

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

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 to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 89.

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 strong support of H.J. Res. 89, 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 and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; The 'Omnibus' Low NO_x Regulation; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision," sponsored by the gentleman from California.

The gentleman from California's resolution would repeal the EPA decision to grant a waiver to the California Air Resources Board rule on heavy-duty engine emissions of nitrogen oxides, or NO_x.

□ 1630

I think it is interesting to point out here because the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) pointed out in the debate on the previous two bills that these rules were approved by a non-elected body in Washington, D.C., for a waiver to a nonelected body in the State of California, so it is interesting that this is a waiver granted not to the legislature even of California but to the California Air Resources Board.

This standard, believe it or not, of the three California regulations we are discussing today, has probably the toughest timeline of compliance.

Now, Madam Speaker, you had to pay close attention because at first I thought my team had made an error. This rule would require a 75 percent NO_x reduction beginning with model year 2024.

Now, you say: Wait, how can that be? This is 2025.

Well, that is a good question, and a lot of people are asking that question, and manufacturers are having to think maybe we have got to do something to be ready for retroactive action.

Now, if we were passing something, I am not sure we could do it retroactive in this nature. Maybe we could. Now we are going to have unelected bureaucrats on top of unelected bureaucrats affecting a regulation passed originally by Congress and authorized by Congress and now a regulation waiving a regulation on another regulation. It doesn't seem right.

Due to the fact that the EPA had not yet granted the waiver when the rule

was made, there was already some uncertainty in the marketplace because of concerns with that retroactive enforcement that I just mentioned.

This rule would require—but, wait. Like the old Ronco commercials: But wait, Madam Speaker, there is more. This rule would require a 90 percent reduction in NO_x from diesel engines beginning with model 2027 engines.

Do you think they are already getting those in production? I think they probably are, Madam Speaker. I think they are already working on it. Now, before it has even become the law of the land through a waiver of a regulation on a regulation, we have a 90 percent reduction in NO_x being required. It would be a 90 percent reduction from current Federal emissions standards in 2027. Did I say that yet? I believe I did.

This California regulation is coming over top of Federal regulators in an effort to truly vilify diesel engines. Some diesel engine manufacturers will have compliance concerns, and already do, and they may end up having to purchase NO_x credits from electric vehicle manufacturers and may have to purchase credits.

Now, that credit is a Federal credit. The emissions credit trading system adds another layer of complexity to the compliance and shows how difficult it can be to marry up the Federal standards with these new California standards. It is essentially allowing some Federal credits to be transferred to the California pool depending on vehicle sales in California. Confusing, convoluted, and hard to follow. You bet it is.

Another burden that manufacturers will have to account for are extended engine warranties and new testing procedures that will inevitably have some costs that will have to be borne by fleet operators who purchased the trucks and by consumers who will have to pay more in freight costs for everyday goods. We have already seen lower truck sales in California and, as expected and previously predicted by one of our earlier speakers, increased purchase prices.

Briefly, I will address the congressional resolution of disapproval process. We have heard a lot today about all this, and I would submit to you that Congress under Article I should deal with repealing regulations, particularly when that regulation has significant impact and is as controversial as this one is.

In the end, it is the House that is covered; the EPA transmitted the California waiver notices of decision on the regulations in February. The notice was published in the Federal Register. The public was allowed to request a hearing and submit materials for the record. It is a rulemaking process on a rule and regulation, no matter what others may choose to call it. Madam Speaker, they can call it whatever they want to. I know what it is, and it is the waiver of a regulation by the Federal Government in order to give power to a

regulation in California. They can call it a notice of decision. They can call it the epizooty if they want to, call it anything they want. We all know what it is. It is a regulation. To paraphrase Shakespeare: A rose by any other name still smells the same.

Accordingly, I would submit to you that we have jurisdiction. I would submit, further, Madam Speaker, that while CRAs can't be reviewed by the courts, when this passes—and I think it will, notwithstanding outside objectors—CRAs technically can't be reviewed by the courts.

It will be interesting to see when it gets to the Supreme Court because I believe the Supreme Court will agree with me: Regulators can call it whatever they want to, but when you are waiving regulations and allowing other regulations to take their place, that is subject to the Congressional Review Act and this process we are doing today.

I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of the resolution of disapproval sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), H.J. Res. 89. Even if you are not 100 percent in agreement, you ought to do it so that we can preserve the power of Congress because if not, we should dissolve and let California run everything, or perhaps my colleagues would like us to dissolve and make all decisions the subject of the Government Accountability Office instead of the elected Members of the United States Congress. I ask everyone to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 89.

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. 89, yet another extremist, and I believe illegal, Congressional Review Act resolution attacking a commonsense regulation to protect Americans' health and the environment.

Now, H.J. Res. 89 would block the California waiver for the heavy-duty omnibus rule that sets stronger standards to lower nitrogen oxide and particulate matter emissions from heavy-duty engines. The trucking industry makes up just 10 percent of vehicles on the road, but 45 percent of nitrogen oxide and 56 percent of particulate matter pollution.

Nitrogen oxide is a precursor for smog that can exacerbate numerous health conditions and is associated with premature death. People who live near ports, highways, and warehouses are disproportionately exposed to high concentrations of this pollution.

Now, the California standard aims to address this pollution and reverse course on these deadly trends. This is based on California's unique circumstances. They have an air pollution problem that is a lot worse than many of the other States.

Despite Republicans' false claims, the California program does not ban internal combustion engine trucks. Maintaining the California program is critical to improve public health outcomes and secure the right to clean air for everyone. Repealing California's Federal preemption waiver for its heavy-duty omnibus plan will rob Americans of over \$23 billion of health benefits through 2050 and increase premature mortality, hospitalizations, and emergency room visits.

This resolution is a waste of our time because, as I have said on the other two, both the GAO and the Senate Parliamentarian have concluded that this waiver is not a rule and, therefore, cannot be revoked using the Congressional Review Act. It is just another attempt by the Republicans to distract from the economic chaos and uncertainty that Trump is creating with our economy.

This resolution is going nowhere, but for all these reasons, Madam Speaker, I oppose the resolution. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We keep hearing that it is not a rule and it is not a regulation and that kind of stuff. I just ask if it is not a rule, does that mean it is not enforceable, and does that mean it can be repealed by the next administration with a click of the fingers? I don't know the answer to those questions. I just raise them. If it is not official, is it even enforceable? That is the argument that my colleagues would have you believe.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), my colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my friend for yielding. I rise as the proud sponsor of this bill, H.J. Res. 89, but also as a proud Californian.

This bill would overturn the EPA's waiver granting California the ability to decide for all Californians what cars they drive and what trucks they use to deliver their goods.

This waiver was granted in the waning moments of the Biden administration, and I believe it was shortsighted and misguided.

To be clear, I am not an opponent of electric vehicles, and I consider myself an environmentalist, but I feel strongly that my constituents ought to have the ability to buy for themselves the vehicle that will best meet their needs. For some of them, that is an electric vehicle. For some of my delivery companies, that is an electric truck; but for some, it is not. I believe our country was founded on the principles of freedom and liberty, and that means we are empowered to choose for ourselves about those decisions and not have our government make those decisions for us.

Make no mistake, it is entirely appropriate that we are taking this ac-

tion here today. Article I of the U.S. Constitution gives this body, the United States Congress, the ability to regulate interstate commerce. As everyone knows, these vehicles, cars and trucks, are not just manufactured for one State, the State of California, they are manufactured for a worldwide audience. It is very much interstate commerce that is at stake here.

Also, let's be clear about this: If it were more efficient or less expensive to deliver using zero-emissions trucks, these companies would already be doing it, but the truth is it absolutely is not. It is more expensive. By forcing this choice on California consumers, we will also be forcing on them all of the concomitant increases in the prices of the goods that they buy every day.

Let me remind you, California already has the worst poverty of any State in the country. Madam Speaker, this waiver would have made it even worse. That is why I think it is entirely appropriate for us to be considering this action today.

Also consider how nonsensical it is for us to run a system of interstate commerce where trucks deliver goods from State to State to State. If we were to allow every single State in the country to establish its own emission standards for those trucks, every one of these goods would have to stop at every single State line and be transshipped from one truck to another truck. Madam Speaker, that is ridiculous, costly, inefficient, and unnecessary.

I believe this body is entirely appropriate in taking this action today, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution, H.J. Res. 89, and the other Congressional Review Act actions we are taking today.

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding. I rise in opposition to this Congressional Review Act resolution. We have already heard so much debate about why the Congressional Review Act is not applicable to these waivers and why this is such an egregious attack on States' rights, so I won't belabor those points.

I will say that California developed this rule, the heavy-duty omnibus rule, to reduce pollution from some of the worst sources of traditional air pollution from the transportation sector.

This rule does not include a sales requirement for zero-emission trucks, but it would result in diesel vehicles reducing their output of harmful NO_x and particulate matter.

Despite these trucks and buses being only a small fraction of vehicles on the road, they account for some 45 percent of NO_x and 56 percent of fine particulate matter pollution from the transportation sector.

We know that heavy-duty vehicles have a long lifespan. Vehicles sold

today will still be on the roads for many, many years. Ensuring that new trucks and buses are as low-polluting as possible not only reduces pollution today, but will continue to contribute to cleaning up our air for decades to follow.

I know this decision to regulate was not made lightly. The California Air Resources Board spent significant time working with truck and engine manufacturers to allow for compliance flexibilities and alignment with EPA's NO_x standards, but, ultimately, California's decision to pursue this rule was done for the sake of their residents, residents that live along highways and ports and who experience a disproportionate amount of pollution from truck traffic.

□ 1645

Madam Speaker, anyone who has spent time in neighborhoods that border these industrial sites, as I have in the south end of Albany that I represent, knows that these additional public health protections are not only warranted but they are indeed necessary.

I am glad that California is leading the way in reducing diesel truck pollution, and we should not stop them from wanting to better protect these fenceline communities.

Of course, no other State is required to adopt the California rule. Like so many other vehicle innovations, I suspect that many of our constituents, whether our States adopt the rule or not, will thank California for supporting the development of new pollution control technologies that will result in all of us benefiting from cleaner and healthier air.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to reject this resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 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. 89, which would nullify California's Low NO_x rule. My Republican colleagues will talk about the supposed EV mandate and how California is forcing the rest of the country to drive EVs. This is obviously ridiculous. California's regulations are for California. We aren't forcing anyone else to do anything.

It is especially ridiculous to call California's Low NO_x rule an EV mandate. The Low NO_x rule for heavy-duty trucks does not mandate zero-emission vehicles. It is specifically and narrowly targeted to reduce NO_x production which is a primary ingredient in forming smog.

Anyone who grew up in California knows the health impacts of smog. Thick clouds used to hang over our city, burning our eyes and lungs. We have come a long way since then,

thanks to our State's strong pollution regulations.

California cities still take 5 of the top 10 spots for the worst smog pollution. Smog increases the incidence of asthma and other respiratory conditions, especially among children and the elderly. It is linked to a host of other metabolic, cardiovascular, and developmental impacts.

These impacts add up. Reducing smog-forming NO_x is expected to have health benefits for California, saving approximately \$36.8 billion in avoided health costs. That is not just dollars and cents. That is thousands of lives that will be saved if this regulation goes into effect.

California has long been a global leader in the fight against air pollution, recognizing early on the serious health risks posed by dirty air. For 50 years, we have worked hard to protect our communities through strong, forward-thinking air pollution regulations.

After establishing the first tailpipe emission standards in 1966, California established the first NO_x standards in 1971, followed by the first particulate matter standards in 1982. California was also the first State to outfit vehicles with catalytic converters, a decision that transformed efforts to reduce harmful smog-forming emissions from vehicles.

The country has benefited greatly from California's leadership, not because California forced the rest of the country to follow suit but rather because the country saw the health benefits that California has enjoyed.

None of this would have been possible without California's leadership and California's authority under the Clean Air Act to set our own air pollution standards.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for clean air and vote "no" on H.J. Res. 89.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MULLIN), also a member of our committee.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republicans' dangerous attempt to revoke California's ability to protect public health and reduce toxic vehicle emissions.

The Clean Air Act is clear. California has the fundamental right to adopt vehicle emission standards that support our communities' unique needs better than Federal standards.

This isn't new. It has been the law for more than 50 years, and the Clean Air Act has been upheld by every administration, Republican and Democrat. Republicans are making an extremist attack on this precedent, and it is utterly hypocritical for them to call for States' rights when it suits them.

I spent 10 years in the California Legislature, and I know firsthand how critical it is for our States to meet the needs of our local communities whose

health and safety are at risk due to pollution.

The consequences of this are real. Toxic air pollution causes asthma, heart disease, and contributes to over 100,000 deaths in America every year. We have a moral duty to protect our residents from unnecessary toxic air pollution and environmental harm.

Let's be clear. This attack comes as Republicans are trying to gut Medicaid. While they are stripping healthcare from millions of Americans, at the same time they are attacking our ability to protect public health. It makes no sense.

It also makes no sense to create chaos for automakers that already agreed to meet these standards with investments in domestic EV production and manufacturing that created over 200,000 new jobs and nearly \$200 billion in private investment.

If they really cared about reducing costs for American families, Republicans would focus on reversing Trump's reckless tariffs that are increasing car prices by up to \$15,000.

This is a hyperpartisan, political stunt that wastes everyone's time. The Government Accountability Office has explicitly said that Congress cannot use this process to overturn California's waivers with the EPA, and we should not pretend otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this effort. Let's stand up for clean air, State rights, and for the health of the American people.

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

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

Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues are really misleading the American people with their claims about the Heavy-Duty Low NO_x Omnibus rule. This rule actually gives California and other States the ability to clean up pollution from dirty diesel trucks, protecting the health of Americans and saving lives.

Heavy-duty engines emit harmful NO_x and other toxic pollutants that are significant contributors to ozone and particulate matter. The health effects of this air pollution are well-documented and include respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, and even death.

Madam Speaker, the Clean Air Task Force recently issued a report showing the impacts of dirty diesel on communities. The figures are staggering, and here are just a few highlights.

In 2026, dirty diesel is projected to cause nearly 500,000 lost workdays, impacting our Nation's productivity; over 3,500 heart attacks; thousands of cases of respiratory illness; and, yes, over 8,000 deaths. Dirty diesel will cost Americans over \$90 billion in health damages. Republicans are fighting for resolutions that are hurting people's health and putting lives at risk.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this is the third of three regulations in the same vein. We have heard today about the process. We have heard today about the fact that California and those who opt in are still a minority of the States and a minority of the U.S. population. Yet, they are dictating in many ways to the rest of the country because of the oversized import of the California economy, et cetera.

The bottom line is that my colleagues have said in the last few minutes that this is somehow a States' rights issue. This is not a States' rights issue. This is the creation of a superstate: California. We have the right to override the waiver granted to them that gives them outsized weight in relationship to vehicles. In this case, it is the diesel vehicles. It is the trucks.

That being said, no one State should have this much power. The waiver should not have been granted in the first place. It is a waiver of a regulation, which makes it a regulation in effect, no matter what it is called. It is a waiver of a regulation.

Therefore, it is something that the Federal Government should be dictating, as you heard my colleague from California say. It should not be granting so many waivers. We heard one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that—I forget the number of years it had been, and I am paraphrasing—California had ratcheted up these regulations on various things over 100 times using various waivers.

This was created in 1967. California started down this path in '66. Congress recognized that in '67. The world is greatly different than it was in 1967. We shouldn't be allowing California to constantly ratchet up and then dictate to the rest of the States.

I was just a kid back in 1967, but I was alive. The world was vastly different even inside the United States. At that time one State doing something didn't have the impact or the ripple effect that it has today across the country.

I think we ought to vote "yes" on this resolution. I strongly encourage all my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 89. I think it is the right policy for all the reasons stated throughout this entire day.

Madam Speaker, I would say to you that if we don't want to see an increase in the price of trucks, the price of maintenance on trucks, the price of those trucks then carrying goods to market all over these United States, if we do not want to see that happen, we need to pass H.J. Res. 89 and stop this inappropriate waiver by the Biden administration's EPA.

Madam 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. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1715

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MORAN) at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.J. Res. 87 and

Passage of H.J. Res. 89.

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

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"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 87) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code,

of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission Warranty and Maintenance Provisions; Advanced Clean Trucks; Zero Emission Airport Shuttle; Zero-Emission Power Train Certification; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Fulcher	McCaull
Alford	Garbarino	McClain
Allen	Gill (TX)	McClain Delaney
Amodei (NV)	Gillen	McClintock
Arrington	Gimenez	McCormick
Babin	Golden (ME)	McDonald Rivet
Bacon	Goldman (TX)	McDowell
Baird	Gonzales, Tony	McGuire
Balderson	Gonzalez, V.	Messmer
Barr	Gooden	Meuser
Barrett	Gosar	Miller (IL)
Baumgartner	Graves	Miller (OH)
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Miller (WV)
Begich	Greene (GA)	Miller-Meeks
Bentz	Griffith	Mills
Bergman	Grothman	Moolenaar
Bice	Guest	Moore (AL)
Biggs (AZ)	Guthrie	Moore (NC)
Biggs (SC)	Hageman	Moore (UT)
Bilirakis	Hamadeh (AZ)	Moore (WV)
Bishop	Haridopolos	Moran
Boebert	Harrigan	Murphy
Bost	Harris (MD)	Nehls
Brecheen	Harris (NC)	Newhouse
Bresnahan	Harshbarger	Norman
Buchanan	Hern (OK)	Nunn (IA)
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Obornolte
Burlison	Hill (AR)	Ogles
Calvert	Hinson	Onder
Cammack	Houchin	Owens
Carey	Hudson	Palmer
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Patronis
Carter (TX)	Hunt	Perez
Ciscomani	Hurd (CO)	Perry
Cline	Issa	Pfluger
Cloud	Jack	Reschenthaler
Clyde	Jackson (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Cole	James	Rogers (KY)
Collins	Johnson (LA)	Rose
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Crane	Jordan	Roy
Crank	Joyce (OH)	Rulli
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Crenshaw	Kean	Salazar
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Schmidt
Davis (NC)	Kennedy (UT)	Scholten
De La Cruz	Kiggans (VA)	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Kiley (CA)	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Self
Donalds	Knott	Sessions
Downing	Kustoff	Shreve
Dunn (FL)	LaHood	Simpson
Edwards	LaLota	Smith (MO)
Ellzey	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)
Estes	Latta	Smucker
Evans (CO)	Lawler	Spartz
Ezell	Lee (FL)	Staubert
Fallon	Lee (NV)	Stefanik
Fedorchak	Letlow	Steil
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Steube
Fine	Lucas	Strong
Finstad	Luna	Stutzman
Fischbach	Luttrell	Suozzi
Fitzgerald	Mace	Taylor
Fleischmann	Mackenzie	Tenney
Flood	Malliotakis	Thompson (PA)
Fong	Maloy	Tiffany
Fox	Mann	Timmons
Franklin, Scott	Massie	Turner (OH)
Fry	Mast	Valadao

Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vasquez
Wagner

Walberg
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—191

Adams	Garcia (IL)	Omar
Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Pallone
Amo	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Ansari	Gomez	Pappas
Auchincloss	Goodlander	Pelosi
Balint	Gray	Peters
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Pettersen
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Bell	Hayes	Pocan
Bera	Himes	Pou
Beyer	Horsford	Pressley
Bonamici	Houlihan	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Ramirez
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Randall
Brownley	Huffman	Raskin
Budzinski	Ivey	Riley (NY)
Bynum	Jackson (IL)	Rivas
Carbajal	Jacobs	Ross
Carson	Jayapal	Ruiz
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Ryan
Casas	Johnson (GA)	Salinas
Case	Johnson (TX)	Sanchez
Castor (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Cherfilus-	Keating	Schneider
McCormick	Kelly (IL)	Schrier
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Cisneros	Khanna	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	Landman	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Simon
Conaway	Latimer	Smith (WA)
Correa	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Courtney	Levin	Stansbury
Craig	Liccardo	Stanton
Crockett	Lieu	Stevens
Crow	Lofgren	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Subramanyam
Davis (IL)	Magaziner	Swalwell
Dean (PA)	Mannion	Sykes
DeGette	Matsui	Takano
DeLauro	McBath	Thanedar
DelBene	McBride	Thompson (CA)
Deluzio	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Titus
Dexter	McGarvey	Tlaib
Dingell	McIver	Tokuda
Doggett	Menendez	Tonko
Elfreh	Meng	Torres (CA)
Escobar	Mfume	Torres (NY)
Espallat	Min	Trahan
Evans (PA)	Moore (WI)	Tran
Fields	Morrison	Underwood
Fitzpatrick	Moskowitz	Vargas
Fletcher	Moulton	Veasey
Foster	Mrvan	Velazquez
Foushee	Mullin	Vindman
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Waters
Friedman	Neal	Watson Coleman
Frost	Neguse	Whitesides
Garamendi	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garcia (CA)	Olshewski	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Casten	Gottheimer	Norcross
Cohen	McGovern	Wasserman
Connolly	Meeks	Schultz
Figures	Morelle	Weber (TX)

□ 1740

Messrs. AUCHINCLOSS, FIELDS, TORRES of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Messrs. HORSFORD and VEASEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.