

and partially devoured right on the property, right next to the building.

Does this mean we are getting a better quality environment because of that? Does that mean we are getting public safety? No. It is getting worse.

□ 0915

REMEMBERING ED ARNOLD

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and legacy of my very good friend, Ed Arnold. He was born in Texarkana, Arkansas, in 1939. He was a homeless teenager. He joined the Marines. As a marine, he was stationed in California where he got a taste of sunshine and decided to stay in the Golden State.

He played football for Santa Ana College. He played for the Dons' 1961 East-rn Conference championship team.

At Santa Ana College is where he met the love of his life, Dixie. Dixie and Ed Arnold were voted Santa Ana College prom king and queen. Ed never forgot where he got his start, Santa Ana College.

Santa Ana College gave him his education. Santa Ana College introduced him to the love of his life, Dixie.

Ed Arnold today is and was Santa Ana College.

My very good friend Ed Arnold, we will miss him, we love him, and we will never forget him and his contributions to our community.

POPE FRANCIS LED BY EXAMPLE

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, Pope Francis led by example. He showed compassion and empathy to all. He reminded us of our shared humanity, and he treated everyone with dignity and respect. Pope Francis understood what it meant to care for one another.

Many of my Republican colleagues often talk about their Christian values. They should practice what they preach. The reconciliation bill shows no compassion and no concern for the American people. Their bill is predatory.

The latest proposal to place so-called per capita caps on Medicaid funding would still jeopardize healthcare for millions of Americans. This includes over 282,000 people in my district. Mr. Speaker, 103,000 children under the age of 19 and 37,000 seniors would have their care ripped away.

I urge my Republican colleagues to stop with their empty platitudes, to stop catering to the cruel authority of President Trump, to stop putting billionaires over the American people. I urge them to take Pope Francis' message of compassion, of respect, and of moral courage to heart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from en-

gaging in personalities toward the President.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RELATING TO "ENDANGERED AND THREATENED WILDLIFE AND PLANTS; ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT OF THE LONGFIN SMELT"

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 354, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the San Francisco Bay-Delta Distinct Population Segment of the Longfin Smelt", 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. 78

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 United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the San Francisco Bay-Delta Distinct Population Segment of the Longfin Smelt" (89 Fed. Reg. 61029; published July 30, 2024), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 78.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 78 offered by Representative LAMALFA of California, which would undo the listing of the longfin smelt in

the San Francisco Bay-Delta Distinct Population Segment under the Endangered Species Act.

The listing was based on flawed science in response to an ESA-related lawsuit and adds yet another piece of regulatory red tape preventing water from reaching California's Central Valley and communities further south.

California's Central Valley is one of the most prolific agricultural regions in the world, growing hundreds of crops that feed millions of people. However, this region faces continual water uncertainty due to drought and ESA-related regulations.

The Central Valley Project, or CVP, transports water from wetter areas in northern California to drier areas further south, including the Central Valley. It is subject to ESA biological opinions that mandate water that would otherwise go to communities and farms be diverted to the San Francisco Bay.

The effects of this can be seen at this very moment in California where Federal reservoirs are almost full, yet many farmers are only receiving half of their water allocations. This is in large part due to restrictions imposed by the ESA, which will only be exacerbated by the listing of the longfin smelt.

Unfortunately, the rush to judgment that ensued from the lawsuit resulted in a listing based on flawed assumptions and bad science.

First, by solely focusing on the bay-delta rather than the longfin smelt's entire range, the service ignores the fact that the species has been found in dozens of locations, including in and around every tributary of the San Francisco Bay. Meaning the longfin smelt is not at risk of extinction and does not meet the statutory definition of an endangered species.

Instead of being based on science, this listing comes from the common radical environmental playbook of suing for a predetermined outcome.

Radical groups have litigated for years trying to get the longfin smelt listed under the ESA, with a 2024 lawsuit compelling the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to make a listing decision being the latest example.

Unfortunately, as with many ESA-related lawsuits, the species is rarely the true motivation. The leader of the organization that filed the lawsuit in question said the not-so-quiet part out loud when he said that protecting the longfin smelt going forward would require taking more water away from farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this CRA and roll back this misguided listing, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This resolution, H.J. Res. 78, continues a very familiar pattern that we are seeing from this Republican majority: distractions and scapegoats instead of dealing with real crises, real

problems, and solutions to the challenges that are facing working families, including American farmers and rural communities all over this country.

Today, they are bringing us a resolution that tries to blame an endangered fish, the bay-delta longfin smelt, for California's water problems and shortages. They are doing that instead of addressing major problems that are actually impacting farmers in rural communities.

Let's be clear. Removing protections for the longfin smelt will not make it rain. It will not rebuild California's snowpack. It won't refill our reservoirs, not even the reservoir that President Trump recently drained in a public relations stunt that had nothing to do with fighting fires or water supply.

California's water shortage is driven by climate change and also prolonged drought, aging and outdated infrastructure, and overallocation. It is not the fault of some tiny fish.

Meanwhile, farmers, including those in my district, are grappling with worsening droughts, wildfires, floods, extreme weather, and now the fallout from President Trump's disastrous trade policies for agriculture.

All the while, Republicans won't talk about any of those things. Instead, they bring us here to debate whether a small fish should be allowed to go extinct or be protected under the Endangered Species Act. All the while, the significant damage that their policies are causing continue to pile up in rural America, including President Trump's tariffs.

Trump is treating not just our adversaries, but some of our neighbors and our best friends in the world, like they are enemies. He is turning them into adversaries. Tariffs on key trading partners have already cost farmers tens of billions of dollars in lost exports. Markets are shrinking. Input costs are soaring, making it hard for farms to stay in business.

We see the sweeping budget cuts and mass layoffs at critical agencies like NOAA and the Bureau of Reclamation, threatening the services that farmers depend on: water deliveries, weather forecasting, climate data, and much more. Farmers need that stuff. They don't want to go back to the "Farmers' Almanac" in order to make key business decisions.

We see hundreds of millions of dollars in water supply infrastructure projects suddenly in limbo because of DOGE, while our colleagues across the aisle say nothing.

We see the entire rural healthcare safety net, including nursing home care, including services that anyone who has a person with disabilities in their family, depend on. All of that is in limbo as we brace for catastrophic cuts from Republicans as they try to fund their tax cuts for billionaires.

If this Republican majority were serious about helping farmers and rural

communities, they would be working to reverse these harmful policies. They would be standing up for rural America right now. Instead, they are wasting our time. Just because we are debating a 3-inch fish today doesn't mean we need to think like one.

Now, about the impacts of these policies that my friends don't want to talk about. You don't have to take my word for it, you can listen to farmers across America.

Here is Caleb Ragland, president of the American Soybean Association, who says: "Our grave concern is we could permanently lose another big chunk of our export market that we are dependent on for our production. . . . And the U.S. farm economy is in a tough spot, and we just don't have any room for error right now."

Here is Chris Harner, owner of Harner Farm in Centre County, Pennsylvania: "We did get a letter from our one supplier that once the tariffs kick in, they will be passing on the costs."

Paul Krueger, a corn and soybean farmer from Bladen, Nebraska, says: "Any time our country gets involved with any sort of tariffs that affect the agriculture industry, every farmer just kind of groans about that. We're powerless to do anything except take what comes out in the wash."

Here is Travis Johnson, who farms cotton, sorghum, and corn in Texas' Rio Grande Valley. He says: "There's a lot of uncertainty around, and I hate to be used as a bargaining chip. I am definitely worried."

Moving to California, here is Ryan Talley, vice president of Talley Farms in San Luis Obispo: "We don't have months to wait something out. We have to continue our operations at the intensity that we currently farm. We're going to have to take those rising prices and deal with it the best we can."

This is what Republican agriculture policy is doing right now: losing export markets, raising costs, telling farmers to just deal with it. They are complicit in the dismantling of rural healthcare, in the freezing of funding for rural infrastructure, in the threat to programs like SNAP that many families across rural America depend on.

It gets worse. President Trump, Elon Musk, and their enablers are gutting critical Federal services that include scientists. They are hollowing out NOAA and weakening the Bureau of Reclamation. They should listen to the people that these decisions are actually hurting.

I know I am quoting a lot right now, Mr. Speaker, but I want to make sure my colleagues across the aisle are listening, since they are not having any townhalls these days. They need to hear from farmers and the folks in these rural communities that their policies are hurting.

In response to mass firings at NOAA and the National Weather Service, Andrea Young of Hidden Creek Farm in Fauquier County, Virginia, said this:

"I cannot bring the animals to safety. I cannot cover up those tender plants. I cannot know that a rainstorm is coming and so I shouldn't water. I cannot function as a farmer in an indoor environment."

The general manager of 14 California Central Valley Project irrigation districts, in a recent letter to the President about layoffs at the Bureau of Reclamation, said this: "That elimination of Reclamation staff will not further the goal of achieving significant cost savings to the American people."

In other words, they are harming the agency that these irrigators depend on, and they are not even saving money for the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the damage from all of this is real. There are real farmers, real communities, and this is real harm caused by failed leadership. While all that is happening, we are here debating whether to strip protections from an endangered fish. They are turning a small fish into a very large scapegoat, pretending it will somehow provide real support to farmers.

The truth is, the listing of the bay-delta longfin under the ESA is both scientifically and legally sound. The longfin population has declined over 99 percent since the 1980s. Think about that. In just a few decades, only about 1 percent of the population is left. That is like the number of environmentalists left in the Republican Party these days.

□ 0930

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service followed the law, the data, and the science, just as a bipartisan Congress intended when they passed the ESA back in the 1970s, just as Republican President Richard Nixon intended when he signed it into law. The system is supposed to work that way.

Protecting species like the longfin is not just about a single fish, but it is about protecting the ecological health of the entire bay-delta, the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Americas. This delta is the heart of California's water system. Its health underpins clean drinking water for millions, healthy soil for agriculture, and waterfowl populations that hunters depend on.

It is so important, and it requires a broad ecological balance to sustain the farms, fisheries, entire ecosystems, and so many communities and millions of people that depend on it. You can't destroy an ecosystem and expect farms, cities, and wildlife to just thrive. These things rise or fall together.

This resolution takes us in the wrong direction. Let's actually do something real for farmers instead of deflecting and debating distractions. Let's repeal the mindless tariffs on our allies and top trading partners. Let's protect the Bureau of Reclamation and NOAA from these disastrous sabotage cuts. Let's protect rural families and communities by opposing cuts to Medicaid and SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution that merely distracts and deflects and scapegoats instead of solving the pressing challenges facing farmers and the rest of rural America.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), the sponsor of the CRA.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I appreciate the opportunity to present and to carry this Congressional Review Act that is, indeed, trying to keep some reality involved in the listing of species, as well as the overall operations of government and forming of regulations.

Mr. Speaker, in support of H.J. Res. 78, we want to block the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's misguided decision to list the San Francisco Bay-Delta population of the longfin smelt as being endangered.

What we have is actual evidence. Former director of Stanford's Center of Conservation Biology wrote a piece on this listing, including these highlights:

The Fish and Wildlife Service abandoned its allegiance to using the best available scientific information.

The proposed listing ignores salient information gaps and shrugs off technical peer-reviewed criticisms that go to the heart of the argument for listing the species.

To list this species, the Fish and Wildlife Service employed unreliable data, presented results from analyses that cannot be justified, and made troubling predictions for the fate of the fish that are built on flawed assumptions akin to a house of cards.

The Fish and Wildlife Service used piecemeal data to try and establish population trends and size of this using detection methods not even designed for longfin smelt to justify its action.

Basically, there is no science, and this has long been sought by environmental groups since they have run out of the regular smelt after tens of millions of acre-feet of water have flowed out to the delta.

Indeed, they need to be looking more at the issues going on with the effluent coming out of bay area cities from underpowered sewer systems that affected the delta so negatively and not some idea that farmers are getting too much water.

At a point where farmers have now just gotten bumped up to a 50 percent allocation here the other day by State and Federal water managers, we are seeing that it is going to negatively affect the food supply not only for California and its production but for the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, we have statistics that show that the amount of water flowing into the delta is hardly being tapped. Indeed, 80 percent of it goes right on out of the delta into the Pacific Ocean.

It is interesting to hear my colleague from the north coast talking about rebuilding infrastructure as part of a solution that we should be talking about here.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about it a lot, and hopefully we can move the ball on it. We have an opportunity to build Sites Reservoir, which would provide 1½ million acre-feet of new storage; and raise Shasta Dam by 18 feet, which would provide 600,000 acre-feet of new storage.

If we would operate the pumps in the delta, we would fill the San Luis Reservoir that would be available to the Central Valley. It came up 200,000 acre-feet short this year, which is about the same amount as what they are predicting this listing will cause to short the Central Valley farmers down there if this listing is allowed to happen.

Instead, we get more and more water being demanded for environmental purposes, which really doesn't fulfill an environmental purpose. Instead, the blame gets shifted to something else: talk about tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, we are tarified so heavily, almost 300 percent, on our dairy products that are going into Canada. Something needs to be done for a reset. Rice into Japan will be up to 700 percent at some point. Tariffs need to be looked at, but that is not this conversation.

The longfin smelt is being used as the latest weapon to take water away from farmers and take water away from people. We grow some of the richest crops in the great Central Valley of California—tomatoes, pistachios, and almonds—and they will be denied to the whole country. They will not come from somewhere else unless we import them with lower quality standards, et cetera.

We have, indeed, a lot going on here that is not really truthful. It is sad to hear my colleague from the north coast. Although we are in parallel districts, the First District and the Second District, it seems like we are in parallel universes when I hear him starting to talk about defending agriculture because it is these policies: introduction of wolves; not rebuilding water infrastructure but tearing down dams on the Klamath that now causes people to be subject to flooding; the water allocation of the Scott and Shasta Valleys being taken away by some emergency drought declaration at the same time as they are being flooded; and one thing after another being taken away from farmers and given to wolves instead.

My Democratic colleagues want to introduce 1,700 new grizzly bears into California as one of their ideas, which would devastate livestock. The ideas that are coming out of this building and the regulatory buildings here are the ones that are choking off agriculture, making food more expensive, and taking away options for people to buy great California-grown products instead of having to import them.

It is coming from here. It is certainly not the fault of what the Trump administration is trying to do in addition to building more water reservoirs and having more water available for people.

Why was it that delta pumps were able to fill San Luis Reservoir 2 years ago to the brim, to the full mark, and they can't for the last 2 years?

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is because of additional water flows that are demanded by the environmental left and certain Representatives in this building. A lot of times, they get them. It seems that the courts are stacked against farmers against this, but we have to fight back.

One tool that we have is H.J. Res. 78, to review what government does and hold it accountable for when it does last-minute, unscientific pronouncements. In this case, it is yet another species that my Democratic colleagues use as a weapon against agriculture and against people's needs.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for all of his efforts on this. He is a farmer. He knows about agriculture. He knows about the water issues in California.

This is an issue that is important to our whole country. It is not just important to California because most of the fruits, nuts, and vegetables grown in this country are in the Central Valley of California. Without water, you can't grow any of them.

If we are taking water away from the Central Valley for unnecessary reasons, that means that the rest of the country is going to suffer when we go to the grocery market.

Mr. Speaker, I think, if truth be known, there is one reason why the longfin smelt got listed. It is because it would divert water away from the Central Valley, and I don't understand that. I don't understand why groups would be so adamant to be taking water away from the breadbasket of our country and shifting it to a purpose that is not accomplishing anything.

There are a lot of myths about the longfin smelt. There is a myth that, if they are listed, it will have no effect on the farmers in the Central Valley. I will read a quote from the science director who was involved from the San Francisco Baykeepers when the listing was finalized:

"Preventing further decline and extinction of longfin smelt will require reducing California's diversion of fresh water from the Bay's watershed to supply unsustainable industrial agriculture. . . ."

If water is taken away from agriculture in the Central Valley, it is unsustainable. You can't grow anything without water.

We need to get back to the science, as Mr. LAMALFA stated, and it is unfortunate that we have to do a CRA on an

endangered species listing, but that is what happens when administrations make bad decisions.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the question has been posed about whether this ESA listing of the longfin smelt is supported by science. I guess this Congress, in all of its infinite mastery of science, has decided to superimpose itself over the scientists at the Fish and Wildlife Service who went through a very public and deliberative process to reach this determination. We are going to now get, I guess, a different scientific interpretation from the great minds across the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the first Trump administration, back when there was still at least a few people around who followed the law and told the truth, agreed that the longfin smelt was a candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans slow walked that listing because of politics. That is why the administration was sued. That is why the Biden administration had to comply with the law and follow through with that science-based process. That is how we got a listing.

Let's not pretend that there is no scientific foundation for this listing. Even my friends across the aisle know better than that.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from the Sacramento Valley has suggested that we live in parallel universes. If that is the case, I will choose the universe where Members of Congress face their constituents and answer hard questions instead of running off to Mar-a-Lago or other people's districts or having distractions about fish in the delta and scapegoating them as the cause for all of our problems.

Answer some hard questions from constituents. Talk about facts and reality of California water instead of all of this scapegoating.

With California water, it is always a challenge not to break the fact-check machine across the aisle. It has been suggested that all of this water is wasted out to the ocean for fish, and you have to explain again how the delta system works. That water that flows out to the ocean, almost all of it, the vast majority of it, is for one reason: to make sure that the saltwater in the Pacific Ocean does not intrude far enough into the estuary that the whole system that tens of millions of Californians depend on and that all the farmers in my friend's district depend on doesn't salt up and cease to function.

The Speaker doesn't have to believe me about it or choose between two parallel universes. Ask any California water manager how this works. This is basic stuff, but we have to explain it over and over again because of the fog of political theater that we always hear across the aisle.

It is a little bit like the President of the United States right now who says

that there is a magic spigot in the northwest and in Canada that, if we could get past all of the radical environmentalists and just open up this spigot, unlimited water would flow to southern California, and they would always be able to fight fires.

It is absolute nonsense. Then he pretended to open a magic spigot, and he dumped and wasted a bunch of water a couple of months ago into a dry lakebed.

Our friends across the aisle retweeted all of these totally fake narratives, and now half the world, the world in that other parallel universe, believes this stuff.

It is a constant challenge just to bring the subject back to facts and reality. Talk to water managers. Do a little bit of basic research. This is how the California water system, especially the delta estuary, actually works. Politics is a poor substitute for understanding basic hydrology and facts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), a colleague who actually represents the amazing delta region of our country.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HUFFMAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, welcome to California water wars. A famous quote attributed to Mark Twain is:

In California, whiskey is for drinking, and water is for fighting.

Welcome to the debate. This is much more than just the delta smelt. It is interesting to see my two colleagues and friends from parallel universes—I am from a southern parallel universe—debate this because, sometime ago when Mr. LAMALFA and I were in the California Legislature, we thought we had put a lot of this past us when we negotiated in good faith the building of those two reservoirs.

Part of it was to finally require the ag industry to get permits because they were depleting the aquifer so much that the water contractors were complaining. They were water contractors who historically have made a lot of money without providing much value.

I say that in the context of this is an important discussion for the environment appropriately for this committee, the chairman and the ranking member, but it is a bigger issue.

□ 0945

It is an issue about fairness, about subsidies. Yes, the agriculture industry is important, as the chairman pointed out, in California, but we have given them a lot of support over the decades, including subsidies from the Federal Government. When we are looking at fiscal management, we should look at this resource in a larger sense, in my view, as somebody who has represented the delta for decades.

The San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary, which I am proud to represent a significant part of, provides economic benefits to the entire State of Cali-

fornia and, as the chairman said, to larger areas of the West Coast and the country in many ways. It provides clean water, recreation, and all of these benefits to a very large area.

The longfin smelt, one of the several native fish populations within the delta, is an important indicator species for the health of this vital body of water and our economy. It serves as kind of a red herring to help alert to habitat degradation across the delta from poor water quality or diversion of too much water.

Unfortunately, the species population, as the ranking member has pointed out, has declined more than 99 percent from 1980s levels, putting us at risk of losing an important way we analyze the delta in a drought-prone region.

The San Francisco Bay-Delta population of the longfin smelt was listed as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act after thorough scientific review, as has been mentioned, and a public comment process. This Congressional Review Act resolution casts aside the data for no apparent reason. Decisions on whether to list a species as endangered should be based on science as Congress intended under the Endangered Species Act, not on politics.

While I agree with my good friend from California that ensuring reliable water supply and storage is essential to northern California, for both of my friends from northern California, disregarding experts is the wrong way to go about the analysis, obviously.

This debate on the whole water supply and storage, as articulated by the ranking member, is essential to the West Coast. Disregarding these experts and scientists and the proper process for endangered species listing is not the way to do it. Protecting endangered species and providing a stable water supply are not mutually exclusive. They can be done in a way where both delta communities and delta species, and, indeed, the entire West Coast and the country, prosper from protecting this endangered species.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump, Elon Musk, and DOGE continue dismantling Federal agencies, shredding constitutional norms. Meanwhile, House Republicans refuse to lift a finger to rein in rogue actors or defend the rule of law.

In the face of all of this, American farmers and rural America are paying the price for all of this chaos.

Right now, the real threats to rural America and to water security and the livelihoods of America's farmers are trade wars that are hammering agricultural exports. It is not this endangered fish.

They face a shrinking Federal workforce hollowed out. The very agencies responsible for permitting and delivering water to farmers and communities are being dismantled.

Congressional Republicans are threatening to rescind critical Inflation Reduction Act investments in drought resilience and water delivery.

We also are facing this administration's efforts to block and cancel key funding that Congress has already approved to support drought resilience and repair vital water infrastructure, support that rural America needs right now in the face of extreme heat and weather from the climate crisis and the burning of fossil fuels.

These are the urgent challenges that farmers and communities are actually facing. Instead of confronting them, House Republican leadership devoted this entire week to voting on performative Congressional Review Act resolutions that are meant to deflect and distract from the real problems created by this administration and the complicity of this Congress.

Passing a rule to actually abdicate Congress' own oversight powers when it comes to our Article I trade authority all the way through the rest of this fiscal year is shameful.

Let's be honest. The longfin smelt didn't cause California's water challenges. This resolution won't solve them. It won't improve drought conditions. It won't help farmers one bit.

Yet, here we are, debating a symbolic resolution that is designed to distract, deflect, and scapegoat rather than talking about and trying to solve real problems affecting farmers and rural communities.

This isn't legislating. It is grievance politics.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I acknowledge and agree with my friends from across the aisle. Mark Twain was correct. The more I learn about water, the further west you go, the more it is for fighting. We can agree on that.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to try to help them solve the issue about parallel universes from an outsider's perspective. I would say that most people who live in States that are east of California, maybe some that are north and west of California, if you go to California, you realize it is a very beautiful State, a very blessed State, wonderful resources, beautiful beaches, beautiful forests, the most productive farmland in the country, some of the most unique trees in the world, wonderful weather, good fishing. Everything nice, it seems like California has it.

I think we all love California, but we all realize somehow it is kind of a different universe than the rest of the country that we live in. Maybe they embrace that and like that, the good people of California.

When we look at this legislation, H.J. Res. 78, it is a serious thing. The ESA listing in question was based on incomplete and bad science and will further complicate the delivery of water in

California communities. It is already complicating the delivery of water.

Passing this resolution will further the priorities of President Trump, who has signed two executive orders aimed at removing unnecessary regulations that prevent water from being delivered to southern California.

The current paradigm of having full reservoirs in California while many farmers are only receiving half of the water they are supposed to be getting is unacceptable, and it is unsustainable. It takes away the myth that this is all due to drought conditions. It is not drought conditions in California right now, yet farmers are still only getting half the amount of water they were promised to get.

This resolution is cosponsored by the entire California Republican delegation. I thank each Member for standing up for their constituents and tirelessly fighting for additional water resources in the face of Federal and State government overreach and radical decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I support 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. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.J. Res. 78 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on:

Passage of H.J. Res. 88.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 195, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—216

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis

Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Costa
Crane

Crank
Crawford
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Elizy
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad

Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Graves
Gray
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)

Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Onder
Owens

Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—195

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeLauro

DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Ocasio-Cortez
Olsewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas

Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Petersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider

Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Stanton
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Burlison
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Boebert
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Crenshaw
DeGette
Frankel, Lois
Garcia (IL)

Gosar
Gottheimer
Hoyer
Mace
McGovern
Moore (WI)
Moulton
Norcross

Ruiz
Rutherford
Salazar
Simon
Swalwell
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1020

Messrs. HORSFORD, THOMPSON of California, FIGURES, and Ms. PEREZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

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”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNN of Iowa). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) providing congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “California State Motor Vehicle and Engine Pollution Control Standards; Advanced Clean Cars II; Waiver of Preemption; Notice of Decision”, 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 164, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—246

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin

Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner

Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice

Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Correa
Crank
Crawford
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Graves
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest

Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Correa
Crank
Crawford
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Graves
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest

Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCauley
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)

Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Ryan
Schmidt
Scholten
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—164

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier

Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Español
Evans (PA)
Fields
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Goodlander
Gray
Green, Al (TX)

Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Houlahan
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan

McCollum
McGarvey
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morrison
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Peters
Petersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Rivas
Ross
Salinas

Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sherrill
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Sykes
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Velázquez
Waters
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Cohen
Connolly
Crenshaw
DeGette
Frankel, Lois
Garcia (IL)
Gosar
Gottheimer

Guthrie
Hoyer
Mace
McGovern
Moulton
Norcross
Ruiz
Rutherford

Salazar
Scalise
Simon
Smith (MO)
Swalwell
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1037

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 114, H.J. Res. 88, I was not recorded due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 114, H.J. Res. 88.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be physically present for votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 113 and NAY on Roll Call No. 114.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 113 and NAY on Roll Call No. 114.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 113 and NAY on Roll Call No. 114.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2025, TO MONDAY, MAY 5, 2025

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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