

NOT VOTING—9

Cohen
Connolly
De La Cruz

Gottheimer
McGovern
Norcross

Onder
Spartz
Van Drew

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1404

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPARENCY IN CHARGES FOR KEY EVENTS TICKETING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1402) to require sellers of event tickets to disclose comprehensive information to consumers about ticket prices and related fees, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 15, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]
YEAS—409

Adams	Carter (GA)	Dingell
Aderholt	Carter (LA)	Doggett
Aguilar	Carter (TX)	Donalds
Alford	Casar	Downing
Allen	Case	Dunn (FL)
Amo	Casten	Edwards
Amodoi (NV)	Castor (FL)	Elfreth
Ansari	Castro (TX)	Ellzey
Arrington	Cherfilus-	Emmer
Auchincloss	McCormick	Escobar
Babin	Chu	Espallat
Bacon	Ciscomani	Estes
Baird	Cisneros	Evans (CO)
Balderson	Clark (MA)	Evans (PA)
Balint	Clarke (NY)	Ezell
Barr	Cleaver	Fallon
Barragán	Cline	Fedorchak
Barrett	Cloud	Feenstra
Baumgartner	Clyburn	Fields
Bean (FL)	Cole	Figures
Beatty	Collins	Fine
Begich	Comer	Finstad
Bell	Conaway	Fischbach
Bentz	Correa	Fitzgerald
Bera	Costa	Fitzpatrick
Bergman	Courtney	Fleischmann
Beyer	Craig	Fletcher
Bice	Crank	Flood
Billirakis	Crawford	Fong
Bishop	Crenshaw	Foster
Boebert	Crockett	Foushee
Bonamici	Crow	Fox
Bost	Cuellar	Frankel, Lois
Boyle (PA)	Davids (KS)	Friedman
Bresnahan	Davidson	Frost
Brown	Davis (IL)	Fulcher
Brownley	Davis (NC)	Garamendi
Buchanan	Dean (PA)	Garbarino
Budzinski	DeGette	Garcia (CA)
Burchett	DeLauro	Garcia (IL)
Bynum	DelBene	Garcia (TX)
Calvert	Deluzio	Gill (TX)
Cammack	DeSaulnier	Gillen
Carbajal	DesJarlais	Gienez
Carey	Dexter	Golden (ME)
Carson	Diaz-Balart	Goldman (NY)

Goldman (TX)	Luttrell	Rulli
Gomez	Lynch	Rutherford
Gonzales, Tony	Mace	Ryan
Gonzalez, V.	Mackenzie	Salazar
Gooden	Magaziner	Salinas
Goodlander	Malliotakis	Sánchez
Graves	Maloy	Scalise
Gray	Mann	Scanlon
Green (TN)	Mannion	Schakowsky
Green, Al (TX)	Mast	Schmidt
Greene (GA)	Matsui	Schneider
Griffith	McBath	Scholten
Grothman	McBride	Schrier
Guest	McCaul	Schweikert
Guthrie	McClain	Scott (VA)
Hageman	McClain Delaney	Scott, Austin
Harder (CA)	McClellan	Scott, David
Haridopolos	McCollum	Sessions
Harrigan	McCormick	Sewell
Harris (MD)	McDonald Rivet	Sherman
Harris (NC)	McDowell	Sherrill
Harshbarger	McGarvey	Shreve
Hayes	McGuire	Simon
Hern (OK)	McIver	Simpson
Higgins (LA)	Meeks	Smith (MO)
Hill (AR)	Menendez	Smith (NE)
Himes	Meng	Smith (NJ)
Hinson	Messmer	Smith (WA)
Horsford	Meuser	Smucker
Houchin	Mfume	Sorensen
Houlahan	Miller (IL)	Soto
Hoyer	Miller (OH)	Spartz
Hoyle (OR)	Miller (WV)	Stansbury
Hudson	Miller-Meeks	Stanton
Huffman	Mills	Stauber
Huizenga	Min	Stefanik
Hunt	Moolenaar	Steil
Hurd (CO)	Moore (AL)	Stevens
Issa	Moore (NC)	Strickland
Ivey	Moore (UT)	Strong
Jack	Moore (WI)	Stutzman
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WV)	Subramanyam
Jackson (TX)	Moran	Suozzi
Jacobs	Morelle	Swalwell
James	Morrison	Sykes
Jayapal	Moskowitz	Takano
Jeffries	Moulton	Taylor
Johnson (GA)	Mrvan	Tenney
Johnson (LA)	Mullin	Thanedar
Johnson (SD)	Murphy	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Jordan	Neal	Thompson (PA)
Joyce (OH)	Neguse	Timmons
Joyce (PA)	Nehls	Titus
Kamlager-Dove	Newhouse	Tlaib
Kaptur	Nunn (IA)	Tokuda
Kean	Obernolte	Tonko
Keating	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Ogles	Torres (NY)
Kelly (MS)	Olszewski	Trahan
Kelly (PA)	Omar	Tran
Kennedy (NY)	Onder	Turner (OH)
Kennedy (UT)	Owens	Underwood
Khanna	Pallone	Valadao
Kiggans (VA)	Palmer	Van Drew
Kiley (CA)	Panetta	Van Dуйne
Kim	Pappas	Van Orden
Knott	Patronis	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Pelosi	Vasquez
Kustoff	Perez	Veasey
LaHood	Perry	Velázquez
LaLota	Peters	Vindman
LaMalfa	Pettersen	Wagner
Landsman	Pfluger	Walberg
Langworthy	Pingree	Wasserman
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Schultz
Larson (CT)	Pou	Waters
Latimer	Pressley	Watson Coleman
Latta	Quigley	Weber (TX)
Lawler	Ramirez	Webster (FL)
Lee (FL)	Randall	Westerman
Lee (NV)	Raskin	Whitesides
Lee (PA)	Reschenthaler	Wied
Leger Fernandez	Riley (NY)	Williams (GA)
Letlow	Rivas	Williams (TX)
Levin	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Liccardo	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lieu	Rose	Wittman
Loudermilk	Ross	Womack
Lucas	Rouzer	Yakym
Luna	Ruiz	Zinke

NAYS—15

Biggs (AZ)	Crane	Norman
Biggs (SC)	Gosar	Roy
Brecheen	Hamadeh (AZ)	Self
Burlison	Massie	Steube
Clyde	McClintock	Tiffany

NOT VOTING—9

Cohen
Connolly
De La Cruz

Franklin, Scott
Fry
Gottheimer

Lofgren
McGovern
Norcross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1411

Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.” So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1615

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RELATING TO “GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA: MOTOR VEHICLES”

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up 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”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 354, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 60

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior relating to “Glen Canyon National Recreation Area: Motor Vehicles” (90 Fed. Reg. 2621), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 60.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 60, led by Representative MALOY. This is an important effort that will overturn an onerous and unnecessary regulation designed to restrict off-highway vehicle access and recreational use of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.

House Republicans are committed to pursuing a comprehensive approach to restoring multiple use and public access to our Federal lands, one that favors commonsense land management and prioritizes community buy-in over preservationist policies that are cooked up here in Washington, D.C.

As chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, I have often said that some of our most meaningful work increasing access to our public lands will maybe never be a headline on FOX News or CNN, but it will make the front page of your local paper.

Established by Congress in 1972 to enhance public recreation, the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area is a premier tourist destination that offers world-class water-based, backcountry, and off-highway recreation opportunities. Off-highway vehicle recreation predates the recreation area's establishment and has allowed visitors for generations to explore some of the most remote and beautiful stretches of this remarkable landscape.

Consistent with this history, the National Park Service issued a rule in 2021 that expanded the permissible uses of off-road vehicles throughout Glen Canyon, but groups quickly sued, leading the Biden administration to enter into a hasty and secretive settlement against the wishes of local communities.

Under that agreement, the Park Service issued a revised rule in the waning days of the Biden administration that restricts motorized uses in Glen Canyon, overturning decades of precedent and severely restricting public access and recreation opportunities.

Under this new rule, dozens of miles of popular trails and shorelines are closed off to highway vehicles in what the State of Utah called de facto wilderness management. Even small road closures can have profound consequences for public access.

For example, the National Park Service effectively cut off access to the adjacent 1.45 million-acre Henry Mountains travel management area by closing just one-half mile of road in the new rule.

Some of the most popular trails in this area, including the Flint Trail and Poison Springs Loop that are pictured behind me, were also shut down under this rule. What is especially nonsensical about this is that these trails aren't even maintained by the National Park Service. The local county maintains them.

These restrictions are unnecessary and, frankly, lack common sense. Many of these routes are restricted to off-highway vehicles and remain open to conventional vehicles. This creates public safety concerns by incentivizing the use of vehicles that are not meant to handle rough terrain and rugged trails.

Restricting off-highway vehicles also disproportionately affects disabled individuals, who often rely on ATVs or side-by-sides to gain access to remote areas of our public lands. The State of Utah compared the decision to limit off-highway vehicles while still allowing for conventional vehicles as akin to designating parts of Lake Powell exclusively for yachts while restricting more accessible fishing boats and kayaks to less desirable sections of the lake.

In totality, this rule ensures that only the most able-bodied and wealthy will be able to have access to areas of Glen Canyon that used to be open and accessible to everyone. Utah boasts \$9.5 billion of outdoor recreation economy driven largely by motorized recreation. By shutting down some of the State's most popular motorized recreation trails, the National Park Service is shutting down a main engine of economic growth in some of the poorest, most rural counties.

Earlier this year, Congress passed the first-ever bipartisan, comprehensive recreation package aimed at growing, not restricting, our Nation's \$1.1 trillion outdoor recreation economy. The EXPLORE Act passed unanimously in both the House and Senate, a rare feat that demonstrates the overwhelming support for opening more of our public lands to outdoor recreation, not locking up our lands and throwing away the key.

In keeping with that, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important joint resolution, which will restore off-highway vehicle access to treasured public lands. I again thank Congresswoman MALOY for her excellent work and leadership on this effort.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would nullify a National Park Service rule that manages motor vehicle use within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. It is a commonsense rule that

this resolution targets, and it outlines where cars and off-road vehicles are allowed to travel within the boundaries of the national recreation area. It shouldn't be controversial. It shouldn't be political.

The Glen Canyon National Recreation Area is a very popular destination. It offers ample opportunities for backcountry exploration across 1.25 million acres of public land. To put that in perspective, this area is larger than the entire State of Rhode Island.

Now, the National Park Service is tasked with managing park units in a manner that balances public access and enjoyment while ensuring responsible stewardship of the natural environment. That is their job.

Achieving that balance can be a tall order under the best of circumstances. It has become even more difficult as the Trump administration works to dismantle the National Park Service. More than 12.5 percent of the entire workforce has left the agency since Donald Trump took office. It has only been a little more than 100 days, and we are already down 2,000 rangers and park employees.

House Republicans have stood by and watched, and now they are proposing a resolution that undermines national park management even further. As a reminder, this resolution would repeal a rule that manages all motorized vehicle access within Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, a unit of the Park Service that is home to very fragile ecosystems like the Orange Cliffs adjacent to Canyonlands National Park and countless cultural and archeological resources.

Initial planning started way back in 2007 and was not finalized until the first Trump administration published an overly permissive record of decision in 2018. A court determined that the 2018 version of the rule did not do enough to consider the environmental consequences of allowing off-road vehicles on certain roads, so the Park Service went back to work and they published a new rule that achieved a better balance.

The updated rule, which is being targeted today, balances visitor use and access with the long-term stewardship and management of park resources.

Despite some of the rhetoric that we may hear from the other side of the aisle, the Park Service did not shut off access to off-road vehicles. Nothing could be further from the truth. The rule allows off-road vehicles on 388 miles of road within the park, only closing access to approximately 6 percent of the existing roadways to protect sensitive resources.

Even those roads are still open to cars, jeeps, and other street-legal vehicles. They are just closed to vehicles that have the ability to travel off-road and cause severe damage in proposed wilderness and other sensitive landscapes.

That is 94 percent of the roads in this Park Service unit open to motor vehicles, including off-road vehicles, and

then just 6 percent where only street-legal vehicles are allowed. That is a very reasonable tradeoff that protects the park for future generations.

It is also worth noting that Congress has never used the Congressional Review Act in the way it is being used right now to repeal a Park Service decision of this nature. This is meddling and micromanaging at its worst, and it could have some unintended consequences as we will discuss in the course of this debate.

When Congress uses the CRA to repeal a rule, then the agency is prohibited by law from issuing a substantially similar rule on the same topic. The decision to repeal this rule could lead to some unintended consequences that would backfire on the very off-road vehicle community that my friends across the aisle are saying that they are trying to protect.

Park managers would be unable to change or alter access even if a proliferation of off-road vehicle use is damaging park resources. That is the downside from the environmental perspective, but even worse, from the perspective of these off-road vehicles, it could mean an end to all off-roading in Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.

Mr. Speaker, Park Service has to have a rule in place if they want to authorize any access. That is what this rule does. If Congress repeals it and the CRA says no replacement rule can be issued, that is how it works. It is like Cortez when he got to Mexico, he burned the boats so nobody would go back. That is how the CRA works.

You burn the bridge; you can't go back on that particular subject area. A court in the future may well decide that the absence of a rule means no off-roading. Period.

It is the kind of uncertainty that would be discussed and fleshed out if you took the time to have a hearing and have a little bit of deliberation instead of jamming a CRA like this, a blunt instrument, right on the House floor.

If the intent is truly about preserving access, there are better ways to do it. There are certainly much better ways for Congress to uplift and support our national parks; for example, standing up to Donald Trump and Elon Musk's gutting of the National Park Service.

I wish we spent more time talking about that rather than a very reckless use of the Congressional Review Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that the idea that passing this Congressional Review Act would restrict all off-road vehicle access is just not right. That is not going to happen. There was a rule in place before the Biden administration put the new rule in place. We vetted this with the Congressional Re-

search Service. We would simply go back to the rule that was in place that was working fine before the Biden administration came in and put this onerous rule in place.

Also, the argument has been made that only 24 out of 388 miles have been restricted to off-road vehicle use, but as we all know, roads are networks. For instance, there is a half-mile section in this ruling under the Biden administration that blocks off access to over a million acres. You block off a half-mile of road, and you restrict the use to a million acres. I don't think that is what most people would call public access or would agree that it is the way that we should be managing our Federal lands, especially in an area that when it was established, part of its goal was to be able to provide off-road vehicles a place to recreate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Ms. MALOY), the lead sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. MALOY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, H.J. Res. 60, which provides congressional disapproval under the Congressional Review Act of the rules submitted by the National Park Service on the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area pertaining to motor vehicles.

The National Park Service finalized a rule that restricts off-road vehicles and all-terrain vehicles, ORVs and ATVs, to access certain areas within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in my district.

This would prohibit access to approximately 24 miles of road as the chairman said, including popular trails near the Orange Cliffs and segments of the Poison Springs Loop. I have spent a lot of time on the ground in these areas with local elected officials who, for years, have tried to generate a better experience for visitors to the Orange Cliffs, and this goes in the wrong direction.

Wayne and Garfield Counties are counties that struggle in a State that otherwise thrives. Utah has a really strong economy, but these rural counties have really weak economies. The reason the rural counties struggle is because almost all of the land in their counties is managed by the Federal Government. The Federal Government can make rules that restrict access to parts of their county over their objections.

□ 1630

These roads we are talking about are important to those residing in Wayne and Garfield Counties and the tourists who come here from all over the world. They have used these paths to get to places that are part of their history and part of their recreation for generations. These road restrictions reflect a pattern of access loss that characterizes the problems with having a distant Federal Government make local rules.

People from across the world come to experience the unique opportunities these trails offer. The rule threatens to

sever these connections, leaving communities to bear the brunt of its consequences. This is in a beautiful part of a gorgeous State, but it is not easy to get to. Keep in mind, this is a recreation area, not a preservation area.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Utah deserve better. They deserve a government that listens, that respects their traditions, and understands the importance of balancing conservation with access.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area is very popular, as my colleague across the aisle pointed out. The Orange Cliffs area is not well traveled. Much like the rural counties are struggling in a State that is thriving, the Orange Cliffs area is tough to get to in a national recreation area where everybody goes to the lake.

It doesn't make sense to close roads and concentrate all those visitors in those small areas. These nonsensical rules that make bureaucrats feel better don't help Utahans and are a symptom of the problem of having a distant and disinterested landlord with an agenda.

That is why I introduced H.J. Res. 60, a resolution that leverages the Congressional Review Act to overturn this misguided rule. The resolution is not just about restoring access to trails. It is about standing up for the rights of my constituents, protecting local economies, and preserving freedoms that define our Nation.

Let us be clear: Conservation and access are not mutually exclusive. We can protect our natural heritage while ensuring that Americans can go see it and enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. We should send a message that we stand with the people of Wayne and Garfield Counties, the people of Utah, and the people who like to recreate on our public lands.

We value their voices, and we won't allow bureaucratic overreach to dictate our way of life. Together, we can ensure that Glen Canyon remains a place of freedom, adventure, and opportunity for generations to come and isn't a hindrance to the local economies.

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

I appreciate the gentlewoman for her efforts on this legislation and for being a voice for her constituents. She talked about the county governments there that didn't have a voice when this rule was made. This is hurting their economy. It doesn't make sense, and it is kind of a bad example of having that distant landlord with an alternative agenda that lives many miles away managing the land where you live. I thank her for her efforts on behalf of her constituents and on all Americans who enjoy outdoor recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close and continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I stand by what I said a few minutes ago. Without the rule in place or a replacement rule, off-roading could very well be illegal in all of Glen Canyon.

I did expect that my colleagues across the aisle would state that they assume the Park Service would simply revert back to a previous rule. Now, I don't know for sure because Republicans didn't hold a hearing on the legislation to bring in a witness from the Park Service to answer any questions, but there are two problems with this assumption they seem to be proceeding under.

One, the current rule was issued under a settlement agreement to enforce compliance with environmental protection laws. Repealing that rule doesn't repeal those legal obligations, so whatever outdated rule the administration might try to revive will still have to comply with those laws, and a court is going to strike it down when it doesn't.

Two, as we keep having to remind our colleagues, using the CRA to repeal a rule doesn't just remove that rule, it also prohibits the agency from ever issuing a substantially similar rule on this same topic. That means any rule regarding off-road access in this park unit.

This repeal is practically inviting a court to strike down whatever fallback rule the administration tries reverting to, and when that litigation ensues and they comb through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to divine the intent of Congress, they will see pretty plainly that I warned you folks that that was the case right here on the record.

Now, since this information seems new to some of my colleagues, they may be thinking: Wait, that can't be right. Wouldn't this sort of thing have happened before?

The answer is no, because Congress has never used the CRA to micro-manage a park or a park-access rule this narrow in the way that is being proposed with this resolution. The entire scheme is untested, reckless, and ill-advised.

If my colleagues accidentally ban off-roading in Glen Canyon, I hope they are ready to explain that to their constituents, assuming they ever hold townhall meetings again.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation. Last week was National Park Week, an annual tradition meant to honor our deep connection to national parks. President Trump carried on the tradition by issuing a proclamation to officially designate the week—this is one of the few noncontroversial actions in the first 100 days of this administration—because all Americans love and value and support national parks.

Unfortunately, the proclamation also highlighted how the administration is trying to use national parks to tell a myopic and narrow view of our history. This revisionist turn is exemplified by President Trump's decision to rename Mount Denali in Alaska despite over-

whelming criticism and concern from Alaska Native leaders and other voices in the State. It is clear the President is more interested in branding and flashy stunts than actually supporting our national parks and public lands.

House Republicans have stood by and watched as all of this happened. They did nothing as President Trump and Elon Musk decimated the land management workforce, shuttered critical buildings, and froze funding for critical grant programs designed to safeguard and restore our parks and our public lands.

Just since January, the Park Service has lost 1,700 rangers and Park Service staff, leaving parks understaffed and resources vulnerable just before the busiest time of the year. There have to be better ways to celebrate and cherish our national parks than to dismantle them.

We could be doing something to restore all the jobs that have been cut by this administration. We could debate proposals to create new parks or expand existing ones to honor our shared history and protect our most cherished landscapes. We could advance comprehensive and thoughtful appropriations bills that invest in the future of our parks and our public lands.

Instead of doing any of these productive and responsible actions, House Republicans decided to use some more precious floor time to overturn a narrow and specific rule at the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. That is a disappointment, another missed opportunity, and a testament to the priorities of this Republican majority. Mr. Speaker, I again urge a "no" vote and yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just want to say that it is unfortunate that we are having to use a Congressional Review Act, but it is unfortunate that a former administration tried to legislate from the administrative branch.

That is the purpose of the Congressional Review Act. When bureaucrats overstep their bounds, we have this tool to rein them back in. It would not allow them to make this rule again. A clear reading of the Congressional Review Act, it is easy to see that the rule would go back to the rule that was in place before the Biden administration put the rule in place that we are doing the Congressional Review Act on. It is also common sense that that would happen, and it is clearly the intent of Congress, should this get signed into law, that it would go back to the original rule.

I again applaud Representative MALOY for her exceptional leadership in this effort and for looking out for her constituents. This is a necessary resolution that will allow for more recreation opportunities, greater public access, and growth within Utah's outdoor recreation economy. Whether it is hunting, fishing, hiking, or recreating on off-highway vehicles, our pub-

lic lands were meant to be enjoyed by all Americans, and this CRA allows just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 354, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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 will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) at 5 o'clock 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:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 1442; and,

H.R. 859; and,

Passage of H.J. Res. 60.

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.

YOUTH POISONING PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1442) a bill to ban the sale of products with a high concentration of sodium nitrate to individuals, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.