

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Representative AL GREEN be censured; Representative AL GREEN forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and Representative AL GREEN be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Washington will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS: RUBBER TIRE MANUFACTURING"

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 177, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 61

*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 "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing" (89 Fed. Reg. 94886 (November 29, 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 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 and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 61.

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, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.J. Res. 61, 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 "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing."

My resolution will repeal this suspect rule that the Biden administration pushed out after the election but before President Trump's inauguration.

This rule was flawed to begin with. It was published on November 29, 2024, after the election of Mr. Trump but before his administration could take office.

Further, as required by the Clean Air Act, EPA performed a risk and technology review specifically on rubber tire plant emissions as recently as 2020. After the risk and technology review, the EPA concluded that the pollutant thresholds and emission regulations already in place were sufficient and protected public health with an "ample margin of safety."

Madam Speaker, under the Clean Air Act, this should have been the end of it, as the EPA is only required to review and revise the standards on emissions every 8 years. To make matters worse, the EPA basically said the only way to comply with the new regulation is to buy regenerative thermal oxidizers, which are essentially flares that burn off the smokestack exhaust at the specific tire plants.

These devices are expensive and likely will not be able to be installed within the 3-year Clean Air Act deadline. It is my understanding that the tire industry estimates that it will cost about \$100 million to get the regenerative thermal oxidizers ordered, fabricated, and installed and then about \$20 million more per year to operate the devices.

While this cost is across several affected plants, these figures are certainly much higher than the EPA's estimates.

I also note that this rule does not affect most of my constituents. I am sure some of my constituents drive from eastern Henry County to work at the Danville Goodyear plant located in the district of my neighbor, Congressman JOHN MCGUIRE, and that facility would be affected.

In the Rules Committee, I was erroneously under the assumption that this

might affect my Yokohama Tire plant today. I still submit, Madam Speaker, that it could affect them because what happens at the EPA, if they do it now on the larger producers of tires, et cetera, at some point, they are going to look at doing it at the medium-sized producers.

□ 1215

The Yokohama plant that employs a lot of people in my district, in my hometown of Salem, Virginia, could be affected long term, but currently it affects Danville. Now, that is about 16 miles from the edge of my district. In my area, because it is a rural area, lots of people drive more than 16 or 17 or 18 miles, whatever the number is, to get to a good-paying job like these facilities have that make tires for the American market.

This rule wouldn't be the first time my constituents have seen an environmental rule from the government inflicting economic pain on our rural part of Virginia. Several years ago, an EPA rule ended up closing down a plant in a small town.

In the end, the Supreme Court struck down the rule just a few weeks after the coal-fired plant closed. It was in Glen Lyn, Virginia. A few weeks after the plant was closed by Appalachian Power, the Supreme Court ruled that the EPA hadn't done it right. The rule was improper and it was invalidated by the Supreme Court, but they are not going to come back in and reopen the plant.

Those jobs are lost. The jobs of the people who worked there, who then ate lunch at the local lunch facilities, or who might have bought a car, or might have bought something else there in the very small town of Glen Lyn, no longer did so. As a result, the people there lost their livelihood, their economic resilience because of an erroneous EPA regulation.

The EPA's callous disregard for my peoples' jobs is not forgotten. What happened in Glen Lyn took about a decade. The population dropped, and last year, they turned in their charter to be a town. They are now an unincorporated census area inside of Giles County, and it all started with an EPA regulation that was misguided and improperly done.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that this regulation is probably not properly done, but that is for the courts to decide. We can fix it, though, here in Congress with this Congressional Review Act.

Some on the other side may say, if we repeal this regulation, we are letting tire manufacturers get away with unchecked pollution.

Madam Speaker, I say not so. That is not so. The EPA's National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants would still exist. All major sources would still have to abide by their Clean Air Act Title V permits and various other Federal and local controls and regulations.

Regardless, if Congress were to pass this joint resolution, rubber tire manufacturers will still be subjected to pollution regulations. The EPA can always come back with an updated hazardous air pollutant standard if they can ever get actual data indicating specific and significant pollution. They don't have that now.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 61 because it is important for peoples' jobs and for the principle of not doing willy-nilly regulations at the end of an administration in order to pursue something that does not have verifiable data indicating specific and significant pollution.

Mr. Speaker, further, as alluded to in this New York Post article, titled, "Jen Psaki mocks reporter when asked about Keystone pipeline job losses," so-called "green jobs" are not plentiful enough to make up for jobs lost because of EPA regulations.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 8, 2021]

WASHINGTON—White House press secretary Jen Psaki on Monday mocked a reporter who asked when workers on the canceled Keystone XL pipeline would get "green jobs" promised by President Biden.

It's expected that up to 11,000 jobs will be lost following Biden's day-one decision to immediately shut down construction of the pipeline that was supposed to carry oil from Canada to Texas—leaving South Dakotans reeling and 1,000 people immediately out of work.

"Where is it that they can go for their green job?" Fox News reporter Peter Doocy asked Psaki at her Monday afternoon press briefing, referring to Biden's promise to create good-paying union jobs in the green energy sector as his administration attempts to end the nation's reliance on fossil fuels.

"That is something the administration has promised and there is now a gap so I'm just curious when that happens, when those people can count on that?" Doocy added.

"Well, I'd certainly welcome you to present your data of all the thousands and thousands of people who won't be getting a green job," Psaki snarked. "Maybe next time you're here you can present that."

"But you said they will be getting green jobs. I'm just asking when that happens?" Doocy responded, noting a report by the Laborers' International Union of North America that found 1,000 union jobs on the Keystone project would "immediately vanish."

Another 10,000 construction jobs expected to be created by the project have also been nixed by Biden's decision.

A prominent union leader and Biden ally, AFL-CIO president Richard Trumka, lashed the decision in Axios on HBO interview Sunday, saying Biden should have also announced where he would replace those lost jobs.

"I wish he hadn't done that on the first day, because the Laborers International was right. It did and will cost us jobs in the process," Trumka told Jonathan Swan.

"I wish he had paired that more carefully with the thing that he did second by saying, 'Here's where we're creating jobs,'" he went on, saying he believed Biden knows his announcement was a "mistake."

Trumka, a former coal miner, also signaled his skepticism at Biden's plan to transition coal, gas and oil workers to clean energy jobs, saying he was subject to a similar failed policy.

"You know, when they laid off at the mines back in Pennsylvania, they told us

they were going to train us to be computer programmers," Trumka said.

"And I said, 'Where are the computer programmer job at?' 'Uh, they're in, Oklahoma and they're in Vegas and they're here.' And I said, 'So, in other words, what we're going to be is unemployed miners and unemployed computer programmers as well'" he recounted.

But Psaki swatted away the criticism and made a vague promise that Biden would put a jobs plan forward in the coming weeks.

"He has every plan to share more details on that plan in the weeks ahead," she said when asked how Biden would support workers left jobless by the decision.

Biden's climate czar John Kerry was also condemned by Republicans last month as "out of touch" when he suggested that energy and coal workers impacted by climate change efforts could "go to work to make the solar panels."

Last month, the Biden administration unveiled its \$2 trillion Green New Deal-fueled environmental plan, which includes eliminating coal, oil and natural gas as electricity sources by 2035.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I say it is good to see the gentlewoman from Utah in the chair.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 61, another attempt by House Republicans to ensure workers and communities continue to breathe toxic air pollution. This harmful Republican resolution puts the profits of billionaire corporate polluters over the health and welfare of the American people, and it makes a mockery of Republican promises to make America healthy again.

I really believe, Madam Speaker, that this resolution is a distraction. I listened to the President's speech last night, and it is clear to me that neither he, nor the Republicans in the House, have found a way to lower grocery prices. They haven't found a way to lower energy prices. They haven't found a way to fund the government. Now they are on the cusp of stripping millions of people of their healthcare, all so they can shower these giant tax breaks on billionaires and big corporations.

Using the Congressional Review Act hatchet to carve away critical protections from an agency that has already been decimated by DOGE's indiscriminate firing demonstrates how unserious Republicans are about keeping Americans safe from dangerous pollution, and another week of nonsense CRAs, in my opinion, shows how unserious House Republicans are about governing.

Madam Speaker, I will directly address what the gentleman said. Under the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency is required to reduce hazardous air pollutants from large industrial sources like rubber tire manufacturers to protect Americans across the country from harm.

They have to do this. They are obligated in the EPA to look at the things that might be hazardous under the

Clean Air Act. To be clear, hazardous air pollutants are air toxics that are known or suspected of causing cancer and other serious health impacts like heart attacks, worsening asthma, reproductive and birth defects, as well as severe impacts on the environment.

EPA is obligated under the law to set pollution limits based on what is already being achieved at similar facilities using readily available technologies.

Basically, under the Clean Air Act, the EPA has to say what is harming the public and is there a technology out there in this industry that is innovative and does not achieve that level of harm?

The bottom line is, there are industries that are already retrofitting and meeting these standards, otherwise, the EPA couldn't establish the standards. I have had this discussion before with my colleague. There are good actors and bad actors. The good actors want innovation, want to retrofit their manufacturing companies to do the right thing and cause less pollution. By repealing this, all the Republicans are doing is basically helping the bad actors, in this case, mostly foreign manufacturers or foreign-based companies that just want to save money by not eliminating this harm.

I don't want to get into the specifics of whether the rubber tire manufacturers will address this, but it is cost-effective, protects public health, and ensures the industry stays competitive. It is long overdue.

In fact, the Court ruling required the EPA to finalize this rule to close the loophole that allowed rubber processing facilities to spew unlimited hazardous air pollution. When fully implemented, the rule will cut these harmful emissions by 171 tons per year. That includes over 100 tons of toxic organic chemicals and over 60 tons of particulate matter that will be removed from the air of the workers and the communities near the impacted facilities.

However, H.J. Res. 61 will throw all of these benefits away. This resolution would hamstring EPA's ability to fulfill its obligation to protect the health and welfare of Americans from air pollution. Unfortunately for everyone with lungs, Republicans can't leave commonsense environmental protections in place.

As the House Republicans move to strip healthcare from millions of Americans to fund tax breaks for billionaires and big corporations, they also want to make people sicker by rolling back regulations meant to keep people safe from cancer-causing air pollution. It is outrageous. I don't know what else to say.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side claim, EPA's rule was developed in close consultation with industry, using industry data. It also proposes emissions reduction technology that the best performers in the industry are already using.

Overall, it is estimated to cost less than a fraction of 1 percent of the company's annual revenue and facilities have years to comply.

This should be a no-brainer, a win-win scenario of reducing cancer-causing emissions and promoting innovative technologies to modernize industry and provide regulatory certainty. I really don't understand why House Republicans are so fixated on trying to repeal and block the work of the EPA.

Madam Speaker, for the health of workers and the surrounding communities and for the sake of clean air, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution that puts the whims of billionaires and corporate polluters before the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me assure you that those of us on this side of the aisle have no desire to make people sick.

The number one test in a community as to whether or not there is a likelihood of being sick or healthy is whether or not the people have a good, strong economy and have a job. What this regulation would do is to take that away.

As I talked about with Glen Lyn, if you start shutting down factories, you shut down towns, and people don't have jobs. Then you will have people who are clearly going to have more issues with their health than they currently have.

Further, in regard to the various things that my colleague said, I have seen it before where the EPA goes out and they create a maximum achievable control technology and they claim, oh, it is out there or it will be soon, and industry tells me it doesn't exist.

Now, in this case, it does exist. It is just very expensive and it would take longer than the Clean Air Act gives them in order to install it. This is where I think we should take care of it instead of letting the executive branch do all of our work for us. They used proxy data and used total hydrocarbons instead of looking at what the EPA is charged with doing, which is the actual hazardous air pollutant. They don't have that data, and when they last checked for that data, they said there was an ample margin of safety.

November 29, they suddenly throw this regulation on the books as a final rule without referencing how the ample margin of safety that was found in 2020 somehow disappeared in a 4-year time period, how it went away. They don't have any data to show actual hazardous air pollutants. They used proxy data. That is not good enough for regulations that could cause the curtailment of tire manufacturing in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), my colleague.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the Chairman, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 61, which would repeal the Biden-Harris EPA's rule amending National Emission Standards on the domestic rubber tire manufacturing industry.

This rule would impact 11 facilities in nine States, including 1 in my district in Fayetteville, North Carolina, which has been manufacturing tires since the 1960s, produces 20,000 tires a day for passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks, and employs 2,300 of my constituents.

Fayetteville plays a major role in the State's industrial economy, and its manufacturing sector provides significant economic opportunities for my constituents, including our area's veterans from Fort Bragg. These 11 facilities have supported the American worker for decades while complying with all environmental regulations.

In 2020, the EPA ruled that these facilities were already operating under the accepted threshold and had established a margin of safety to protect public health. This rule, issued by the previous administration, would do just the opposite, actually. It would increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by requiring facilities to install additional costly technologies that will increase energy consumption.

Beyond that economic harm, the rule would prove costly to manufacturers, affecting workers' wages and the expansion of the domestic tire manufacturing industry.

The per-company cost to comply with this rule would be four times what EPA has suggested: 100 million in capital costs and \$20 million in other annual costs.

Madam Speaker, this regulation must be rescinded. We must reinstate common sense. Rubber tire manufacturing facilities have complied with the existing standards, and keeping this rule in place would bring economic harm and no benefit for anyone, including my constituents.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

□ 1230

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

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. I am honestly having a hard time understanding why we are considering this resolution today.

In the first 9 weeks of 2025, the House majority has made no progress on funding the government for the remainder of the fiscal year, and they have made no attempt to hold the Trump administration accountable for its actions, whether it is ignoring court orders to stop withholding congressionally directed funding or dismissing hard-

working Federal employees or upending our closest trade and national security partnerships.

Instead, today, we are taking time on the House floor to consider a minor rule that EPA was legally obligated to develop. The rule in question—to limit hazardous air pollutants from rubber tire manufacturers—was finalized in November of last year.

At no time, as far as I can remember, did the Energy and Commerce Committee conduct any oversight of that rules development during the years EPA took to collect data and then propose and finalize the rule. It was certainly never the subject of a hearing. Why would it be? This rule only affects 12 facilities across our country and does not even meet the Congressional Review Act's definition of economically significant.

Hazardous air pollutant emission limits have existed for most parts of rubber tire manufacturing since 2002. However, a 2020 court ruling required EPA to address all unregulated hazardous air pollutant emissions from a major source category. When EPA carried out a required technology review, it was obligated to propose limits for the unregulated rubber processing subcategory of rubber tire manufacturing.

I understand this is getting into the weeds of the Clean Air Act, so let me be as clear as possible for our Members. This rule requires a very small number of rubber processing manufacturers to take reasonable steps to reduce hazardous air pollutants. It is not overly burdensome to manufacturers. It is achievable, based on cost-effective, existing pollution control technologies, and it does fulfill EPA's legal obligation to regulate harmful air pollutants from all segments of the rubber tire manufacturing process.

While the economic impacts on these firms are small, the rule will reduce air pollution, resulting in greater public health protections for the communities near those 12 facilities.

This resolution is just the latest on a long and growing list of legislation to give a free pass to polluters. I urge Members to oppose it.

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

Obviously, when, in 2020, the EPA found there was an ample margin of safety, there was no reason for the Energy and Commerce Oversight Committee, which at the time I chaired, to do an oversight hearing on something that appeared to be a matter which on its face would not require new regulation.

The EPA, of course, does things that sometimes are perplexing to many of us. I would submit as well that one would have anticipated they would have used, as they are supposed to, an actual hazardous air pollutant study or standard. Instead, they used a proxy study of total hydrocarbons.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY), my friend.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRIFFITH for the opportunity to speak in support of this resolution.

It is death by a thousand cuts with the EPA. Each one only costs a little bit. It is kind of like when we have DOGE right now. It only costs a little bit to have two or three extra people on each job. It only costs a little bit to add another regulation that does not make sense and that does not accomplish anything.

These businesses are dying because, one regulation at a time, for no reason other than to create jobs for some bureaucracy, we continue to have those.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 61 to repeal yet another burdensome regulation from the Biden administration that threatens American jobs and manufacturing, some of those in my district. Although it may only be a few that are recognized, one of those is in my district.

This rule imposes costly, unnecessary mandates that do little to improve the environment but will drive up costs, hurt businesses, and put hard-working Americans at risk or out of work.

In my district and across the country, the manufacturers provide good-paying jobs that support families and strengthen our economy, but under this rule, companies will be forced to take on massive new costs, costs that will either be passed on to consumers or result in lost jobs and closed facilities. We cannot afford to let Washington bureaucrats dictate policies that weaken American industries and send our opportunities overseas.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 61 and to push back against reckless regulatory overreach. American workers and businesses are better.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Reclaiming my time, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

Is the gentleman trying to tell the American people that it is only a minor rule, as one of our colleagues said, it is only a minor rule if it doesn't apply to you?

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY) for a response.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. If it doesn't apply to you.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Also, if it doesn't take your job?

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Also, thousands of those minor rules add up over time.

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

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 61.

As the government hurtles toward a shutdown and millions of Oregonians fear being stripped of their healthcare, House Republicans are wasting time on ridiculous resolutions that do nothing to lower costs for working families and, instead, threaten our public health.

Before coming to Congress, I spent over two decades as a pulmonary and critical care physician. Every day, I saw firsthand how climate change impacts people and how poor air quality leads to people's morbidity and, yes, mortality. It is undeniable, the air we breathe is making us sick, and we cannot afford to ignore this any longer.

As Democrats fight tooth and nail to protect public health and center our families, Republicans are pushing harmful resolutions that threaten the well-being of our constituents and the future of our planet. If it weren't so cruel, it would be laughable.

H.J. Res. 61, the one before us today, would cripple the EPA's ability to protect our communities from hazardous air pollutants, the worst cancer-causing air toxins, at a time when Republicans are also on the cusp of taking away healthcare from millions of Americans.

This resolution is part of a larger, more dangerous trend to gut our public health agencies, silence our scientists, and roll back critical environmental protections. It proves just how out of touch they are with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my message to the Oregonians watching is simple: I will stand on this floor time and again to raise their voices and make sure they are heard because, as a doctor, when my patient's health is threatened, I do what it takes to protect them.

Clean air is not a luxury. It is a right, and I will not stop fighting for it. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this reckless and irresponsible policy.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 61 because it is common sense. The Biden administration decided to put these additional regulations on tire manufacturers. The inevitable consequence of that, of course, is increasing the cost of tires for the American people.

The American people might be okay with such a regulation if it was to have a meaningful, positive effect. Everybody wants to protect the environment. I can't name a single Member who doesn't. As policymakers, we have to ensure that regulations are pragmatic and balance the inherent trade-offs. That is what policymaking is about. That is what regulation is about, trade-offs.

The Biden-era regulation on tire manufacturers is a perfect example of when regulators fail to do a proper cost-benefit analysis.

Let's talk specifics. This EPA rule piles on huge costs for our domestic tire makers. It is going to hit close to 100 rubber-mixers across the country. That jeopardizes jobs, increases prices, and makes American manufacturers less competitive globally.

Worse, there is not really a benefit to this. These regulations don't do much

of anything to actually improve the environment. Under the final rule, tire manufacturers have to install expensive new devices like regenerative thermal oxidizers, which require incredible amounts of energy to operate. Therefore, you offset the so-called benefit by burning a lot more energy, meaning you are burning a lot more carbon dioxide, by the way. In other words, you are left with a policy that is pretty much all cost and no clear upside to it.

If you look at the justification, the Biden EPA claimed they implemented this rule to address hazardous air pollutants from tire manufacturers. Here is the thing: The agency's own data found that our existing standards already kept those emissions in check and protect public health. Why did they do it anyway? It is simple. It was because the political appointees at Biden's EPA are beholden to a bunch of radical environmental groups.

They went for the optics. They want headlines like "Tough on Pollution" instead of trusting the data that says actually we are in a good place here. They want the headlines. They believe in this crazy philosophy that if 1 regulation is good, then 10 more must be better. You can never do enough.

Of course, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have started with the scare tactics claiming the sky is falling, the air quality is plummeting, and people are dying and they are not going to have healthcare. There is no evidence for that, of course.

The evidence actually shows the opposite. The EPA's own website shows criteria pollutants have dropped by nearly 80 percent over the last several decades. We have already made a huge amount of progress. The data backs that up, not doom-and-gloom talking points.

Mr. Speaker, I say to anyone watching at home, don't buy into the fear-mongering that the Democrats are selling. This resolution is about protecting American jobs and keeping an eye on costs for everyone. It won't hurt the environment at all. It just reverses a burdensome rule that does more harm than good.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with Chairman GRIFFITH in support of this resolution. I urge all my colleagues on both sides to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition of H.J. Res. 61, which would nullify an Environmental Protection Agency rule to significantly reduce the unregulated toxic chemicals from tire manufacturing facilities, facilities that my community is all too familiar with.

In 1839, Charles Goodyear invented vulcanized rubber, revolutionizing the way that the world travels. Decades later, the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company was founded and headquartered in Akron, Ohio, my hometown, in Ohio's 13th Congressional District.

For many years, the city of Akron, which I proudly represent, has been nicknamed the Rubber Capital of the World due to its long history of rubber and tire manufacturing. This industry has provided decades of local jobs, economic development, and financial stability to countless families in Akron and the surrounding area.

Without rubber manufacturing, Akron would not be what it is today. In fact, Mr. Speaker, my family fled the segregated South to find jobs in these rubber factories, in the Firestone plant, and I stand here before you a proud graduate of the Harvey S. Firestone High School, the founder of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company.

Yes, we are proud in the city of Akron to honor the legacy of rubber workers in my district. As the centerpiece of downtown Akron's Main Street corridor, you can find a statue of a rubber factory worker standing tall in commemoration of their contributions to our community that is 200 years old this year. Unfortunately, a generation later, we know now that the stories of far too many rubber workers and families included cancer, asthma, and other respiratory illnesses. Decades without adequate regulation of toxic emissions from these plants have taken a serious toll on the Akron community. Studies from the 1980s found increased risk of leukemia among rubber plant workers in Akron and respiratory illnesses in children nearby rubber plants. Good-year's St. Marys, Ohio, rubber plant vented carcinogenic vinyl chloride into the environment in close proximity to a Boy Scout camp, and an Akron plant vented dust contaminated with asbestos into surrounding neighborhoods.

It should be no surprise that asthma and cancer remain challenges for my community. In 2019, the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America designated Akron as an asthma capital alongside it being the rubber capital, and ranked the city 14th in the list of the top 100 most challenging places in America to live with asthma.

Thankfully, in 2024, Akron moved further down the list to 52, but we would obviously prefer not to be on that list at all. Studies have also shown that neighborhoods in southern Akron, like Summit Lake and Kenmore, continue to pose lifetime cancer risk from industrial pollution that is nearly twice the EPA's acceptable levels.

Unfortunately, everyone in Akron has a friend or a family member with a cancer story. Too often, these stories involve working in rubber or being too close to a plant.

The EPA rule that is the subject of this joint resolution estimates that compliance with the rule will cost these multimillion dollar corporations no greater than 1 percent of their annual revenue. Yes, I know that can still be a lot of money, but to argue that these costs are too great when the alternative is communities plagued with years of increased cancer and asthma,

as they are in my community, is just plain insulting.

To be clear, I know the importance of the rubber industry to my community. It is the reason why I stand here today. It is, quite literally, why I get the opportunity to stand here today. I appreciate rubber workers in Akron who helped make our city the rubber capital and revolutionized the way in which we travel.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we also built the best middle class that this country has ever seen, but we cannot repeat history and continue to expose our communities and our rubber workers to these toxic chemicals. This resolution poses a danger to the public health of our communities across the country.

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

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, with Americans looking at a reduction in critical healthcare services from the recently passed Republican budget, including cuts to the Medicaid program that children with asthma will need to access, this resolution could not come at a worse time.

This is not hyperbole, and I hear my colleagues when they say on the other side of the aisle that this may be problematic. I ask them to hear me, standing on behalf of 786,000 people from the city of Akron, representing northeast Ohio, a great-granddaughter of a rubber factory worker, who knows what it is like to lose a friend because of cancer due to some of these toxic chemicals: I don't want the same for my colleagues' communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask them to learn from our mistakes, and I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Chairman GRIFFITH, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an example of unsubstantiated bureaucratic overreach that does not have any added impact to public health benefits and actually goes so far as to have a negative environmental impact.

The Biden-Harris EPA finalized a rule targeting American tire manufacturers that runs the risk of destroying domestic tire production and eliminating thousands of good-paying American jobs.

When finalizing the rule, the EPA stated the goal was to reduce emissions from hazardous air pollutants. However, the rule also adds emissions limitations for total hydrocarbons. These two pollutants are not correlated.

In short, limiting hydrocarbons does not reduce emissions from hazardous air pollutants.

Additionally, implementation of this rule requires facilities to use regenerative thermal oxidizers. Use of RTOs will result in higher carbon dioxide emissions, as they require significant energy inputs to operate and maintain.

American tire manufacturers already comply with National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, known as NESHAP, and are operating well under the acceptable limitations. The manufacturers' compliance has ensured that our communities are safe. On the other hand, this rule all but ensures their demise.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are concerned about why we are bringing these issues up now. Due to the number of Biden-Harris administration midnight regulations, we have no choice in Congress but to address the onslaught of these policies before they destroy businesses and make life more expensive for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, let us be pragmatic and use common sense in our policy-making, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 61.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MORRISON).

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise, as a doctor of more than 20 years, in opposition to H.J. Res. 61, an egregious and completely unnecessary assault on our public health.

This resolution put forward by congressional Republicans would rip away protections that keep Americans safe from some of the most dangerous and cancer-causing air toxins in the world, such as arsenic and lead.

As an OB/GYN, I am extremely concerned because these toxins are known to cause reproductive harm and birth defects.

Just last night, in this Chamber, President Trump claimed: "Our goal is to get toxins out of our environment." President Trump also highlighted the concerning increase in rates of childhood cancer and claimed: "Reversing this trend is one of the top priorities."

Yet, less than 24 hours later, the Republican majority is choosing to increase toxins in our environment, expose more Americans to some of the most dangerous pollutants, and likely increase the rates of cancer.

Let's be clear: This cost-effective rule presents minimal cost to industry in order to protect public health.

What are we doing here? Why are we selling out the health of Americans? The consequences of this would be devastating to our children, moms and new babies, and families across the country. It is completely preventable.

To my Republican colleagues who hold the majority rule in this Chamber,

please, for the sake of the health and well-being of the American people, vote “no” on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize none of us wants the world polluted. The gentlewoman indicated that somehow this was going to affect arsenic and lead. I suppose, in a theoretical world, perhaps it could, but there are other regulations on tire manufacturing that may deal with that.

That is not what this Congressional Review Act is about. It is about a regulation that was put into effect because, instead of looking for things like arsenic and lead or actual hazardous air pollutants, the EPA used a proxy measurement and measured carbon dioxide. They didn’t use a test to come up with this rule based on arsenic or lead. It was a proxy using carbon.

Further, somebody said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we were stripping away critical regulations. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if it was so critical, why did the Biden administration wait until November 29 with less than 2 months left in their term? If it was so critical, why did the EPA in 2020 find that there was an ample margin of safety in the regulations that already existed?

Mr. Speaker, this is not about stripping away all regulations on tire manufacturing. It is one specific ill-advised, ill-timed, expensive regulation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I can’t stress enough that the EPA’s rule, which the Republicans are trying to repeal, would remove 171 tons of hazardous air pollution per year, including some of the worst air toxins.

This critical rule is, first and foremost, a public health rule, seeking to help both the workers and the communities surrounding these facilities.

We heard a very impassioned speech by the gentlewoman from Akron, Ohio, who talked about how much, in Akron, they depend on this industry and want it to thrive. They have suffered over the years, not only the people who work in the factory but the people of Akron and the surrounding areas, from hazardous air pollution. Essentially, that is why she is opposed to the repeal of this rule that helps people breathe.

Again, this is not only something that the EPA is required to do under the Clean Air Act, which is to look at whether or not particular industries are causing health problems for the American public, but in addition to that, the EPA was compelled to regulate these specific air toxins by a 2020 court case that required the agency to close loopholes for unregulated hazardous air pollution that they are legally required to manage under the Clean Air Act.

My colleagues on the other side suggested that somehow this is a Biden administration midnight rule and that it

was rushed at the last minute. The reality is that the EPA has been regulating the process involved in tire manufacturing since 2002. That is over 20 years ago.

Rubber processing, which is really what we are talking about here, had gotten a free pass, as I said, for over 20 years. This rule that the EPA promulgated seeks to ensure that the workers and communities like those in Akron near these facilities aren’t put in harm’s way any longer.

I think House Republicans are really minimizing these critical public health protections decades in the making by using the CRA to repeal this title and block the EPA from further action.

Instead of funding our government, lowering prices, or finding ways to help everyday Americans, House Republicans are wasting Congress’ time by rescinding a long-awaited rule that will reduce 171 tons of harmful, cancer-causing emissions a year.

While this rule was finalized in November, the 11 rubber processing facilities have 3 years to make the necessary technology upgrades. Any doomsday claims about the EPA rule simply ignore the very real experiences of people who have been forced to breathe toxic pollution while coming into work or walking out of their front door for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the EPA was under no obligation to do this regulation. They may have been under an obligation to look at unregulated hazardous air pollutants, but nowhere in the statute does it allow for proxy carbon studies.

Hydrocarbons are not listed as a hazardous air pollutant. The plain language, I repeat, does not authorize proxy or surrogate studies to say: Well, we looked at it, and there is a lot of carbon. Therefore, we are going to make specific regulations that cost hundreds of millions of dollars and may or may not cost jobs.

That is not their job. That is the purpose of the Congressional Review Act. It is to rein in unreasonable, improper, or irrational regulations done at the last minute by an outgoing administration or by an incoming team.

This is not something that needs to be on the books to protect health. They did a proxy study. They don’t have actual data that shows that this would do any good at all. It will perhaps cause significant curtailment in production at certain facilities of tires made in the United States. It is our job as Members of Congress to prevent this travesty.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the arguments that we have made have now worn out. We have used up the mileage on these arguments. Now, we get to vote “yes,” and voting “yes” is where the rubber meets the road and gives us

a more sound regulatory scheme related to tire manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 177, 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 yeas 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.

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM FOR APPLIANCE STANDARDS: CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, LABELING REQUIREMENTS, AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL EQUIPMENT”

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 177, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment”, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 42

*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 Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment” (89 Fed. Reg. 81994 (October 9, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.