

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

chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision”, 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. 88

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; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision” (90 Fed. Reg. 642 (January 6, 2025)), 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 88.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 88, 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; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision,” sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania’s resolution would repeal the EPA’s decision to grant a Federal preemption waiver for this California Air Resources Board rule, the so-called Advanced Clean Cars II rule.

California had a strict vehicle emission standard before, but this rule right here is a mandate. It is a mandate, Mr. Speaker, for electric cars.

The requirement begins with 35 percent of the vehicles sold in 2026 being zero emissions and then scales up to 100 percent of vehicles sold by 2035.

This is an EV mandate, Mr. Speaker. Make no mistake about it.

Mr. Speaker, if you are shopping for a new car in 2035, then you are going to be forced to buy a zero-emission car. At present time, you will be paying more for that EV, about \$14,000 more.

These are supposed to be tailpipe emissions standards, not emission standards that are so low or difficult to meet that electric cars are the only path to compliance.

I am not an anti-electric car person. I don’t hate electric cars. If an electric car works for you and your family, Mr. Speaker, then so be it. That is fine, but what really gets me and a lot of my constituents stirred up about this is that we are mandating that these cars be the only ones sold.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a mountainous district where electric car batteries are not up to the challenge. When you factor in range problems and charging waiting times, it is not something that many in rural America can use.

I fear that we might find ourselves in situations like Cuba did after Fidel Castro took over. Because of the shortage of new cars in Cuba, people were doing everything they could to keep the pre-Castro cars on the road for decades and decades. In many districts like mine, we might have something similar with gas-burning cars if EVs are mandated.

Let me explain. My folks cannot afford to buy a new EV car. They can’t really afford to buy a used car. Normally, what they do in a district like mine, which is economically stressed, is they will buy a used car. The problem is that with the batteries in the EV cars, if you buy a used car, Mr. Speaker, then you really don’t have any idea how long it is going to be before that battery wears out.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, you buy the chassis and a battery hoping it works for you if you don’t have any other choice. If the battery goes bad, then you are looking at \$4,000, \$5,000, maybe more, to replace the battery.

It is kind of like going to the roulette table and just throwing your money on the table and spinning the wheel, hoping that if you buy a used car, you might be able to make it work because the battery is so integral.

With gas-burning cars, a lot of them know how to fix the cars themselves, and they will make it work. They will continue using those gas cars as long as they can get any usage out of it whatsoever, no matter how bad of a shape it is in, because they can’t afford to buy one of the leftwing’s EV cars.

That is just not going to happen in my district by the timelines that they set up.

The technology is not available today, and when we are talking about 2035, the technology we are selling today is what my constituents are looking to buy used in the future. Many people drive cars more than 10 years old, and they are going to put our

folks either without cars or still burning gas cars for many years, many decades, in the future.

□ 1530

There are some communities in my district that are more suburban and urban, and there an electric car may make sense for those folks. But some of my folks drive an hour or more to go to work or even go to school because it is cheaper for them to live at home and drive to the school. I am talking about the colleges and the law schools and the vet school and the pharmacy school in my district. Every day they drive back and forth to save money and they don’t want to have to rely on an EV car that might not get them there and back.

When it is cold and you are going up a mountain, the EV doesn’t get the mileage that is stated. It is kind of like your gas mileage. When you buy a car, it says a standard driver will get this much, but that doesn’t work for everybody, particularly if you are climbing mountains. If you need to run errands before or after work, that adds to the time. It makes it so they have anxiety about recharging. That is a real issue for people being forced to drive EV cars.

I can’t even get around my district in an EV car. I looked at it because I like the idea, but I sometimes drive 400 miles a day around my district. Oftentimes, there is no place to charge, or if there is, I am not stopping at any one place long enough to get a full charge on an EV battery.

Some might say this is just a California regulation. That is just not so. As we heard in the previous debate, and we will hear again in this debate, California is a dominant force in the economy. They will tell you that every day of the week.

Further, while California has a waiver, other States can opt into it. They can’t modify it, but they can opt into the California standard. When they do, that pushes the manufacturers further and further in the direction of the California standard.

The States should either be equal or we should have a national policy. I am not so sure that we should give California a super-State status, imposing its preferences on the rest of the country.

It gets even worse. This started in 1966, and then it made some sense. Today, it doesn’t make sense. Right now, we have 11 States opting in to this California standard: Oregon, Washington, New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, Colorado, New Jersey, Delaware, Rhode Island, New Mexico, and Maryland. With those States, even though they represent a minority of the population and a minority of the market and a minority of the States, they are dictating much of what is going to happen in the rest of the market.

Now, those markets add up to about 35 percent of the total new car market,

and this has a cascading effect on manufacturers who are forced by the policy of a minority of States not to do what the market dictates but to do what the States have dictated and to make unprofitable investments that won't work for the poor, rural areas, particularly mountainous ones, in the United States.

The situation we now find ourselves in is different than the one that was contemplated by the 90th Congress. In 1967, when the body passed the Air Quality Act, which later became the Clean Air Act after extensive amendments in later years, in that act California was allowed to have a waiver for stricter tailpipe pollution regulations. One of the big reasons this carve-out was made was because of the terrible smog that enveloped Los Angeles at the time.

I remember that. I can remember that being talked about in the news. We have all seen the old pictures. You have got the ocean on one side and the mountains inland. It causes an inversion where pollution just sits over the cities there. California was granted this exemption because it already had the capabilities to formulate and enforce stricter standards. That is not true for everywhere else, nor was it anticipated that they would continue to ratchet up to the point where they made many cars in the United States illegal.

The intent of the waiver was to allow California to have more stringent vehicle standards, not a way to have a backdoor ban on gasoline- and diesel-powered cars for the rest of the country.

I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 88, to roll back the State of California's EV-only agenda.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I was listening attentively to my colleague from Virginia and what he has been saying. I have to correct some things.

First of all, this idea that California is imposing a national mandate is not the case. Only certain States, a minority of States, have adopted the California standards, and there is a lot of flexibility in that.

His own State, Virginia, hasn't adopted the California standards. Maryland has modified the standards. My State adopted the California standards a year after California. So this idea that there is no flexibility or one size fits all is simply not the case.

You don't have to adopt the California standards at all. In fact, if you don't adopt the California standards in your State, you can continue to sell internal combustion, gas-powered vehicles.

Essentially what California is doing is, because of the fact that they have a major air pollution problem, they have adopted more stricter standards, and

the Federal Government lets them do so.

As I mentioned during debate on the last resolution, this resolution—this one now is about cars, primarily—is a waste of time, because both the GAO and the Senate Parliamentarian have concluded that this waiver is not a rule and, therefore, can't be revoked using the Congressional Review Act. This is just another attempt by the Republicans to distract from the economic chaos and uncertainty that Trump is creating with our economy as they stand by and let it happen.

Now, in the case of California, their program builds on the success of previous standards and scales down light-duty vehicle emissions to reduce smog-forming pollution and greenhouse gases starting in the model year 2026 through 2035. This program has been in the works since 2020, and it provides a clear, planned, and gradual approach to transitioning to cleaner vehicles.

No State has to adopt it. The California standard only applies to new on-road vehicles. It does not impact cars already on the road or used cars. It is not an EV mandate. A wide variety of currently available vehicles, like hybrids, for example, which allow you to use gas, obviously most of the time, continue to be allowed.

I really had to laugh when I heard my colleague talk about—I think he said EVs are like a left-wing thing. I assure you that a lot of the people, maybe a majority of the people, driving around my district with electric vehicles are not voting for me. It is not a left-wing thing. People buy these whether they are Republican or Democrat, whether they are liberal or conservative. That is simply not true.

It is estimated that in California, their program will result in \$13 billion in savings from reduced health costs, and the standards will save clean vehicle drivers \$7,500 in maintenance and fuel costs over the first 10 years of use. These are real cost savings that will make a difference in people's lives.

Again, California is doing this because they are concerned about pollution. It does save money. It saves fuel costs. These savings are needed now more than ever because Trump's tariffs are wreaking havoc on our economy and particularly on car sales.

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

A little more about California's advanced clean car program. It is forward-looking, it slashes harmful pollution and the associated health costs, and it also drives up investments, innovation, and job creation. They have proven to be a leader in improving air quality but also enabling significant economic growth.

Again, I don't want to take away from California. I think they are doing a good job, and I think my State of

New Jersey, by following them, is doing a good job in trying to protect people from the health effects of dirty air.

There is nothing in any of this that requires other States to follow, and they haven't for the most part. They can continue to sell cars pursuant to the Federal standards that are for internal combustion, gas-powered vehicles.

I don't understand what the Republicans are talking about, but it is a waste of time.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the waivers before us today: H.J. Res. 87 by Representative JAMES of Michigan; H.J. Res. 88, led by the vice chairman of the full committee, Representative JOYCE of Pennsylvania; and H.J. Res. 89, led by Representative OBERNOLTE of California.

The issue is that it is essentially becoming a nationwide mandate. Article I of the Constitution clearly gives Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. These are the reasons that I would point to that we need to not have State-by-State standards for building automobiles.

What this is, is you can't build a gas-powered car in Michigan and sell it to somebody in California. California has 40 million people, over 10 percent of our country. When you start having a patchwork of State laws banning cars that can be driven anywhere else in the country, except California says no, New Jersey says no, and Maryland, as pointed out, says no, then it completely distorts national commerce.

If you think about it, by 2035, zero-emission cars in California, the problem with that is, I don't think anybody believes they can get there with that standard, just like the EV mandates by 2032.

What happens, though, these automotive companies have to start building for that. We see the results of it. In my district, BlueOval SK, which is tied to Ford Motor Company, has two battery plants. One they are building. Only one is going to have production in it. They are looking at what to do with the other one. They have that and another one in Bowling Green because they put out these mandates, and businesses have to follow them. When they don't come to pass, it is just not an efficient way to do business.

You have California doing mandates on having to buy electric cars or non-internal combustion engine cars. It is clearly within the purview of the Commerce Clause. It is clearly the responsibility of the national government to set up what the standards are so commerce can easily move across State borders.

If somebody builds a car in California, a gas-powered car in California, I think California has the right to ban their citizens from buying it. I don't think they have the right to ban their citizens from buying cars produced everywhere else in the States.

There are contracts among the States. It is clearly what our Founding Fathers intended. This certainly fits right in it, and I urge my colleagues to reject these policies and support the underlying resolutions.

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

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

I rise in opposition to this Congressional Review Act resolution.

The American Lung Association recently issued its annual "State of the Air" report, which found that nearly one-half of all Americans are breathing unhealthy air.

Despite all the progress that has been made since the enactment of the Clean Air Act, air pollution remains a public health threat. This is especially true in California where over 90 percent of residents live in an area with poor air quality.

Given this tremendous public health threat, California has taken the initiative, as it is clearly authorized to do in the law, to protect its residents, including through the Advanced Clean Cars II Program.

We have gone over all of the reasons why the CRA is not applicable to this waiver. I will focus on the specifics of the underlying rule which will rapidly reduce tailpipe pollution from light-duty vehicles by increasing the percentage of new zero-emission vehicles sold in California to 100 percent in 2035.

I will try to dispel some of the myths about this rule. First, it only applies to new vehicles. No one is requiring people to give up their existing vehicles. Second, it does not apply to used vehicles, so there will continue to be a robust secondary market for internal combustion engines.

Third, I heard several Republican Members express their support for hybrid vehicles at the Rules Committee. Under this standard, plug-in hybrid vehicles can account for a significant portion of sales requirements through 2035.

Now, Members also raised a litany of concerns about the performance of electric vehicles, that they don't have adequate range, they don't perform well in cold climates, and they are too expensive. Well, as they are sharing those concerns, we have a Trump administration response that I will talk about.

We hear a lot of talk here today in this debate about executive overreach, primarily from the previous administration of President Biden. Well, I find it ironic that these complaints are

coming up while the Trump administration is actively working to undermine Federal investments and programs to address these very issues.

□ 1545

The Trump administration is illegally freezing billions of dollars at the Department of Transportation that were intended to build out a network of charging stations, which will reduce range anxiety and improve the convenience of EV ownership.

The Trump administration has made the Department of Energy an unwelcoming place to work, resulting in 3,500 public servants leaving the agency who were responsible for supporting R&D funding to improve battery technology.

Mr. Speaker, talk about overreach by the executive branch. There it is. Improvements to batteries will allow for greater range, improved performance, and lower costs.

It has been very publicly reported that the majority is considering repeal of consumer incentives that reduce the upfront costs of EVs, all while giving people a clear choice of what vehicle to purchase.

Of course, after the upfront costs, EVs are proven to save consumers considerably through reduced fuel and maintenance costs. Even that upfront cost is quickly approaching parity with internal-combustion vehicles as more and more activity is existing out there with the manufacturers globally.

If Members were truly concerned about the cost of vehicles, they would speak out about President Trump's reckless tariffs, which are expected to raise the cost of all vehicles, EVs and internal-combustion engines alike.

Finally, Republicans have suggested that the EV transition plays right into China's hands. The reality is that the market, both in the United States and globally, is heading down a clean-vehicle path. At this moment, China has emerged as the global leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the moment, China has emerged as the global leader, but its long-term dominance of the global EV market is not guaranteed.

Here is what I know for certain. If we do not compete, China benefits and will control those global supply chains. Yet, if we embrace this transition, we will give America's automakers and innovators a great opportunity to win the competition in clean vehicles.

The bottom line is that, at every turn, the Trump administration is sabotaging all efforts to build a domestic EV and battery manufacturing industry, and the attack on California's right to put forward more protective standards is part of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to reject this resolution, to allow California to make the decisions it needs to protect the health of its residents, and allow our entire country to have a better chance to create jobs and compete to dominate for the future of the automotive industry.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN) to address the resolution.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 88, but I will clarify one thing for my colleague on the other side of the aisle and add a little bit more color or correct the truth with the other half of the truth. That is, yes, Trump is trying to claw back some money for the infrastructure of building these charging stations. Why is that?

It is because the Biden administration gave them approximately \$1 billion to build charging stations. Let's see, I think they built less than 10. I don't know about other Members, but I don't think that is a real good use of taxpayer money, so I am in support of clawing some of that money back. I thank President Trump.

Mr. Speaker, moving on to the resolution, this resolution offered by my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) would reverse a waiver granted by the Biden EPA that allows States to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles. This EPA rule has legitimate constitutional questions and would increase costs for Americans and manufacturers.

Americans deserve to choose the car of their choice. In fact, Biden used liberal California to force a one-size-fits-all solution nationwide. One State should never dictate national policy because I can assure my colleagues that what works in California sure doesn't work for the people of my great State of Michigan.

In fact, this policy only hurts Michigan auto manufacturing jobs, threatening to kill 37,000 jobs in my State of Michigan. I am not for that.

This is yet another example of House Republicans righting the wrongs and failings of the previous administration. We are keeping our promises to the American people to restore common sense, roll back burdensome regulations, and lower prices.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), who is the ranking member of our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.J. Res. 88.

It shouldn't be controversial to say that air pollution is dangerous. Every year, particulate-matter pollution kills more than 50,000 Americans. Study after study has linked air pollution to higher rates of cancer, heart disease,

diabetes, cognitive decline, and, of course, respiratory conditions. The evidence is overwhelming that clean air saves lives.

If my colleagues are like me and grew up in California, then Members know the impacts of air pollution. I remember what it felt like to breathe smog and particulate pollution before we had the strong pollution standards that we have today.

In California, we have been dealing with the impacts of air pollution for a long time. California's unique geography, with its valleys, coastal basins, and surrounding mountain ranges, creates natural barriers that trap pollutants and contribute to unique air pollution challenges. As a State, we have long recognized the dangers of air pollution, and we have been a pioneer in addressing the root causes.

In fact, California's efforts to control air pollution predate Federal efforts in 1967. In 1967, California was the first State to establish a State air pollution control agency. The country soon followed with the Clean Air Act of 1970, which created the EPA and established the First national air pollution standards.

In light of California's unique air pollution challenges and our State's early leadership in tackling air pollution, the Clean Air Act grants California the authority to set its own stronger vehicle emission standards. Over the last 50 years, California has used this authority more than 100 times to update and strengthen our pollution standards, and these actions have actually saved countless lives across California.

Yet, this resolution would strip California's rights to manage deadly air pollutants within our own State, stripping away our right to protect ourselves. Why? Why are Republicans trying to degrade California's air quality? It is my constituents, my neighbors, and my fellow Sacramentans who will suffer if Republicans succeed in killing California's emission standards.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: Why are Republicans willing to put the health and safety of our communities at risk? I think the real answer is that California's leadership helps to support automotive innovation. The catalytic converter and electric car are thanks to California's visionary leadership and re-imagining a future without air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry is afraid of electric vehicles. Once again, Republicans are doing the bidding of oil lobbyists. Once again, the majority is on the wrong side of history, fighting to hold back the future for as long as they can. It is shameful and indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 88.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong

support of H.J. Res. 88, my legislation to reverse California's radical electric vehicle mandate.

With one foot out the door, President Biden and his administration provided a waiver approving of California's policy to require all vehicle sales in the State to be electric vehicles by 2035. What makes this policy even more dangerous is that 17 other States, making up 40 percent of the American auto market, are set to adopt these regulations, including my home State of Pennsylvania.

If consumers want to purchase an EV, they should be able to, but Californian politicians have no right to remove the choice to buy a gas-powered vehicle from my constituents.

The Biden EPA wrongly allowed California to enact an electric vehicle mandate that will ultimately affect the entire United States.

What works in Glendale does not work in Gettysburg. Allowing the California waiver to stand impedes on the rights of all other States, even those who do not follow California standards.

Not only do EVs not fit the needs of so many American families, but they are incredibly costly, as well. In my district, the average household income is \$65,000 a year, while the average price of an electric vehicle is more than \$55,000 a year.

Prices in the used car market will also surge, as dealers will not have the gas-powered vehicles to sell because of the inventory of unsellable EVs. My constituents simply cannot afford this ridiculous regulation and should not be forced to purchase entirely unaffordable vehicles that do not meet their needs.

Our economy was built on an open market and the freedom of consumer choice. Congress cannot allow California to continue its abuse of its standing in the Clean Air Act to limit consumer freedom. It is time that we overturn this dangerous rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation to protect our auto industry, to protect our auto-workers, and, most importantly, to protect the freedoms of all of America.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a staunch defender of Michigan's auto industry, which is still the backbone of the American economy, and someone who cares deeply about the environment, I do not take this vote lightly.

I have spoken multiple times to all of the stakeholders involved. I believe in preserving consumer choice, maintaining American leadership in innovation, defending the future of domestic manufacturing, and protecting the environment. These are not mutually exclusive.

Michigan and the United States put the world on wheels, and we are now leading in the transition to the next generation of vehicles. We cannot afford to cede that leadership to our adversaries.

I will remind my colleagues that, in my lifetime, it wasn't that long ago when gasoline prices went up and American consumers wanted smaller cars. Japanese automakers flooded our markets with smaller vehicles, caught our domestic auto industry flatfooted, and U.S. manufacturers paid the price for that for a decade.

We must innovate, adapt, and build vehicles competitively here at home. The global marketplace wants EVs, hybrids, and internal-combustion engines.

To lead globally, we must accelerate the manufacturing of cleaner vehicles in a practical, affordable, and inclusive way. That means building out EV charging infrastructure, keeping hybrids and plug-in hybrids available, and assuring affordability, which is becoming one of the biggest issues in this country, especially when we are competing with at least one other country where the government subsidizes the manufacturing, uses forced labor, and manipulates its currency.

We cannot cede our leadership to China or any other country. This also means investing in advanced manufacturing, securing domestic battery supply chains, and protecting the Inflation Reduction Act's historic EV investments.

□ 1600

California's Advanced Clean Cars II program would impose EV sales mandates across nearly 30 percent of the U.S. market. While that may work for California, it isn't working in some other States.

Let me be clear. This is not the time to ban gas-powered vehicles. CARB and Governors must be able to adjust these programs if market conditions change. Maryland Governor Wes Moore recently did just that, easing compliance enforcement. Consumers in these other 13 ZEV mandate States need to be talking to their Governors, and CARB needs to pay attention.

I also share concerns about consumer choice, but this Congressional Review Act resolution has serious legal flaws. The Government Accountability Office and the Senate Parliamentarian both ruled that these waivers are not subject to the CRA. Proceeding sets a dangerous precedent.

Misusing the CRA today could open the door to striking down a wide range of Federal programs tomorrow, including Medicaid waivers, which worries me greatly. I don't sleep at night on that one.

We are here today because some States have adopted stricter rules that could ban new gas-powered vehicles by this summer. I support the EV transition, but we are simply not there yet.

For model year 2026, ACC II States would require 35 percent of new car sales to be a mix of electric or plug-in hybrid, yet the national average is at about 10 percent. That requirement jumps to 68 percent by 2030 and 100 percent by 2035 for the ZEV mandate States. For most States, this is simply not realistic today.

We need all the stakeholders at the table—labor, manufacturers, suppliers, dealers, consumers, the environmental groups—to work together for the American people and figure it out and figure it out right so that we stay competitive in a global marketplace, meet consumer demands, take care of the environment, sell affordable cars, and keep manufacturing in this country.

This resolution would be unprecedented Federal overreach. While I disagree with California's timeline, I also disagree with misusing the CRA to address it.

If we are serious about America's leadership, EVs must be in our portfolio. I remain committed to protecting American jobs, expanding consumer choice, and ensuring U.S. leadership in global automotive innovation.

The American people sent us here to solve problems.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, let's stop wasting time on illegitimate messaging CRAs and work together to support innovation, build out the infrastructure, ensure access to affordable American-made vehicles, whether gas-powered, hybrid, or electric. Let's work together for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no."

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, referencing my previous comments related to the GAO, et cetera, I will not yield to the GAO on what the responsibilities of the United States Congress are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Virginia for leading this.

For my dear colleague from Michigan who just spoke on that, I greatly appreciate she got most of the way there. Indeed, why we have the Congressional Review Act is to reel in out-of-control bureaucracies and bad mandates that come down the pike. That is why we have H.J. Res. 88, led by my good colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

We are supposed to take back when government gets out of control. In this case here, people are not going to have control of their automobile choices. We see, with the mandate coming down the pike here, that by 2026—that is next year. This current model year is almost over with, 2025 vehicles. By 2026, it will be a requirement of 35 percent of vehicles sold—in one more model year in these States, 35 percent.

At the current rate in California and New York, about 10 percent of these vehicles are being sold. How the heck are you going to jump to 35 percent in a year?

Nobody wants to buy these cars. Mr. Speaker, as you see when you go talk to the dealers, they have to have a certain number of vehicles that meet

these mandates on the lot that aren't selling in order to get a Jeep or something you want that has a gas-powered engine in it or a pickup with a bigger engine in it. They have to sell a certain number of these other ones to meet the quota. They can't sell the other stuff because they are not what people want to buy.

When talking about vehicles to be replaced anyway, these cars cost half again as much as a similar size, similar used car. Who is supposed to afford that?

Go down the supply chain here. People with a lower income probably primarily buy used vehicles. There is going to be a bigger premium on used cars on the market that are going to be less available to people with more moderate incomes.

As it is, we are going to see the \$7,500 incentive done under the IRA disappear soon. When we are talking \$14,000 more per vehicle anyway, and that \$7,500 incentive is gone to people who can file a tax return with all of those complications on it, because there is a large standard deduction, thanks to the JOBS Act legislation a few years ago—most people can't even take advantage of that if it is there.

What are we talking about? By 2035, 100 percent of these cars are going to be battery-powered. What were we just saying a while ago about the power grid? What were we talking about with all of these data centers coming online using mass amounts of new electricity? When are we going to talk about that we can't produce power plants in this country? We can hardly get out of our tracks to build nuclear plants. They are tearing down hydroelectric plants in my district that make CO₂-free power. We love to stop CO₂, right? That is what this whole electric deal is about.

Let's go back to 1990 in California, when CARB, the California Air Resources Board, decided we are going to require that by the year 2000, 10 percent of all vehicles have to be zero emission.

What happened? Mr. Speaker, go to your dealers there and you see these little golf carts with license plates slapped on them that are pretending to be automobiles. They are trying to get those into the market. Nobody is going to buy that. Nobody is going to drive that. They are not even safe.

CARB had to relent on that year 2000 goal, and they are going to have to relent again on this and on the trucks because it isn't realistic for real consumers, for real people. They don't want these cars unless they can get a sticker and drive in the fast lane in California on that, but that is a narrow group.

One of the automobile reps I talked to drives from Sacramento up to Oroville and then has to go on up to Susanville. He is unsure if the pickup he has, which is a new electric pickup, is going to be able to make the whole trip. They are uncertain whether he

can cover that trip, about a little over an hour here and about an hour and a half up the mountain to get the job done.

People have uncertainty about even being able to rely on these vehicles. We have all heard the story about someone who bought a new pickup. I think he is from Michigan. He bought a camper, the whole works. It was to take his family on vacation. He made it about two States away. He had to stop and recharge so often that he finally took the truck to a different dealership, a different brand, and traded it in and bought another one with a diesel and finished the family vacation on that.

This is the stuff they are going to put normal consumers through with these mandates, and it is going to happen in many States. A lot of times people in an industry, auto manufacturers, they want to just have one standard. They will take the worst standard that affects everybody, like food labeling and stuff, and foist it upon everybody else.

We need to pass H.J. Res. 88 and give people a choice.

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

Mr. Speaker, it really bothers me that I never hear during this debate anybody on the Republican side of the aisle talk about clean air and the fact that we need to continue to make progress toward clean air because of the negative impacts of air pollution on people's health, particularly people who have health problems, asthma and other health problems.

I want to talk a little bit about the Clean Air Act and why it is important, and then I will talk a little bit about the California standards.

Thanks to the Clean Air Act, America has made massive strides in cleaning up our air, but we still have a long way to go. Nearly half of all Americans are breathing unhealthy air, and I think that that is unacceptable.

Air pollution is a serious public health crisis. It can lead to health problems like lung cancer, asthma attacks, heart disease, and even premature death. Air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States every year. I have reiterated this statistic before, and I am not going to stop until I make my Republicans on the other side of the aisle understand that we are still trying to clean up the air and save people's lives.

Tailpipe emissions from cars, trucks, and other vehicles are significant sources of air pollution. Burning gasoline and diesel fuel contributes particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, and greenhouse gases into the air.

The transportation sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, making up nearly one-third of overall pollution. Therefore, strong vehicle emissions standards are necessary to combat these deadly trends.

The three waivers under threat today in these three bills would yield \$45 billion in health benefits and prevent 4,700

deaths in California alone. Why shouldn't it be the case that because California has unique air pollution problems that they can't have stronger regulations with regard to tailpipe emissions or decide to move toward electric vehicles over a period of years? They are doing this because of the unique circumstances of California.

Eliminating these waivers would allow more than 1.5 billion metric tons of nitrogen oxides, 17,700 metric tons of fine particulates, and 1.6 billion metric tons of climate-harming emissions to poison our air.

I know that President Trump says that climate change is not real, not human-induced, but the fact of the matter is that the pollution problem continues. Climate change continues.

Nullifying the California waivers is going to wreak havoc on Americans' well-being and public health, leading to more premature deaths. There is no doubt about it.

I find it deeply disappointing that in the first 100 days of the Trump administration, Republicans are continuing the trend of putting polluters over people by attempting to nullify health-protective vehicle emissions standards.

What is worse is that, at the same time, Republicans are also plotting to cut hundreds of billions of dollars from Medicaid, take healthcare away from millions of people, all so they can secure tax breaks for their billionaire friends and big corporation cronies.

I have heard the Republicans on the other side act as if the California standards are a mandate and that they are going to mandate electric vehicles. Members on the Republican side from Michigan, Texas, Virginia, Minnesota, and Ohio have all spoken. None of those States have adopted the California standards. I have no reason to believe that any of them ever intend to adopt the California standards.

This is not a mandate. They can continue to sell internal combustion gas-powered cars in those States. Nobody is saying they can't, but they still have to meet the national standards, which are not really at issue today. They still have to meet the national standards for tailpipe emissions with those vehicles, as it should be because we want to have clean air.

There is nothing in the law that says that other States can't continue to sell gas-powered cars. Even under the California standards, they can still sell hybrid vehicles. There are other options. For a hybrid, most of it is still being powered by gas.

I just think that the Republicans are giving the impression that somehow California is dictating what we do in other States, and that is simply not true.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Madam Speaker, today, I am presenting a reso-

lution I have sponsored under the Congressional Review Act to reverse California's ban on gas-powered vehicles, to stop a single individual, Gavin Newsom, from dictating what tens of millions of Californians and other Americans are allowed to drive.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you where this ban came from. It was September 23, 2020. California was in the throes of the worst wildfire recorded in our State's history. There was untold suffering. Our heroic firefighters were doing everything they possibly could to get the blaze under control. Governor Newsom came out and announced: Here is what we are going to do. We are going to ban gas-powered cars. Our cars make wildfires worse.

It was an absurd, pathetic attempt to deflect responsibility from his own failures, for an NPR investigation would soon find that Newsom exaggerated the fire prevention work he had done by a staggering 690 percent and had also slashed the fire prevention budget by \$150 million.

□ 1615

Newsom's edict eventually took the form of the regulation that is in front of us today, and on his way out the door, President Biden gave him special authority to effectively impose it on the rest of the country.

Three things about this mandate are undoubtedly true: Number one, it was never voted on, not in Sacramento, not in Washington. Number two, it does have a nationwide impact. Number three, it is not just a problem for the future. The 35 percent mandate goes into effect next year.

Therefore, we must act with urgency to democratically reverse that which was unilaterally imposed. It will be one of the most important things we do in this Congress. It will lower costs and restore common sense. It will restore the paradigm of consumer choice.

Madam Speaker, I like EVs. I happen to drive an EV myself. It works well for where I live and for my lifestyle, but I would never think to use the coercive powers of government to impose my personal preferences as a consumer on everyone else. Americans should be able to drive a car of their choice, not one that is chosen for them by the government.

Finally, with this resolution, we can restore a paradigm of dynamic innovation rather than command and control mandates. It is an odd approach to innovation that says we are going to force innovation by banning any and all available alternatives. I believe in the future of clean energy. I believe that it is upon us now, but that future is being driven by entrepreneurs and innovators, not by vainglorious politicians.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to this resolution passing. I hope it does with bipartisan support, so we can prevent the insanity of California's politics from infecting the rest of the Nation.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), my swimming partner.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 88.

In the final weeks of 2024, the Biden-led EPA approved a waiver allowing California to ban the sale of gas-powered diesel and even hybrid vehicles by 2035, effectively paving the way for the State to set emission standards for the entire Nation.

This resolution overturns this waiver, protecting the right of every American to choose the vehicle that works best for them. For many consumers and entrepreneurs, they see conventional gas-powered cars as reliable, affordable, and able to meet the needs of their families and small businesses. Yet, the Biden administration chose to team up with radical climate activists to support the one-size-fits-all electric vehicle mandate that the market and the American people have clearly rejected.

This legislation is about defending consumer choice. Let's make sure California does not dictate what the rest of America drives.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I will just stress that my Republican colleagues like to wrongfully assert that California standards set the vehicle emission policy for the whole of the United States, and it just demonstrates an inaccurate understanding of the Clean Air Act.

So let me just close by explaining this.

Through section 209 of the Clean Air Act, Congress provided the EPA the ability to grant California Federal preemption waivers to set more protective vehicle emissions standards to address the compelling need to reduce air pollution in that State.

The resolutions at issue today are about one State's Clean Air Act waivers, California, not the entirety of the United States. Other States do have the flexibility to voluntarily adopt California standards in whole or in part, modify the standards to their specific needs, or just not adopt the standards entirely.

As I have mentioned, most of the speakers on the Republican side, their States haven't adopted the standards at all. If your State doesn't want to

follow California, you don't have to. Each State is allowed to decide what works best for them, but today's resolution threatens that choice and is basically an affront to States' rights.

Now, just last week, the American Lung Association issued its annual "State of the Air" report, which shows that nearly half of all Americans breathe unhealthy levels of air pollution. Unhealthy air leads to hospitalization, increased infant and fetal mortality, impaired development in children, and the higher likelihood of illness and cancer, among other detrimental health impacts.

We know that air pollution has serious impacts on the most vulnerable among us, especially pregnant women and children, populations my Republican colleagues claim to care a lot about. If you want women to have more children but can't muster the courage to ensure pregnant women and children have safe air to breathe, what are you talking about?

The bottom line is, we have to do something about the air pollution in this country. If some States like California and mine want to have more strict standards, they should be allowed to do so because they have more air pollution problems. It is that simple. That is why I oppose this resolution and will oppose all three resolutions today.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I was saying to the team over here that I was getting a little tired of hearing myself speak, and I suspect that my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, is probably getting to that same point, too, because our job is to reiterate the same points over and over because we have three bills of a similar nature.

Notwithstanding the fact that I am tired of hearing myself speak, I will proceed nonetheless.

I will say that States can opt in and out, but they only have the choice of the national standard or the California standard. Why is that?

Madam Speaker, that is because back in 1966, California started moving in this direction. In 1967, Congress passed its first national rules. It recognized that California was already moving in a slightly different direction, and it gave them the ability to have a waiver. Other States could opt in to that, but in 1966, the world was greatly different than it is today.

In fairness, a big part of the air pollution in the Western part of the United States comes because of previous bad rules by the EPA that force so much of American manufacturing to Asia, particularly to China.

China was not a major economic power in 1966. They were going through all kinds of problems, and I don't remember now if they were in the Cultural Revolution or about to start it, but it was about that time.

Today, they are a major manufacturer but they don't have the regulations that we have and they produce a lot of air pollution. According to a NASA study, it takes 10 days for the air to get from the middle of the Gobi Desert to the eastern shore of Virginia, and a lot of that pollution is falling on California.

If we really want to solve California's air pollution problems, we need to bring manufacturing back to the United States where we can do it more efficiently and cleaner than what they are doing currently in China. Further, regulations like this only play into the hands of manufacturing being done in China instead of being done in California or in Michigan or in Virginia or in Kentucky.

Now, the gentleman raised the issue about nobody is talking about clean air. There is your clean air talk, Mr. Ranking Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my good friend from New Jersey, because if we really want to clean things up, we will stop regulations like this that make it harder on American businesses.

The gentleman correctly points out that this is only for California and other States can opt in. What happens is, manufacturers respond to California and they respond to a few other States, even though it is not a majority, Madam Speaker; even though it is not a majority of the States or a majority of the population that has opted in to any of these three regulations that we are doing today or intends to. Some States have opted in to the California rule on this one and then opted out, including my State of Virginia.

It becomes a mishmash and very difficult for manufacturers to know what they are supposed to be doing. The regulations that were anticipated—was it a tailpipe emission regulation—were never intended that the regulation by California and other States, perhaps, would be so low as to outlaw gas and diesel vehicles. That is why we need to pass this CRA.

We have the authority in Congress to do so notwithstanding bureaucrats that work for us, not the other way around, and notwithstanding whatever the Senate might say.

If I have additional time, Madam Speaker, you know how I feel about this. We were directed in Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice and Procedure not to discuss and debate what the Senate was going to do or not going to do. If we wanted a unicameral body, we should have had a unicameral body. We have a bicameral body, and this House must make its own decisions and not worry about what the Senate does or whatever the heck the Senate Parliamentarian may think.

It is the United States House of Representatives, and we should not take a back seat to any institution, particularly the unelected ones here in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I ask everyone to vote for this 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam 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 AND NONROAD ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; THE 'OMNIBUS' LOW NOX REGULATION; WAIVER OF PRE-EMPTION; NOTICE OF DECISION"

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 89) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO_x Regulation; 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. 89

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 and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO_x Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision" (90 Fed. Reg. 643 (January 6, 2025)), 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