

REPUBLICAN TAX CUTS

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

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, every day I hear this big story about how we are making big tax cuts for the rich.

Let's be abundantly clear once again, today, that the current tax rate on the wealthiest Americans is 37 percent. Under the new law we will be passing soon enough, it will stay at 37 percent.

The people who will get the true tax cuts in this bill are people who have earned Social Security, people who have earned tips, and have earned overtime pay. That is the message we need to make clear. It is 37 percent now, and it will be in the future.

We are not cutting taxes for the rich. We are looking out for the folks that make America work every day and who have been hardest hit in the last 4 years by high inflation and failed government policies.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the House may be voting on America's worst budget ever. It includes cuts to SNAP and Medicaid funding that will hurt those who can least afford it and provide tax breaks for those who don't need them.

Also among these tax changes are rollbacks to critical clean energy taxes and credits that were part of the Inflation Reduction Act. These include phasing out clean energy production and investment tax credits and ending longstanding home energy efficiency tax credits.

If these aren't bad enough, they also add provisions to require the accelerated sale of public lands for oil and gas drilling and to rescind funding from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund that protects America from pollution and lowers the cost of energy bills.

Climate change is real, and it is happening now. We must act. These were commonsense initiatives to move us away from complete reliance on fossil fuels and move toward a clean energy future.

Mr. Speaker, try to spin it any way you want. Americans will suffer. Our world will continue to burn.

VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY

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

Mr. MOORE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a deeply troubling breach of trust by one of our closest trading partners.

What happened to the Vulcan Materials Company is nothing short of a

hostile act by the Mexican Government. This American company has operated legally in Mexico for decades, supporting critical construction projects across the Southeast.

Yet in 2022, the Mexican military invaded their site, shut it down, and seized control of their operations, including a strategic deepwater port only a few hundred miles from Florida.

Why? Vulcan refused to turn over their land to President Lopez Obrador for his own benefit.

This is an unlawful expropriation of American property by a foreign government, and it is a clear assault on our American economic interests and a threat to our national security.

Congress must stand united against this kind of aggression. I am committed to working with my colleagues and President Trump to ensure there are real consequences for this. We cannot allow a trading partner to seize American assets with impunity. Mexico must reverse course now.

□ 1215

HONORING FEDERAL GLOVER,
FORMER CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
SUPERVISOR

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a good friend and a great political and community leader in my community and in the bay area in San Francisco, California, former Contra Costa County Supervisor Federal Glover, who passed away on Sunday after a distinguished life of service to his community and his country.

Born in Pittsburg, California, Federal served as a city council member and mayor of the city of Pittsburg before becoming the first African American to serve on the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors in the east bay.

I was lucky to serve alongside Federal on the county board for 6 of his 20 years. He supported efforts to expand job opportunities, create the board of supervisors' public protection committee, and he was an instrumental leader on regional transportation in a transformative period of time in northern California and the bay area.

Federal was a good man, a good friend, and I will miss him very, very much.

I wish Federal good luck, and I hope I will see him again in the future.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN
INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE
CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOP-
MENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412,

and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. COLE, Oklahoma

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, New Mexico

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GAL-
LAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Mr. OWENS, Utah

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Minnesota

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL
DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE
SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRON-
MENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
RELATING TO "REVIEW OF
FINAL RULE RECLASSIFICATION
OF MAJOR SOURCES AS AREA
SOURCES UNDER SECTION 112 OF
THE CLEAN AIR ACT"

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Pursuant to House Resolution 426, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act", 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 426, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 31

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 "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act" (89 Fed. Reg. 73293 (September 10, 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBER of Texas. 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 insert extraneous material in the RECORD on S.J. Res. 31.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 31, a resolution that pushes back on yet another outrageous overreach by the Biden-Harris EPA which spent the last 4 years tying the hands of America's energy producers and undermining our position as a global energy leader.

The latest example is this joint 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 Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act.

This commonsense resolution, led by my good friend, Senator CURTIS of Utah, and carried in the House by my good friend, Representative FEDORCHAK, along with support from Representatives BALDERSON and ALLEN, pushes back on a deeply flawed EPA rule that is yet another blow to American energy producers and manufacturers, as well as small businesses.

What does this rule do? This rule shackles businesses with burdensome red tape under what is called the "once in, always in" policy. That means once a facility is deemed a major source of emissions, even if it invests heavily in modern equipment and successfully lowers its emissions, it is still locked into that stricter classification forever, period. They are not given credit for cleaning up their act. There are no incentives given to improve. There is just more bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. This rule is anti-innovation, anti-investment, and anti-American.

Mr. Speaker, repealing this misguided rule would do what we should have done all along: encourage facilities to reduce emissions by giving them a path to reclassify as area sources once they meet that threshold. That is not only good for industry, it is good for our environment. It is a true win-win, Mr. Speaker.

Now, here is some background. Under section 112 of the Clean Air Act, facilities that emit over 10 tons of a single hazardous pollutant, or 25 tons of a combination, are considered major sources and hit with the strictest regulations and nonstop monitoring. What about those below that threshold? They are area sources with more reasonable requirements.

However, the "once in, always in" rule, cooked up during the Clinton ad-

ministration, locked companies into major source status forever, even if they had dramatically reduced their emissions. That is just plain wrong.

Thankfully, in 2020, the Trump administration corrected this nonsense. They rightly said that the Clean Air Act doesn't prohibit facilities from reclassifying if and when they reduce emissions below the legal threshold.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? That rule actually worked. It encouraged improvements, and businesses responded.

Under the Biden-Harris rule, companies have absolutely no incentive to decrease their emissions.

We should encourage industries, Mr. Speaker, to lower their emissions and allow them the possibility of reclassifying as an area source if they can successfully reduce their emissions.

U.S. emissions have already decreased over the past two decades, even as our energy production has hit record highs. That is not government regulation, that is American innovation.

American industry relied on the Trump rule to make progress in reducing emissions. Yet, under this new EPA rule, companies that did the right thing under the Trump-era guidance, those that cut emissions, are actually being punished. That is not environmentalism; that is government overreach plain and simple.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. This resolution does not strip the EPA of its authority to regulate air pollutants. It doesn't. It simply returns us to the commonsense, pro-growth, pro-clean-air policy of the Trump administration. If a business steps up and reduces its emissions, it ought to be rewarded, not handcuffed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with the American worker, stand with American innovation, and vote "yes" on S.J. Res. 31. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S.J. Res. 31. On the day that House Republicans have been planning to actively strip healthcare away from 13.7 million Americans, they are also seeking to make Americans sicker by giving some of the worst industrial polluters a free pass to pump dangerous chemicals into communities across the Nation. With this resolution, Republicans are repealing critical Clean Air Act safeguards that have been in place for decades.

The regulatory rule Republicans are trying to repeal today is first and foremost a public health protection measure. It requires facilities that emit the worst of the worst hazardous air pollutants to monitor, report, and cut those emissions to the maximum degree of reduction achievable, even eliminating them entirely if possible.

The rule also prevents any backsliding by major sources of the seven most dangerous hazardous air pollutants, including mercury and PCBs. By

repealing this rule, Republicans are going to allow large facilities to increase their toxic emissions up to just below the legal limit, endangering the health of American communities.

The cruelty of the Republican majority cannot be overstated. Let me be clear. The dangerous air pollution this rule protects us from can cause cancer, birth defects, developmental disorders, and neurological problems, even at small levels of exposure.

Unfortunately, Republicans want to make it easier for large industrial polluters to increase their emissions of these chemicals, regardless of the harms. They want to make Americans sicker at the same time they are looking to strip away their health coverage.

Allowing nearly 2,000 large industrial facilities to escape from their Clean Air Act compliance obligations, as this resolution allows, will not magically push them to invest in new technologies to clean up. There is zero evidence that giving facilities a free pass leads to less pollution. In fact, the opposite is certainly true.

Passing this resolution will be a race to the bottom, giving these facilities the green light to permanently abandon their long-installed pollution control equipment that are currently saving lives. This Republican resolution will allow these facilities to spew hazardous air pollution into the air with reckless abandon, and increase cancer-causing pollutants without consequence.

It will also allow these facilities to stop monitoring and reporting to the EPA which would end any chance of accountability for surrounding communities. The Trump EPA has been clear that enforcement of environmental laws is not a priority, so American families will be at the mercy of large corporate polluters.

This resolution proves, once again, that Republicans are completely out of touch. Americans are struggling to make ends meet and facing the reality that Republicans may soon strip them and their families of healthcare, but their focus is on repealing commonsense protections that make the air safer to breathe.

In the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, Congress recognized the clear and present danger caused by hazardous air pollution coming from large industrial sources across the country. It is because of the requirements put in place to address that danger that we have seen such sharp emission reductions and cleaner air over the past one-half century. To turn back now because of a CRA vote would be catastrophic, especially for anyone who lives near an industrial facility.

It is not enough to gut the healthcare of millions of Americans. Republicans first want to make sure the air we all breathe will do us harm. S.J. Res. 31 is cynical, dangerous, and deeply irresponsible. Congress should be trying to protect Americans, not trying to make them sick.

Mr. Speaker, for the health and safety of all Americans and for the sake of clean air, I urge all my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Texas for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 31 to overturn the Biden administration’s “once in, always in” rule. This is an egregious and burdensome rule, and it was just one of many actions taken by the previous administration on their way out the door to further hamstring our domestic energy producers.

By permanently classifying certain industrial facilities as major sources of hazardous air pollutants, even if they successfully reduce emissions, the Biden administration was seemingly punishing job creators for being good stewards of the environment.

As an original cosponsor of S.J. Res. 31, I am proud that House Republicans are taking a stand and defending our energy producers, manufacturers, and small businesses against unfair and costly environmental rules.

In overturning the “once in, always in” rule, we are returning to common-sense policy implemented during President Trump’s first administration. If businesses reduce their emissions below the major source threshold, then they should reap the reward of more cost-effective and flexible requirements under the Clean Air Act, period.

Repealing this backward rule is part of House Republicans’ work to unleash American energy and ensure that government red tape does not stand in the way of creating jobs and growing our economy here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting S.J. Res. 31.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. S.J. Res. 31 is irresponsible, especially as we wait to see whether Republicans will bring forward their budget bill to strip healthcare from millions of Americans to give tax breaks to billionaires.

However, this resolution would allow 1,800 facilities that emit the worst of the worst cancer-causing toxic air pollutants to avoid Clean Air Act requirements that protect the air that we breathe.

It would eliminate a 2024 EPA rule that ensures large industrial facilities like chemical plants and oil refineries control their hazardous air pollution. Hazardous air pollutants are known or suspected to cause cancer, birth de-

fects, developmental disorders, and neurological problems, even at extremely low levels of exposure.

It has been suggested that the 2024 rule eliminates the incentive for facilities to deploy new technologies to reduce pollution. However, we have some real-world data on this, and there is zero evidence that polluters will go above and beyond what is legally required of them by installing new technologies once they have avoided the major source requirements of the Clean Air Act.

□ 1230

The first Trump administration initially undid the “once in, always in” policy in 2020, and over 200 facilities were able to escape those given requirements. As far as I know, none of these sites has taken additional steps to install new pollution controls.

On the other hand, many of these facilities have been free to run their existing, previously installed pollution controls less. When they were categorized as a major source, they needed to take steps to drastically reduce their emissions as much as possible, based on demonstrated, cost-effective technologies.

In many cases, that resulted in emission levels dropping far below the major source thresholds, but the Clean Air Act’s intent was never to bring pollution levels right below some arbitrary major source threshold. It is about reducing emissions and potentially even eliminating emissions as much as it is cost-effectively possible.

Rescinding this rule would give another 1,800 facilities the green light to shut off their long-installed pollution control equipment, spew hazardous air pollution right up to the major source trigger, and increase cancer-causing pollution without consequence.

The Clean Air Act is an incredible public health success story, and we are at risk of writing a new, dark chapter in this law’s history. There have been five decades of strong, bipartisan support in Congress for the law, which has allowed us to make steady progress to reduce air pollution in our country.

Yes, in many places we are breathing cleaner air today than we were in the 1970s or 1990s, but that improvement is not guaranteed to be maintained if we start to chip away and backslide.

This resolution puts our previous progress in serious jeopardy, and the people who live along the fence lines of these 1,800 industrial facilities are at risk of facing the worst consequences.

These communities tend to be low income. I would venture that many rely on Medicaid. The one-two punch of this resolution with a budget bill to strip healthcare from nearly 14 million people is wrong. It will leave people with unhealthier air, fewer protections, and less access to healthcare to deal with the consequences—cancer, birth defects, and developmental disorders—of allowing these facilities to pollute more.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this resolution.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WEBER for yielding me time.

I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 31. This resolution would disapprove of the Biden-era EPA’s “once in, always in” rule, which was finalized in the final months of the previous administration.

Simply put, the “once in, always in” policy hurts America’s manufacturing and energy sectors while doing nothing to actually improve air pollution.

In 2020, the Trump administration first reversed this policy, which encouraged businesses to lower their emissions and reduce pollution.

My home State of Ohio ranks third in the Nation with almost 700,000 manufacturing jobs. The manufacturing sector is responsible for over 17 percent of Ohio’s gross domestic product and has an annual payroll of \$48 billion in the Buckeye State alone.

It is critical that we support this resolution today and send it to the President’s desk to deliver on our promise to unleash American manufacturing and energy.

I am proud to have introduced the House companion to this CRA with the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. Fedorchak), my good friend, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this commonsense resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dirty, pro-polluter resolution, so I rise in strong opposition to S.J. Res. 31. It is going to increase hazardous air pollution across America. It is going to expose more Americans to cancer-causing toxins.

What is worse, it comes at a time when Republicans are ripping healthcare away from at least 13.7 million Americans in their billionaire boondoggle bill. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you talk to folks back home or in your townhalls, what they are talking about is the cost of living.

It is amazing that this is the priority of the GOP at a time when people are really being squeezed back home. Republicans have not brought one bill to the floor to lower the cost of living and tackle the everyday challenges of our neighbors back home. Instead, they are consumed by this tax giveaway for billionaires.

This is the priority, to gut the Clean Air Act, to give polluting industrial plants the right to pollute more, to pollute our air with toxins that cause cancer, neurological damage, and death.

As a result of this Republican bill, we will see about 1,800 industrial facilities able to increase their pollution output.

Back home in Florida, we anticipate that will apply to 72 more polluting facilities that will be allowed to escape regulation and emit cancer-causing air pollution.

These are the major sources of hazardous air pollution, the large industrial facilities like chemical plants, refineries, and pesticide manufacturers. It is especially troubling because—and I think Mr. PALLONE would agree that this hasn't gotten a lot of play—in that billionaire boondoggle bill, the big tax giveaway package that is ruminating here in the Rules Committee right now, the American people need to know what else was included in that bill.

The Energy and Commerce Committee Republicans included a pay-to-play scheme to sell out the most vulnerable communities to the highest bidder. This is in addition to gutting Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act.

What they put in relating to their pay-to-play scheme would allow Big Oil polluters to pay a one-time \$1 million fee to the Department of Energy to grease the skids to get polluting gas plants online faster.

Yes, we need more energy, but this comes at a time when they are, in doing so, going to raise electric bills across the country because they say it is only oil and gas. Forget about solar, wind, storage, all the energy that is ready to come onto the grid.

It is another example of sacrificing the people's interests for the special interests'. The special interests here are the chemical plants, refineries, and pesticide manufacturers.

This is especially troubling, too, because, for decades, Congress has recognized the clear health dangers of hazardous air pollutants from these large-scale industrial polluting plants. We know they cause cancer. We know they cause birth defects, developmental disorders, and neurological problems, even at low levels of exposure.

While Americans struggle with the high cost of living and watch this billionaire boondoggle bill try to get through the House, just know what else is going on at the same time.

They are gutting the Clean Air Act, the bipartisan piece of legislation that has stood us well for years and years. No Congress has ever stripped away protections against toxic air pollution, and we shouldn't start now.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK).

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my resolution to repeal the Biden administration's eleventh hour reinstatement of the "once in, always in" rule and to counter some of the misinformation being shared on this rule by my colleagues on the other side.

I am a mom of three. When my kids were growing up, they woke up every Saturday morning to a job list, and they couldn't get their allowance until

they completed the jobs on the list. They were motivated to get their jobs done by that allowance, and I would have had very little luck incentivizing them to do their jobs if they never received their promised reward.

This is a law of human nature. People respond to incentives and rewards, which underscores the main problem with the "once in, always in" rule. There is no incentive to invest.

This misguided regulation permanently classifies certain industrial facilities as major sources, major sources of hazardous air pollutants even after they have made significant investments to reduce the emissions below the Federal threshold.

Mr. Speaker, think about that for a minute. They invest millions of dollars to modernize their operations, improve efficiency, and reduce emissions only for the Federal Government to permanently classify their business as a major source, stuck with the same costly regulations.

That is not smart policy. That is counterproductive. By refusing to let businesses reclassify after making progress, after meeting the standards, this rule removes any real incentive to invest in cleaner technologies.

Our energy producers in North Dakota have invested \$2 billion in emissions control technology. They have done this because they care about our communities and environment. In fact, North Dakota exports thousands of megawatts of electricity every year.

We are the third largest oil- and gas-producing State in the Nation, and we are one of only four States in the Nation that has never violated Federal air quality standards. That is not an accident. That is the result of smart investments, cutting-edge technology, and a commitment to responsible energy production.

North Dakota is proof that we can grow the economy, power the country, and protect the environment at the same time.

This bureaucratic rule ignores these successful efforts. It removes the incentive to innovate and locks facilities into restrictive regulations, even when they are trying to reduce emissions and operate more efficiently.

It is not just a problem for North Dakota. This rule affects manufacturers, energy producers, and small businesses all over the country. This approach raises costs, discourages innovation, and forces companies to think twice before making long-term investments in cleaner technologies.

This is not how to build a stronger economy or a cleaner future, and it is not how to make things more affordable for Americans.

Our Nation's energy future should be driven by innovation. American technological innovation have allowed us to reduce emissions more than any other Nation since 2005, all while achieving record energy production.

We need a regulatory framework that incentivizes innovation and rewards it

when it happens. That means eliminating one-size-fits-all regulations like the "once in, always in" rule.

Supporting this resolution means supporting American energy jobs, lower prices, and fostering a regulatory environment where businesses can thrive while safeguarding the environment.

I want to underscore that this resolution is not about allowing facilities to maintain high pollutant levels. It is about incentivizing them to reduce emissions and rewarding them when they do. That is how we both expand energy production and protect our environment.

I thank Senator JOHN CURTIS of Utah for his leadership on this resolution in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this resolution.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and I want to highlight one line she said: American technology and innovation has allowed us to reduce emissions more than any other country since 2005. That is important.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Today, I rise just flabbergasted and outraged by the latest attempts to undermine protections that keep our air clean, safe, and healthy. Do we really disagree about that?

Today's bill would allow an unnecessary, dangerous increase in some of the worst toxic chemicals back into the air that we and our children breathe, even when these facilities have abided by these standards for decades and proven that they have the technologies to do so. Let me repeat that: They have the technologies. They have the equipment already.

As a pediatrician, I know how damaging these toxins can be. Mercury and lead can lead to severe developmental delays, birth defects, and brain damage for children. Dioxins are known human carcinogens. The list goes on.

As a Member of Congress who strives always to find pragmatic, bipartisan solutions for us and for our children, I simply fail to understand when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are choosing to relax these standards for clean air, all while stripping healthcare away from more than 13 million Americans.

□ 1245

I mean, they are jeopardizing our health and taking away our healthcare. I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this bill. It is a corporate giveaway that hurts our constituents once again.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is amazing to me, quite frankly. I served 4 years in the Texas legislature, and we were busy with catalytic scrubbers on all the industry that we had

making sure that Texans had clean energy. We care about the environment. We care about people's health. We care about the future. We care about the economy.

It is a little bit curious to me to hear our friends across the aisle say that we don't care about any of that stuff. In Texas, we have a saying, Mr. Speaker: It just ain't so.

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

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to S.J. Res. 31.

Once again, Republicans are gutting our most fundamental pollution regulations.

This bill overturns air quality regulations for the most polluting industrial facilities in the country, giving a green light for polluters to pump more cancer-causing pollutants into the air we breathe.

Without these safeguards, nearly 2,000 of the Nation's largest polluters would get a free pass. Oil refineries, chemical manufacturers, pesticide producers, they would all be allowed to shut off their pollution controls and start spewing some of the most dangerous chemicals directly into our air: lead, mercury, arsenic, benzene. When inhaled, these pollutants are known to have significant health impacts, including cancer, birth defects, infertility, organ failure, and developmental disorders in children.

The science is clear. Pollution kills. Study after study has shown that air pollution is linked to higher rates of hospitalizations and death.

Every year, air pollution kills over 100,000 Americans, and nearly half of Americans now live in areas with harmful levels of pollution, up 20 percent from just last year.

This is a health crisis in the making. Republicans aren't cutting red tape. They are sentencing thousands of Americans to die in communities across our country. This isn't a partisan issue. This affects everybody. Red States and blue States, Republican and Democrat, every American deserves clean air.

Yet, my Republican colleagues would rather prioritize their donors in the oil and chemical business instead of protecting the health of their own constituents.

Let's not forget, while Republicans are attacking Americans' access to clean air, they are also ramming through their big, ugly reconciliation bill, which slashes funding for pollution reduction and prevention programs, ends clean energy and climate programs, and strips away healthcare from almost 14 million Americans.

The Republicans' agenda will make Americans sicker and poorer, sending

more Americans to the hospital, and ensuring fewer Americans can afford the healthcare they need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for clean air. Vote "no" on S.J. Res. 31.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today addresses a key issue created in the Biden-Harris administration that harms American businesses and actually disincentivizes investment to reduce pollution.

This was originally created during the Clinton administration. It was the "once in, always in" rule that penalized job creators and energy producers who took steps to invest in new technologies that lowered pollution.

If your emissions are at such a level you become a major source, once in under this rule that we are overturning today, you are always a major source, no matter what you do with your businesses. If you lower emissions, if you lower standards, you put in new equipment, you do operating hours differently, you do whatever you can to lower your emissions, you can't go back to being an area source and regulated with a level of emissions. Once you cross the threshold, no matter what you do, you stay listed as a major source pollutant.

We believe it disincentivizes companies from trying to lower their standard, and that is what we want to do. It is a disincentive. It is counterintuitive for what is trying to be done with the rule. We want lowered emissions, and we want to incentivize businesses to get there.

In the last Congress, I was proud to lead the legislation to overturn this burdensome regulation, which is a one-way ratchet that creates a disincentive for businesses to take steps to reduce their emissions.

By passing this resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act, we are working to unleash American energy and ensuring that every dollar that is invested in our economy is focused on jobs, growth, and innovation, not siphoned off for unworkable compliance created by government red tape.

I thank Congresswoman FEDORCHAK for leading this resolution, and I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the seven hazardous air pollutants that Republicans are apparently fine with pumping into the air we breathe.

First is mercury. Mercury is quickly absorbed into the body through inhala-

tion and skin contact. It moves quickly across the placenta and into a human fetus and can also cross the blood-brain barrier and remain in blood cells for decades.

This is why it is linked to developmental deficits in children. It can impact the heart, lungs, central nervous system, reproduction, kidneys, and GI tract. It is also linked to cancer and autoimmune diseases. The Republicans want children to breathe more of this toxin.

Next is alkylated lead. Alkylated lead is a combination of toxic lead and hydrocarbons from fossil fuels. It affects nearly every organ in the human body and reduces cognitive function in children. It is a known carcinogen, and as far as we know, there is no safe level of lead.

Then we have dioxins, furans, polycyclic organic matter, hexachlorobenzene, and PCBs. Also, all of these would be increased because of this CRA. These are all known carcinogens. All are bioaccumulative, persistent, and toxic, even in amounts in fractions of a gram.

It is really a shame to frame this rule simply as a so-called regulatory burden or a simple cost of doing business. EPA's rule is a public health rule, and we need to uphold it to protect the health and safety of our constituents, both adults and children.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, big polluters are the only people who will benefit from the rescission of this rule, not the American people.

If this rule is blocked, industrial facilities would once again be allowed to escape the regulations of the Clean Air Act that are meant to curb the release of harmful and cancer-causing pollutants.

Once they have escaped, most of these facilities would not be required to conduct monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting of what pollutants they are releasing into our communities.

They certainly will not have any incentive to implement any type of reporting on their own, especially when over half of the States prohibit regulators from being more stringent than EPA regulations.

This is all while the American people will bear the burdens of the rule's repeal, facing even higher risks of cancer, asthma, and other severe health conditions.

Not once—and I will repeat that—not once in the history of the Clean Air Act has Congress rolled back its protections. I find it extraordinary that Republicans are attempting to do this at a time when they are also trying to gut Medicaid.

We should be protecting this rule to defend the health of our constituents

and to make sure that polluters are held accountable, not just trying to rescind this rule entirely.

I think it is time that we stand up to big polluters and billionaires and recenter the health and needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am kind of amused listening to our friends from the other side, all of the facts and the things that they are bringing up. You know, it is not, Mr. Speaker, that they are ignorant, it is just that so much of what they know ain't so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on S.J. Res. 31, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.