and better for the environment and economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stop this political theater and focus on the real issues that matter to the American people. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note that with respect to wind energy, yes, Texas is one of the leaders in wind energy. I worked for Governor Perry when the Governor was embracing wind power, and the fact of the matter is, as it has become a larger percentage of the grid, the reliability of Texas' grid has suffered, and now the consequences of having embraced wind as a significant portion of the grid are now coming to roost.

We are now having to deal with what happens when these need to be shelved. Where do they go? They fill landfills. How much oil and gas goes into the production of said windmills? How do you get the power from the wind farms in west Texas to the various facilities where we are making power? How reliable is it during ice storms or during the heat of the summer? When you have a cloudy, windless day, how are you getting power? Who is making the parts for the solar panels? What happens to the solar panels in the environment when you are finished with the solar farm?

All of these questions get brushed aside in a quest to say that we can have magical "green, clean energy," when we have clean-burning natural gas in Texas and throughout this country that is producing a significant amount of economic benefit and power for our country and has done more to drive down CO<sub>2</sub> production and for clean air than virtually any other innovation we have had over the last century.

Yet, we are impeding the ability to have more reliable power by virtue of mandates. That is the whole point of the problem with the Inflation Reduc-

tion Act. That is the whole point of the problem with the rules and the rule-making done by the Biden administration that we are trying to reverse under these CRAs, so that we can make things more affordable for the American people. That is it. We are trying to help the average Texan, the average New Mexican, the average American be able to afford to live, trying to be able to figure out how to get power, get a vehicle that they can afford to be able to carry out their job. That is it.

On the issue of healthcare, the issue was raised, as is often the case by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to try to scare the American people that somehow raising questions about the inefficiency, the ineffectiveness, the waste, the fraud of a government healthcare solution, that somehow that is taking away benefits.

When you have a trillion dollars of improper payments, when you have the State of California openly and publicly stating that they are gaming the Medicaid system and the provider tax and the Federal match rate to provide funds to illegal aliens and for their general budget to game the system at what best can be called money laundering, as was editorialized in The Wall Street Journal last week. When that is what is happening, when you have people on Medicaid who are getting a higher subsidy than people on Medicare, who have paid into it their entire lives, into the tax on Medicare; when you have people who are able-bodied who are getting a higher subsidy than the vulnerable population for whom Medicaid was originally created, then someone explain to me why we don't have a duty to fix that.

That is what we are putting forward, to try to deliver healthcare that would actually have a doctor and a patient relationship rather than a corporate overlord or government bureaucrat telling you what your healthcare is. That is the system that has been created. That is the system that we are living with now under expanded ObamaCare. That is what that is, expanded ObamaCare. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to talk about that. They want to talk about the expansion of that population into the able-bodied who could be and should be working at a higher rate of return by the Federal Government than is going to the vulnerable population, while California games the system to give money to illegal aliens. That is expressly and openly being acknowledged by California leadership.

They don't want to have those conversations. They don't want to talk about how you manage that problem, how you get more people to be able to have affordable care instead of what they currently have, which is a broken system that insurance companies run, forcing individuals onto an exchange so they can get like my constituent who passed away last year from cancer, who wanted to go to M.D. Anderson and could not go because she was on an

ObamaCare plan and couldn't go to the best cancer hospital in the world because she was covered under ObamaCare.

The failure of our healthcare system cannot be overstated. Both parties need to step to the table to get government out of the way and to allow doctors and patients to be able to go get healthcare from a provider of their choice—not some insurance bureaucrat or government bureaucrat—in order to deliver outcomes that the American people want us to deliver.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is, after 100 days of Trump, the verdict is clear: We are living through a campaign of economic chaos, constitutional contempt, and corporate greed. The American people see what is happening, and they are not fooled by the chaos. They are not happy with the chaos. They are watching this body to see who will fight for them and who will fold to Trump.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. This administration isn't governing. It is looting. Trump's cronies are lighting the house on fire so their billionaire friends can sell the ashes for profit.

With this issue of cutting Medicaid and addressing healthcare, yes, our healthcare system is not working. We need to address some issues in Medicaid. Let's be honest. The CMS itself said that there is less than 1 percent of fraud in the system. It is an incredibly lean system. It pays out less than any other system.

Still, even with it as it is, 40 percent of pregnant women in the country rely on Medicaid so they can give birth to healthy babies. They would strip that away from those women. It is even higher in rural areas, and those hospitals in the rural areas rely on that.

With regards to prices, Trump's tariffs are raising prices. At the same time that prices are going up, they are slashing food assistance. At a food bank I went to last week, they have more people showing up and less food because Trump literally stopped the trucks from delivering the food that was in the trucks. How cruel is that?

They are wrecking our national parks, not out of necessity but to fund tax cuts for 759 of the richest people in America. They are bleeding rural hospitals, stripping students of opportunity, and polluting our air, all to line the pockets of the ultrarich.

This isn't policy. It is plunder. House Republicans won't stop it. I say we stop it by voting against this rule. Let's defeat this rule today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, number one, Congress has an important role to play in repealing the Biden-Harris administration's EV mandates and other rules that are damaging the lives of the American people.

When the administration transmits an action to the House and the Senate for review under the CRA, then it is Members of Congress, not the GAO and not the Parliamentarian, who decide whether and how we proceed under the CRA.

The fact here is California mandates, which is what we are dealing with here in several of these Congressional Review Act actions, effectively take away Americans' ability to buy new gas cars, a hybrid vehicle, or the vehicle of their choice. It raises their vehicle and transportation costs.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the former Speaker of the House, came down and described that somehow we are not factoring in the price of clean air. With the vehicles that we are producing today, the fact is we have the cleanest air we have ever had.

There is no problem with having EVs. It is the mandates that are the problem. It is mandating the American people must convert that is the problem. In fact, worldwide, the extent to which coal-fired plants in China, coal-fired plants in India, and other countries around the world are producing CO<sub>2</sub> and other particulate matter that is bad for the air is rising.

Why would we undermine our own economic well-being to pursue a negligible impact on the overall global emissions, while driving up the price of goods and services for the average American family? They have to live for today. They have to pay their bills today.

All the subsidies in the world aren't making those things economically viable for them. Whether you are talking about wind farms or EVs without the mandates, what is clear is the American people aren't buying these things because they are still not able to function and carry out their livelihoods effectively under the mandates.

Higher costs and fewer choices for consumers hit low-income and disadvantaged communities the hardest. There is a reason why, when I drive around Austin, Texas, I see it is the rich folk driving around in their Teslas. It is the rich folk who are getting their EV tax credits. I see it. They are not in east Austin. They are out in the rich parts of Austin.

Mr. Speaker, do you think that is an accident? Do you think the hard-working plumber I represent in San Marcos, Texas, in New Braunfels, Texas, or any other part of Texas is going to go out and get a battery-powered truck to drive across 10 counties

to carry out his job or his livelihood? As I said before, the average EV costs \$14,000 more than the average non-luxury vehicle.

Mandates disrupt the free market. We have talked about the impact these mandates can have on the reliability of our power grid.

Is the Nation's grid even up to the mandates we talk about? No, it is not because then there will be more mandates on what the grid has to look like. Suddenly, we are Spain. Suddenly, we are wondering why the grids are failing.

Importantly, California's move empowers China, which dominates the EV market and uses slave labor and coal-powered plants to produce EV batteries. That is just the truth.

Mr. Speaker, 77 percent of the world's electric vehicle batteries are manufactured in China. China owns 80 percent of the industrial cobalt mines in the Congo and controls 15 of 19 of the primary cobalt mines in the Congo. These mines are operated by trafficked child slaves. Since when do we not care about that?

The idea that California can do this unilaterally is preposterous. They are the only State allowed to seek waivers under a unique policy. They should not be able to determine policy for the State of Texas or any other place.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 354 OFFERED BY  
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2753) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for a point of order against reconciliation measures that cut benefits for Medicaid or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2753.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 354;

Adoption of House Resolution 354, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1402.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 60, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RELATING TO "GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA: MOTOR VEHICLES"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 78, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RELATING TO "ENDANGERED AND THREATENED WILDLIFE AND PLANTS; ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT OF THE LONGFIN SMELT"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 87, PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; HEAVY-DUTY VEHICLE AND ENGINE EMISSION WARRANTY AND MAINTENANCE PROVISIONS; ADVANCED CLEAN TRUCKS; ZERO EMISSION AIRPORT SHUTTLE; ZERO-EMISSION POWER TRAIN CERTIFICATION; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 88, PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; ADVANCED CLEAN CARS II; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 89, PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CALIFORNIA STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AND ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; THE 'OMNIBUS' LOW NO<sub>x</sub> REGULATION; WAIVER OF PREEMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 354) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Park Service relating to "Glen Canyon National Recreation Area: Motor Vehicles"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) providing for congressional disapproval under chap-

ter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the San Francisco Bay-Delta Distinct Population Segment of the Longfin Smelt"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 87) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions; Advanced Clean Trucks; Zero Emission Airport Shuttle; Zero-Emission Power Train Certification; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO<sub>x</sub> Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision"; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 206, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

### YEAS—215

Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Alford	Ciscomani	Flood
Allen	Cline	Fong
Amodei (NV)	Cloud	Fox
Arrington	Cole	Franklin, Scott
Babin	Collins	Fry
Bacon	Comer	Fulcher
Baird	Crane	Garbarino
Balderson	Crank	Gill (TX)
Barr	Crawford	Gimenez
Barrett	Crenshaw	Goldman (TX)
Baumgartner	Davidson	Gonzales, Tony
Bean (FL)	DesJarlais	Gooden
Begich	Diaz-Balart	Gosar
Bentz	Donalds	Graves
Bergman	Downing	Green (TN)
Bice	Dunn (FL)	Greene (GA)
Biggs (AZ)	Edwards	Griffith
Biggs (SC)	Ellzey	Grothman
Bilirakis	Emmer	Guest
Bost	Estes	Guthrie
Brecheen	Evans (CO)	Hageman
Bresnahan	Ezell	Hamadeh (AZ)
Buchanan	Fallon	Haridopolos
Burchett	Fedorchak	Harrigan
Burlison	Feenstra	Harris (MD)
Calvert	Fine	Harris (NC)
Cammack	Finstad	Harshbarger
Carey	Fitzgerald	Hern (OK)
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Higgins (LA)