

million children across our country. Meanwhile, the White House is assessing ways to “persuade women to have more children.”

I am an OB/GYN. It has been my life's work to help women have children. Let me tell you, eliminating early childhood care and education, making our Nation's childcare crisis even worse and taking away parents' ability to go to work and provide for their families, is not how you persuade women to have more children.

On top of that, gutting Medicaid, the health insurance program that covers half of all children and 40 percent of all births, is not how you persuade women to have more children.

It is hard to imagine a more antifamily agenda. The Republican plan pressures women to have more children then abandons them, gutting the healthcare, education, and support they need to be healthy and to thrive.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

RECOGNIZING GAIL ACAMPORA

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

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Gail Acampora from Prospect, Virginia. I am lucky enough to call Gail a close friend of mine. She has always been interested in politics and is an avid supporter of President Trump.

In 2021, Gail was diagnosed with lung cancer. She has had a lobe and lymph nodes removed and went through tough chemotherapy. Unfortunately, she is still fighting after another cancer diagnosis.

Her strong faith in God and positive attitude will keep her on the road to recovery.

Tracy and I are with Gail, and I know she is going to fight hard and beat this thing. I ask that everyone include her in your prayers.

CUTS TO FEMA BRIC GRANTS

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

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to this administration's devastating cuts to FEMA's BRIC program, otherwise known as the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities grants.

Towns like Crisfield in Maryland, Baltimore, and dozens of communities

across this Nation, rely on this funding to ward off the very real and very devastating effects of flooding.

Not only do these programs save lives, but it is also one of the best investments that this Federal Government can make in this country, matching State and local funding. These projects in the long-term save \$6 for every \$1 in upfront spending.

Yet, on this Earth Day, and just before we are about to enter hurricane season, instead of protecting our communities from sea level rise, the Trump administration ended this program.

When we talk about government cuts to environmental programs, I will caution that rising seas don't care who is in the White House. The water doesn't care how a small town that experiences 90 days of flooding or more a year voted in the last election. Flooding will continue to devastate communities, even if the President does not believe in climate change.

That is why I will continue to fight for the reinstatement of these funds for Crisfield, for Maryland, and for every community affected by flooding across this country.

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 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1415

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia) at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

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”

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up 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 Provi-

sions; Advanced Clean Trucks; Zero Emission Airport Shuttle; Zero-Emission Power Train Certification; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision”, 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. 87

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 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” (88 Fed. Reg. 20688 (April 6, 2023)), 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 87.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 87, a resolution providing for 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,” sponsored by my friend from the great manufacturing State of Michigan.

In general, what makes these California rules have such an outsized impact on the rest of the country is that, under section 177 of the Clean Air Act, other States can opt in to the California standard.

Not only does California dominate because of its sheer size, but when a

handful of other States opt in, the California standard becomes the de facto national standard for the United States.

It is my understanding that on just this California EPA waiver for trucks, 10 States—Colorado, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington—have opted in to this regulation. This is concerning to me because it seems that California is being given super-State status vis-a-vis the other States of the Union.

States can opt in to a proposal of the privileged State or the super-State but are not able to request a preemption or a waiver from the Federal Government on their own.

This is either the national standard or the California standard. Those are the only two you can have.

It does not allow for individual States to become the laboratories of innovation and democracy as was seen fit and as it was believed to be the case for our Federal system.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that the States should be equal. I am not so sure that we need a super-State imposing its preference on the rest of the country. If that is what we want, why not cede all authority to California and disband the United States Congress?

Either way, having parallel State vehicle regulatory systems is what really causes manufacturers and big fleet operators to be concerned.

Specifically, on this California advanced clean truck rule, this rule creates a complex credit trading system where truck manufacturers must buy or generate zero-emission truck credits just to have the privilege of doing business in the State.

At the end of the day, this rule is very restrictive on traditional diesel-powered trucks. By 2035, this rule ends up requiring electric big rigs to make up 40 percent of the class sales.

I am not here to tell you that electric trucks don't have their place. We all know that they do. Yard trucks, in particular, might be an application where electric trucks have an advantage. Perhaps in certain city delivery situations, those delivery routes could be done with electric vehicles.

That should be a business decision, not the decision of a waiver granted by bureaucrats from Washington to a super-State to dictate to the rest of the country what our policies should be.

Unfortunately for independent owner-operators and small trucking companies, this mandate for electric trucks comes with a very expensive price tag. A new diesel rig costs about \$180,000. Electric big rigs can go anywhere from \$200,000 to \$400,000. That price tag is going to hit the independent driver, the small owner-operators, and the small fleets hard.

Trucking is a relatively small-margin business where time on the road equals money. I am afraid that all of these increased costs could lead to

more consolidation in the industry and less competition.

Further, these higher rig costs will present a bigger barrier to entry for the owner-operators and small trucking companies that, with the current technology, would have more charging downtime. Accordingly, not only are they not able to be on the road, but when they are off the road, they are off for a longer period of time.

Time on the road, as I said earlier, equals money. Therefore, it is going to cost more to operate. The big companies might be fine with that, but your smaller companies are going to find it very difficult.

This regulation throws a wet blanket on truckers' opportunities to share in the American Dream of starting their own business, starting out with one truck and building it to five and then maybe getting it to 10. It gives all the power to the big companies.

I believe that this electric truck mandate is going to lead to inefficiency and increased costs on all products that have to be transported over road.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 87 and ending this regulatory nightmare.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 87, 88, and 89, the three bills that we are considering this afternoon.

Like much of what Republicans do here on the House floor, these three resolutions are a waste of time and are going nowhere. That is because both the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, and the Senate Parliamentarian have determined that Congress cannot nullify these waivers using the Congressional Review Act. Yet, here we are. Republicans are ignoring these rulings and moving ahead—again, a giant waste of time.

These resolutions are nothing more than a ploy to basically distract hard-working Americans from the fact that President Trump is singlehandedly destroying our economy and driving up costs for American families, including on vehicles.

Markets are in turmoil. The first quarter report indicated that the American economy is actually contracting. It is not growing. It is actually contracting, getting smaller. American retirement savings are in free fall. Prices for everyday goods continue to rise, all as a result of President Trump's trade war with the entire world. He is at war with the entire world.

Trump's tariffs are also expected to drive up the costs of vehicles in the United States by up to \$15,000, and Republicans silently sit back and let it happen, bringing up resolutions on the floor that are going nowhere.

These illegal CRA resolutions threaten the Clean Air Act waivers of Federal preemption that allowed stronger pollution standards for cars and trucks for the State of California. My colleague from Virginia gives the impression that States have to follow California's lead. I don't know that he means that, but he gives that impression. That is not true. No one is telling any State that they have to follow California. My State of New Jersey decided to, but that is up to the Governor and the legislature. In fact, they could withdraw the California standards at any time. New Jersey could if they wanted to. No one is forcing any State to follow California's lead.

My colleague from Virginia, I love him, but he is talking about Big Government. It used to be that the Republicans believed in States' rights, meaning that the States, little or large, would have their own rights and be able to do their own thing. He is the one who is talking about Big Government now because he is suggesting that the Federal Government is going to preempt everything that California and some other States have done.

These resolutions are a direct attack on over 50 years of Congress and the Environmental Protection Agency recognizing California's, and other States that follow, longstanding authority to set stronger vehicle emission standards to protect the public health of its residents from the State's unique air quality challenges.

Why do we let States like California and New Jersey decide this on their own? Because there are different problems in those States with regard to air quality.

Right now, over 90 percent of California residents live in an area plagued by poor air quality. If California decides that we need more stringent standards because we don't want people to get sick in their State, then they should be allowed to do so.

This isn't like pie in the sky. This is based on the fact that the air quality in California is not good. I mean, I hate to say it, but it is true. That is why they need more stricter standards, and they decided to do that.

California started regulating tailpipe emissions actually in 1966 before the Federal Clean Air Act was even enacted. In drafting the Clean Air Act decades ago, Congress recognized California's air quality challenges that demonstrated compelling and extraordinary circumstances, justifying more protective standards.

This waiver mechanism also allows other States with challenging air pollution conditions to voluntarily adopt California standards if they feel that it is appropriate.

This has allowed States to be a laboratory of innovation for the auto industry and pioneer emission reduction technologies, such as check engine dashboard lights or even the development of zero-emission vehicles, and the standards under threat today would continue that legacy.

These resolutions would completely dismantle that progress at a time when the Trump administration appears to be determined to cede our global leadership in clean transportation to China. None of this has to happen. These resolutions are illegal, plain and simple.

My Republican colleagues were informed weeks ago by the independent, nonpartisan GAO that California's waivers cannot be revoked using the CRA for two reasons. First, EPA's waiver decisions are not rules. Second, even if the waivers were considered rules, they would be rules of particular applicability since they only concern one specific entity; i.e., California.

These two factors disqualify the waivers from review under the CRA, and the Senate Parliamentarian agreed. That should have been enough. In other words, the Senate says they can't do this. The GAO says they can't do this.

Again, the Republicans are taking their cues from Trump, and he doesn't care what the law says. He just says do it. That is why we are here today. None of this is going to matter.

EPA has granted dozens of waivers over five decades, and there is a long bipartisan history of recognizing these waivers as orders, which House Republicans are determined to ignore.

What I am saying, Madam Speaker, is they can't do what they are suggesting to do today because it is illegal. Even if they were able to, it sets a terrible precedent for other waivers and other abilities of States to decide on their own what they want to do.

If the theory behind these resolutions were to be successful—in other words, using the CRA to nullify orders—House Republicans would set a dangerous precedent that expands the applicability of the CRA. That would mean countless numbers of executive actions made across the Federal Government would be at the mercy of the political winds of a vocal few in Congress. States seeking approvals for energy infrastructure projects would be under threat. Leasing decisions for major oil and gas fields could be targeted. States that submit waivers for their Medicaid programs could be up for congressional review under this newly expanded applicability. This opens up a Pandora's box for Republicans to invalidate other State programs that they deem unfit for their extremist agenda.

□ 1430

They are trying to impose a very extremist Federal national standard and basically preempt the States.

It is not what Republicans historically do, but this is the age of President Trump.

I think this should ring an alarm bell for everyone in this Chamber. Today, it is waivers for California's clean vehicle standards; tomorrow, it could be a program or project in another State out of favor with Trump or the Republicans.

To be clear, the transportation sector is the largest contributor to green-

house gas emissions in the United States, making up nearly one-third of overall pollution. Passing these resolutions would allow more nitrogen oxides, fine particles, and climate-disrupting emissions to poison our air.

While it is disappointing that my Republican colleagues are attempting to tear down health-protective standards, it is not surprising. Just look at their plans to strip healthcare from millions of Americans with hundreds of billions of dollars in devastating Medicaid cuts, which I expect next week in our committee.

Instead of attacking clean vehicle programs, opposing investments in American electric vehicle manufacturing, and pushing regressive anti-electrification policies, Congress should focus on supporting market innovation, preserving U.S. competitiveness, and providing regulatory certainty for the clean vehicle industry.

My colleagues on the other side talk about China and competition from China, but everything that President Trump is doing is giving China even more of a runway to be competitive and to win, in this case, in the transition to a clean energy economy, especially across the electric vehicle supply chain.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose all of these misguided resolutions, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I remind my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, that we are not here today talking about Medicaid cuts. We are talking about EPA rules that need to be set aside in a Congressional Review Act.

You heard him say that this is all illegal. I find this kind of interesting because we have heard them railing for weeks on executive action and why haven't the Republicans pushed back against executive action. That is what we are doing today. We are railing about executive actions. Now, it is the prior administration, mind you, but they are executive actions.

Madam Speaker, I ask you just to use your logic on this, to stop and think about this. The EPA passes what they call a decision in a legalistic attempt to get around the law. That decision that they claim does not fall under the CRA process gives a waiver on Federal regulations to a State, California, that then if you opt in 100 percent, you can't modify it. If you opt in 100 percent into the California rule, other States, currently a minority of the States opt in to, but because you didn't create this patchwork what happens in the industry is, everybody starts to move in that direction. Because if we have to do it in California and 9 other States or 10 other States, then we might as well do it nationally.

What happens is, this is a de facto national regulation. My colleagues on the other side are saying that because they have called it a decision instead

of calling it a regulation because they are using a waiver of a regulation that somehow Congress doesn't have any authority.

Madam Speaker, they would have you believe that this Congress can't make decisions on its own. We have to rely on independent bureaucrats to tell us how to do our jobs. I say to you, Madam Speaker, if the Senate wishes to take a back seat to the unelected bureaucrats, so be it. As long as I am in the United States Congress, I will fight to make sure that we are, at least, grabbing what power we can. They heard me say yesterday in committee that I think we give too much to the various Secretaries. I think we give too much to the executive branch. Here is a case where we have an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to grab power back from the bureaucrats and to say: No, you can't do this. My colleagues want to rely on legalistic principles from the unelected bureaucratic class in Washington, D.C. I cannot agree to that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, quite frankly, I can't even believe that our friends across the aisle are complaining. I guess that seems to be their habit, their modus operandi these days.

Madam Speaker, House Republicans are fighting tooth and nail to undo the damage President Biden's radical agenda—maybe that is why they are complaining, come to think about it—inflated on our economy, our freedoms, and the American way of life. It is just that simple.

This week, we are moving to overturn yet another reckless regulation this time targeting the very backbone of our supply chain: American truckers.

Under Biden—I call him “O’biden” because I think he is Obama's third term—we had a shortage of truckers, Madam Speaker. This was Washington bureaucrats trying to do California's dirty work. Don't our bureaucrats here have enough work to do on their own?

This is a direct hit on our truckers. I know. I ran a small trucking business for a short time. This is a direct hit on our small businesses and anyone who relies on affordable, reliable transportation, which, quite frankly, is just about every American.

Let's be real: This isn't about cleaner air. Never was. Never gonna be. It is about control. It is about forcing a one-size-fits-all green agenda on the rest of the country—I might say the unsuspecting country—regardless of what it costs working families, what it costs farmers, job creators, and, yes, truckers. They just don't care.

This CRA sends a clear message, Madam Speaker: Republicans stand with the men and women who keep America running. We stand with Americans for common sense. I couldn't be

more proud to be here with my colleague for this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. In the words of the truckers: Let's slam the brakes on this nonsense and put America back in the driver's seat.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Congressional Review Act resolution.

The three CRA resolutions being considered today target Clean Air Act Federal preemption waivers that authorize stronger pollution standards for cars and trucks for the State of California.

Ranking Member PALLONE and others have explained how these resolutions go far beyond what is legally allowable under the Congressional Review Act and how the Clean Air Act clearly authorized California to pursue and be granted these waivers as has been the case many, many times over the past 50 years.

Now, I understand that many Republicans in Congress do not like that California is able to take steps to address its extraordinary air pollution from the transportation sector, but they are in luck. They control the House, they control the Senate, and President Trump is in the White House.

If the majority wants to directly attack States' rights and prevent California from developing more ambitious public health protections, they can propose an amendment to the Clean Air Act to change the law and end the waiver process. No one has proposed this because it would require hearings and markups and convincing people of the merits of upending more than 50 years of Clean Air Act precedent, which has been the most successful public health law in history.

Instead, we are here today debating a shortcut, a Congressional Review Act resolution, as we have done time and time again this year as a quick way to undermine environmental rules rather than doing the hard work of actually legislating. If we dug into the legislative history of the Clean Air Act, it would be clear that Congress carefully crafted the law to recognize the diverse air pollution challenges facing each State.

We would also have a chance to understand how so many innovations have occurred not only because of the law broadly but specifically because California has been able to pursue more protective standards.

The process that has resulted in us debating this resolution today is all wrong, but it is also bad on the merits.

The Advanced Clean Trucks program is going to make major contributions to reducing air pollution in California, and this rule would only apply to California.

Beyond that, every other State would be able to decide what works best for them. Despite what has been suggested, this rule never required 100 percent zero-emission vehicle sales for any class of truck.

Both new and used diesel-powered trucks, buses, and vans will be available for purchase in California and elsewhere in our United States. The rule also includes numerous flexibility measures to help auto manufacturers comply with the standards. The reality is, there are hundreds of different models of zero-emission, medium-, and heavy-duty vehicles available for sale today. Major fleets are making the conversion to pollution-free vehicles. Prices are coming down, and more charging infrastructure is being built.

Perhaps, most importantly, these vehicles have the potential to contribute to a tremendous reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and traditional air pollution. Reducing this pollution will, indeed, improve health outcomes, result in fewer hospitalizations and missed days of school and work, and avoid thousands of premature deaths. Let's stop with this CRA overreach and attack on States' rights to allow California to move forward with ushering in the next generation of heavy-duty vehicle innovation.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this resolution.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY of California. Madam Speaker, our Governor in California, Gavin Newsom, likes to say that California leads the Nation and, unfortunately, President Biden enabled him to do just that. He has led our Nation down a path of total insanity in a way that puts us at war with common sense, with American consumers, and with our fantastic truckers.

California has come after truckers in every way you can imagine, whether it is by far the highest diesel tax in the country, the regulation after regulation after regulation that makes more and more trucks unusable, or AB5 that went after the independent owner-operator model and threatened to put thousands of truckers out of work. However, with this regulation, the State came after the whole ball of wax. They said we are going to take your truck itself.

With this regulation, the State has said that by just the year 2035, we are going to have for some classes of trucks, 55 percent have to be zero-emission vehicles; for others, 75 percent; for others, 40 percent.

What is the practical consequence of this going to be? First, trucks are going to be a lot more expensive, tens of thousands of dollars more expensive. Companies will either have to buy more trucks or they will have to carry less in their trucks because there is less capacity because of the weight of the battery.

By the way, they are going to have to use charging infrastructure that doesn't even exist at this point in time.

American consumers, as we are seeing already in California, will see the cost of just about everything, certainly the cost of groceries, go up, and this will only contribute to the fact that we have a shortage of truck drivers in our State and in this country.

California is being allowed to create policy for the whole country because 11 States are tied to California's actions here and because it puts manufacturers in a dilemma if they have to manufacture one truck for one State and another truck for another State.

Today, we are restoring common sense. We are restoring uniformity when it comes to interstate commerce. We are restoring support for our truckers and we are lowering costs for consumers.

By the way, we believe fully in innovation and we believe in a clean energy future for this country. We believe in clean air, but it is through innovation that we will get to clean air. It is not by government fiat. Indeed, it is an odd approach to innovation that says we are going to somehow magically fiat innovation by banning any and all available alternatives. That is not the way it works.

□ 1445

Finally, to the notion of the gentleman from New Jersey that this sets a dangerous precedent, I will note that no California legislator ever voted on this or the car ban, no Member of this House has voted on it, no individual citizen has voted on it. There has been no vote whatsoever on a policy of profound personal consequence to 40 million Californians and tens of millions of other Americans. I think that is precisely the precedent, actually putting this to a vote of the people's Representatives.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), the ranking member of our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.J. Res. 87.

Heavy diesel trucks are some of the most polluting vehicles on the road. Even though they make up just 10 percent of all vehicles, heavy-duty vehicles produce more than half of all pollution and smog-forming NO_x. The soot and smog pollution from these vehicles kill thousands of Americans every year.

For over 50 years, California has had the authority to set its own stronger vehicle emissions rules because California has, to quote the Clean Air Act, "compelling and extraordinary circumstances" that justify stronger emissions standards than the Nation as a whole. This was true in 1970, and it is still true today.

According to the American Lung Association's 2025 State of the Air report,

5 of the top 10 most polluted cities in America are in California, and that includes my district. I-5 and I-80, which crisscross my district, are both major heavy-duty trucking corridors. The diesel emissions along these corridors create serious air quality issues that directly affect the health and well-being of my constituents.

Not only that, these emissions are also a significant contributor to severe weather events. California receives the brunt of climate change's most severe impacts, from wildfires to atmospheric rivers to droughts. In Sacramento, we have faced deadly flooding from more intense winter storms as well as longer and more extreme droughts, and the foothills above Sacramento are still scarred from the many wildfires we have seen in recent years.

California's emission standards are a matter of life and death for my constituents. To protect my constituents, I spent much of my career in Congress fighting for stronger emissions standards.

I am once again stunned by the hypocrisy of my Republican colleagues, who claim to defend States' rights while they do everything in their power to stop California from setting its own statewide emissions standards.

This is even more absurd because the Government Accountability Office, GAO, has already ruled that the EPA waiver for California's emissions standards is not eligible for repeal under the Congressional Review Act. In other words, the legislation we are debating here today is a pointless political exercise, a waste of time because perhaps my colleagues have nothing better to offer today.

The President is playing with tariffs, sending the cost of groceries soaring, and kneecapping American manufacturers. My Republican colleagues will maybe stop debating this meaningless resolution and reassert congressional authority over tariffs. They can end the tariffs this week and bring down costs for families.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 87.

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

I am not against States' rights. I am against creating a super State in California because they are the only ones that are entitled to get a waiver and then claiming, as the Government Accountability Office, that they have some kind of extrajudicial authority to tell Congress how to do its business. I don't agree with that. I believe we make those decisions, not the GAO.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), my good friend, on this resolution.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 87, which will prohibit California from mandating electric trucks not only for Californians but for all Americans.

The Biden administration's misguided decision to grant California this

waiver has serious implications far beyond the State of California, impacting all Americans. It is an assault on our way of life in northern Minnesota.

Madam Speaker, I am not opposed to Americans having the ability to purchase and drive an electric car, truck, or bus if they so wish. In fact, I support their choice to do so. We should support and embrace consumer choice.

What I am opposed to is unelected bureaucrats in Washington or Sacramento mandating my constituents purchase and drive an electric car or truck. The people in Minnesota, many of them, not only can't afford an EV, these vehicles are not compatible with our daily lives.

How are you supposed to drive an electric vehicle when it is 20 below zero, and it loses 60 percent of its battery life in a short period of time?

We cannot forget that the critical minerals that are used to make these EVs are sourced from Chinese Communist Party-controlled mines in places like Congo, where 15 of the 19 industrial mines are owned by the Chinese Communist Party. These mines have zero environmental standards, zero labor standards, and they use child slave labor.

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

Madam Speaker, the Biden administration "exported their environmental guilt."

In my hometown, the Duluth Transit Authority bought electric buses in 2018. It was a big event. There was a ribbon cutting and all the leaders were there. What they didn't tell you was that in short order, Madam Speaker, they had to add diesel-generated heaters to those electric buses because they wouldn't work in the cold climate. They were happy they had their electric buses, but they didn't tell everybody they had to spend more money to add diesel-generated heaters to those buses.

Madam Speaker, in this town just 2 weeks ago, I spoke at an event, and I condemned child slave labor in Congo. As I was walking out, a gentleman from one of those mines said he disagreed with me.

I said: What do you disagree with?

He said: That we use child slaves in our mines.

I said: It is confirmed. It is factual. Not only the Trump administration, but the Biden administration confirmed it.

He said to me, Madam Speaker: Well, it is only a few children.

I said: Even one is too much. We will not consume any critical minerals used by child slave labor, and the Biden administration did that.

Madam Speaker, 33 percent of our cobalt that we use came from child slave labor when we have mines in northern Minnesota that the Biden administration shut down.

I urge my colleagues to join me in standing up against these mandates and standing for consumer choice.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. DEXTER).

Ms. DEXTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to these resolutions that strip away a State's right to protect its residents from dangerous air pollution.

As a pulmonologist, a lung doctor, I have spent my career caring for people struggling to breathe—patients with asthma, COPD, and lung cancer. However, I am also a mother, deeply concerned about the world we are leaving our children.

I came to Congress after years of treating the consequences of inaction. I could no longer stand by while politicians ignored the root cause—the pollution poisoning the air we breathe. The truth is, Madam Speaker, our air is making us sick, and we have the power and responsibility to do something about it.

More than 156 million people in this country live in counties with dangerous levels of ozone and particulate matter, and yet instead of empowering States to raise the bar on clean air, Republicans are telling them to stand down. Let me say this another way. Republicans are telling States they cannot take action to protect their people, their health, and their future.

They want to prevent States that are at the forefront from using their authority to cut tailpipe pollution, a move that guts local authority in favor of polluters. We must let our communities lead. Repealing these waivers would undermine stronger vehicle emissions standards that reduce dangerous pollution and are essential to fighting the climate crisis.

Make no mistake: That would have immediate impact for our communities, for every family living near a busy highway, every child using an inhaler, and every senior who can't go outside on a high pollution day. This is a direct attack on over 50 years of precedent that recognizes that EPA has the authority and the obligation to allow States to do what is required to protect their residents.

I am, frankly, stunned that my Republican colleagues in the House want to undermine States' rights. Repealing these waivers is an illegal expansion of the use of CRAs, which the Government Accountability Office and the Senate Parliamentarian have conclusively determined cannot be used for this purpose. This is government overreach at its most reckless.

It is a distraction—a deliberate one—from the fact that President Trump's agenda is failing to meet the needs of working families. It doesn't lower prescription costs. It doesn't fix our crumbling infrastructure, and it certainly doesn't improve the air our children breathe or the water they drink. At the end of the day, every American deserves the right to breathe clean air.

Clean air shouldn't be political. Clean air shouldn't be anything but fundamental.

The people of Oregon should know that I see these attacks for what they are. I hear their concerns, and I will not stop fighting to protect them, their children, and their future. I will fight to ensure that science, not politics, guides how we safeguard our communities.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Illinois). The gentleman from Virginia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Did the gentleman from New Jersey reserve?

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I am a California resident, and I am also a California businessman. We have a farm in northern California where we actually operate three highway trucks, and I would probably only have two except for State mandates make it to where one of my older trucks, which is a fine-running vehicle, is only allowed 1,000 miles per year to operate under an agricultural situation. Consequently, I had to buy yet another truck that was newer than 2011 in order to be able to comply with these mandates.

Soon after, when the State had said: Well, if you buy a 2011 or newer engine-powered truck, you are going to be good for a long time. That is until they change their mind and take away the mandate. What many people did was purchase, in good faith, vehicles they thought would last for maybe 20 years, 25 years, or whatever their needs are. I am especially talking about mom-and-pop operations that don't buy new trucks with massive turnover like operations with many, many trucks in their fleet that run them 500,000 miles and turn them over.

What we have with these mandates is more and more difficulty to even operate trucks. There is an old saying: If you have got it, a truck brought it. In California, you may not be getting it anymore. By the time 2035 comes around, and they ban the sale of internal combustion engine trucks and cars in California, what are we going to replace them with? That takes no account for the great strides that are made to make cleaner running diesel engines in all these vehicles and gas engines in automobiles and pickups.

With the technology, we have to add this DEF fluid to our vehicles to make sure that they are running in compliance. What credit is given as a transition to more and more of these trucks meeting this mandate helps deliver cleaner air quality? No credit is given. It is just more mandates. CARB sits down there in Sacramento thinking up

more and more mandates all the time, taking away barbecues, gas-powered stoves, and gas-powered everything, even gas-powered generators. I still don't know what you are supposed to replace a generator with if you can't power it on gas or diesel when the power goes off. It is ridiculous what is coming down the pike.

Where California goes, there are several other States that want to follow as well because they think we have got it going on with these mandates.

They want us to take away these trucks and take away the ability to have diesel-powered vehicles. Diesel, like it or not, is going to power things for many decades to come. The technology for batteries and the generation of electricity that is needed to keep all these going on the grid—if you have, say, a neighborhood where three or four cars in three or four homes are electric vehicles requiring that power supply, you would have to change the power lines and the transformer in the neighborhood by the time just a few of these vehicles are in place due to the intense load that is required to fast-charge these vehicles; let alone a truck fleet in a particular area. If there are 50 trucks or whatever in an operation all required to be on electricity and charging overnight, the grid people are going to laugh at you on that.

□ 1500

This is at the same time as they are removing hydroelectric dams in California. They may not renew the nuclear power plant in San Luis Obispo, also known as Diablo Canyon. They got a 5-year extension a couple of years ago. Is it going to go beyond that? That plant alone represents 9 percent of the power grid in California.

They keep taking away the generation of power. They don't permit the new generation of power except for wind and solar. They want to turn farms in the Central Valley into solar farms perhaps. Take a look at the Ivanpah installation down in southern California where two-thirds of that is being shut down. They have the giant tower and the mirrors all pointed at it. That one is being shut down due to economics. If the economics on renewable power don't work out, where is the power going to come from?

Who is going to drive the trucks? How will we get deliveries when these vehicles aren't purchased? The price of these is 2.5 times what a regular truck costs. If people would pass my legislation on the Federal excise tax, making the \$20,000 to \$30,000 of additional tax, a tax that was put in place to pay for World War I, on the price of new trucks, maybe people would have a little more relief.

We do not need this mandate. The Federal Government should not give California more waivers. It was okay back in the 1960s when things were bad in southern California, but air quality has improved vastly due to these vehicles and other measures that have been taken.

Agriculture has the ability to burn its refuse, clippings, tree removal, and all that. That has been banned in the San Joaquin Valley now. There have been a lot of strides or moves made. Yet, they are never satisfied at CARB in Sacramento.

Other States will monkey see, monkey do what California does to the detriment of all consumers. All prices of goods delivered, the prices of production where trucks haul raw materials, and then the finished products from field or forest or mine to be manufactured or refined will just go up across the board.

We don't have the battery technology to have these trucks go more than really 150 miles, whereas diesel-powered trucks, depending on how many tanks they have, can go 400 miles.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reject the waivers.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LICCARDO).

Mr. LICCARDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 87, H.J. Res. 88, and H.J. Res. 89.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I was here to speak about different policies, policies that the American people actually want to see to help them pay their bills and to lower the cost of living that is choking millions of American families.

Instead, in this administration's first 100 days, I have seen this Republican majority capitulate to the largest sales tax in U.S. history in the form of Trump tariffs, costing the average American family perhaps \$4,900 annually at the checkout counter. I have seen this Republican Congress authorize the imposition of even more excessive overdraft fees which will cost American consumers another \$5 billion.

Where is the action to help Americans pay their bills? Mr. Speaker, you won't find it in any of these three measures. Instead, my Republican colleagues seek to undermine waivers from Federal regulations that California and 13 other States have relied upon for half a century to protect our clean air.

This waiver has done much to clear the once smoggy air of the Golden State, and eliminating these standards will result in the release of 1.6 billion metric tons of pollutants into the air. That pollution will imperil our children, our seniors, and the tens of millions who suffer with respiratory illness like asthma and COPD.

As if the harm to our health and environment isn't enough, the GOP proposals in each of these three measures will cost American citizens even more in their pocketbooks. Over the next 15 years, eliminating these fuel standards will increase Americans' spending at the gas pump by \$89 billion. Even if it is adjusted for different vehicle purchase costs, Americans will pay \$55 billion more out of pocket because of these efforts to make our cars and trucks less fuel efficient.

Indeed, it will also cost us in higher medical bills. The waiver for the Advanced Clean Cars II rule will save

Californians some \$13 billion in spending on healthcare for respiratory ailments.

The health and cost benefits are even greater under the heavy-duty truck regulations. In the heavy- and medium-duty truck sector, we are seeing zero-emission and low-emission trucks that are 2 years ahead of schedule in sales set by California requirements.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, the global industry and the market have left them behind. House Republicans have no agenda to lower the costs for the American people. They are attacking California by putting on this political Kabuki show for political benefit.

Let's talk about California. Despite our many faults, my State has used this waiver and these clean air standards to clear skies that were once filled with smog when I grew up there in the 1970s and in building the world's fourth largest economy. It is larger than Japan, India, the U.K., and, yes, even Texas.

Madam Speaker, I am not entertained by this Kabuki, and the American people aren't either. Do you know what would entertain them? If we actually did something to lower their costs.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), home to a large part of our manufacturing base for automobiles.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairmen GUTHRIE, Congressman GRIFFITH, and their staff for their professionalism, especially on moving this important measure forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.J. Res. 87, my resolution of disapproval to overturn the Biden administration's California Advanced Clean Trucks rule.

Mr. Chairman, I am kind of disappointed but not surprised at my colleagues' lack of understanding for exactly what we are trying to do here. I would expect bad-faith negotiations here and elsewhere. Let me highlight a couple of points that we have heard over the recent few minutes.

Let's talk about lowering prescription drug costs. I wonder what my colleagues think about our truck drivers and how their lifesaving drugs get to their constituents. I wonder if they just appear out of thin air, or maybe the trucks that carry these things will actually just get there on unicorn tears, hopes, and dreams. That doesn't happen.

We actually need trucks to get our lifesaving drug medications to the pharmacies at lower costs. Mr. Speaker, if you increase the number of trucks required because you increase the payload capacity, you are going to actually do more harm than good.

Let's talk about infrastructure. Apparently, my colleagues think we are doing nothing to address infrastructure when literally their plan will contribute directly to crumbling infrastructure due to the heavy weight of

these trucks. They could also crash into barriers, which would endanger lives. This would make sure the number of around 45,000 fatalities in this country would increase. I wonder how many American lives they would sacrifice on the altar of their Green New Deal initiatives.

How do we pay for these roads, Mr. Speaker? We pay for these roads with gas taxes, and the gas taxes that these gas trucks would not be paying would take directly from the funds that we need to build our roads all across the country.

In addition to air pollution, Republicans care about clean air. We care about clean water. We also care about common sense. Maybe in California they can plug their trucks into a tree, but in the rest of the country we are relying on an energy grid that is still at least half reliant on an all-of-the-above approach where we have economic, reliable energy and we are still including things like natural gas and coal.

These are the types of things that happen in the real world, and common sense applies in other areas outside of California. In Michigan, we are not afraid of the future, but we demand to be a part of it. America called on us during two World Wars and a global pandemic, and my legislation ensures Michigan stands ready to answer the call once again.

My family is no stranger to how important the trucking industry is. My father started a trucking business with one truck, one trailer, and no excuses. Then a generation later, I started a trucking company during the COVID pandemic.

He grew up in the Jim Crow South and moved to Michigan in search of opportunity and for the American Dream. Tooth and nail, he fought harmful regulations and misguided rules that would have prevented his company from ever getting off the ground.

More than 50 years later, his son stands before the United States House of Representatives to continue the fight against harmful regulations and misguided rules that put thousands upon thousands of livelihoods at risk.

This Biden rule is not just bad policy, Mr. Speaker. It is the scam of the decade to put California's failed EV policies in charge of the entire trucking industry in Michigan and the United States. Does anyone in this Chamber actually believe that this is the United States of California? Perhaps Californians do, but in Michigan we do not want to be dictated by Sacramento. There are about 49 other States that would agree.

Gavin Newsom may be content with being the number one State for declining population, losing nearly 1.2 million Californians from 2020 to 2023. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I am not. This Biden-era waiver allows California to ram its comply-or-die, zero-emission truck rule down the throat of the American trucking industry, essen-

tially gutting the trucking industry all across Michigan and across the country.

It is a Green New Deal mandate that will crush our trucking industry and drive costs up on everything and increase deaths on our highways. Those are facts.

This policy, if left unchecked, would mandate truck manufacturers only sell expensive, less reliable, zero-emission trucks, no exceptions, no choice. This is going to increase the number of trucks required, which is going to increase the cost of everything from gas to groceries.

The death of the American trucking industry is not just an unintended consequence of this radical California policy. Mr. Speaker, it is the goal. They intend to set unworkable emission standards that will cripple our supply chains and make it impossible for tens of thousands of trucking companies to do business because they are unwieldy and inconvenient.

This policy is unsustainable, unrealistic, and a job killer. Most importantly, it will end lives. Telling the Michigan trucking industry and all other industries that they are willing to move forward with this policy is unacceptable.

Today, the House of Representatives will send a resounding "no" to the radical left and a resounding "yes" to the middle class, to our job creators, to our employers, and to our truckers who keep America running.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do simple math, use common sense, and put this Biden-era California waiver to bed once and for all.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGUIRE). The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from New Jersey has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RIVAS).

Ms. RIVAS. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak against H.J. Res. 87, which will illegally stop California's efforts to work toward a greener and cleaner future through zero-emission trucks.

Strong vehicle standards protect Americans from expensive and volatile fossil fuels and accelerate the adoption of cleaner vehicle technologies to help us compete globally.

According to the American Lung Association, the L.A. metro area has the most polluted ozone in the country. This is due to the high concentration of freeways and heavy trucking industry and communities such as those in the San Fernando Valley like Pacoima and Sun Valley. Stopping these efforts will worsen our air quality and the public health of our communities that are already plagued with the effects of air pollution and vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this resolution and its goal of stripping California's ability to regulate air pollution

and improve public health. Not only are Republicans taking away healthcare from over 370,000 of my constituents who rely on Medicaid, they are actively worsening the health problems many of them face. This is insult to injury. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN).

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak for the families who cannot afford to breathe dirty air for another day. I rise for the parents who have rushed their child to the emergency room because the smog outside triggered another asthma attack. I rise for the young people who have the right to a future free from polluted air, climate disasters, and preventable health crises.

House Republicans are trying to overturn EPA's approval of California's clean air waivers, a move that would strip California's ability to protect its people from dangerous air pollution.

This isn't just about California. Over one dozen States voluntarily follow California's standards. If we overturn these waivers, then families from New York to Oregon will feel it, too, in their lungs.

States are not forced to adopt California's standards, but many choose to because of the harm air pollution causes their communities.

If these measures pass, then more pollution will fill our air, more kids will miss school because they are sick, more seniors will land in the hospital, more families will lose loved ones far too soon to preventable deaths, and billions of dollars will be spent on health expenses that could be avoided.

Communities like the ones I represent, low-income neighborhoods near freeways, ports, and warehouses and working-class communities of color, are already, indeed, breathing some of the dirtiest air in our country.

Thousands of people in California and around the country wrote in support of these clean air protections that Republicans want to rip away.

Jane Flynn, from the L.A. area, wrote EPA in support of the clean truck rule. She said: "Living in southern California, I see how truck pollution impacts our families: asthma, heart disease, respiratory problems. These aren't just numbers. They are our children, our parents, and our neighbors. Please allow California to enforce stronger clean air protections."

Tia Triplett from Los Angeles wrote to EPA that heavy truck pollution threatens the health of her community, and she urges stronger protections.

House Republicans want to silence these voices.

Our constituents don't need more diesel trucks idling near our homes, pumping smog into our lungs. They need cleaner trucks, cleaner cars, and cleaner air.

Mr. Speaker, we should build a future where children can play outside without an inhaler in their backpacks or around their necks, a future with fewer hospital visits, not more. We should stand with communities fighting for their right to breathe, not keep them polluted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with our communities and protect their right to clean air. Vote "no."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what I really want to stress today is that, contrary to what the Republicans are saying, the bottom line is that no State is forced to adopt the California rules.

I heard from speakers on the other side of the aisle from States that actually don't follow the California rules at all but somehow feel that they are being forced to comply, which is simply not the case.

Mr. Speaker, what you have to understand is the reason why we allow California and the States that follow it to do what they are doing is because, in those States, we have major pollution problems.

I heard one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about a freedom to pollute or a freedom to choose. The bottom line is, when there is a problem with clean air, you don't really have a choice, Mr. Speaker. You are going to breathe dirty air.

Mr. Speaker, if you are in one of these States like California that feels that they have to have more strict compliance in order to deal with the clean air problem they have in their State, then it is really not fair to suggest that those States should not be able to deal with that problem and have more stringent standards so they can have cleaner air and avoid health problems for their constituents.

That is all we are talking about here. This is not a one-size-fits-all. It is just the opposite. It is a situation where each State makes a decision on whether they want to adopt California standards for their own pollution problems.

I don't think this should be a freedom to pollute. The bottom line is that every State has to look out for its own constituents, and if the situation is such that they need cleaner air and have to try to have some more limitations, then they should be allowed to do so. That is all we are really saying here. We want to protect the public and have cleaner air.

For all those reasons, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this resolution and allow California and other States like mine to continue to be more protective of their constituents.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, is a great

guy, and he is a good friend. He is mistaken in part and correct in part. He is right that it is not one-size-fits-all. It is two-sizes-fits-all, and States other than California aren't given the opportunity to determine whether they want to do something that is a little bit different than California or if they want to do something that is a little bit different than the national standard.

As Mr. KILEY pointed out in his very good comments on this subject, the problem is when California keeps ratcheting up their regulations, because they are a large economy, as has been pointed out, and because several other States decide to join them, although still in a minority, the manufacturers have to look at that and say: Are we going to manufacture two different types of vehicles for each class, or are we just going to follow what California has done?

De facto, this is a regulation on the Nation as a whole. De facto, this decision by the EPA is a regulation on the entire Nation.

That is why this Congress is paying attention to its own responsibilities and not listening to the bureaucrats and other unelected officials. We must make a decision and vote to pass H.J. Res. 87.

It is important to the Nation as a whole to protect our trucking industry and to protect jobs across this great land.

Mr. Speaker, 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. 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.

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"

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) providing congressional disapproval under