

□ 1359

Mr. SCHNEIDER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WESTERMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 204, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Malliotakis
Alford	Flood	Mann
Allen	Foxx	Massie
Amodei	Franklin, C.	Mast
Armstrong	Scott	McCarthy
Arrington	Fry	McCaul
Babin	Fulcher	McClain
Bacon	Gaetz	McClintock
Baird	Gallagher	McCormick
Balderson	Garbarino	McHenry
Banks	Garcia, Mike	Miller (IL)
Barr	Gimenez	Miller (OH)
Bean (FL)	Golden (ME)	Miller (WV)
Bentz	Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks
Bergman	Good (VA)	Mills
Bice	Gooden (TX)	Molinaro
Biggs	Gosar	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Granger	Mooney
Bishop (NC)	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Boebert	Graves (MO)	Moore (UT)
Bost	Green (TN)	Moran
Brecheen	Greene (GA)	Murphy
Buchanan	Griffith	Nehls
Buck	Grothman	Newhouse
Bucshon	Guest	Norman
Burchett	Guthrie	Nunn (IA)
Burgess	Hagaman	Ogles
Burlison	Harris	Owens
Calvert	Harshbarger	Palmer
Cammack	Hern	Pence
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Carl	Hill	Pfluger
Carter (GA)	Hinson	Posey
Carter (TX)	Houchin	Reschenthaler
Chavez-DeRemer	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)
Ciscomani	Hunt	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Jackson (TX)	Rose
Clyde	James	Rosendale
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Collins	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Crane	Jordan	Salazar
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Santos
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Curtis	Kean (NJ)	Schweikert
D'Esposito	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Self
De La Cruz	Kiggans (VA)	Sessions
DesJarlais	Kiley	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Kim (CA)	Smith (NE)
Donalds	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Duarte	LaLota	Smucker
Duncan	LaMalfa	Spartz
Dunn (FL)	Lamborn	Staubert
Edwards	Latta	Steel
Ellzey	LaTurner	Stefanik
Emmer	Lawler	Steil
Estes	Lee (FL)	Steube
Ezell	Lesko	Stewart
Fallon	Letlow	Strong
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Tenney
Ferguson	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Tiffany
Fischbach	Luna	Timmons
Fitzgerald	Luttrell	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Mace	Valadao

Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)

Beyer
Gottheimer
Huizenga
Johnson (GA)
Kustoff

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)

NOES—204

García (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Loftgren
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar

NOT VOTING—14

Langworthy
Lynch
McBath
Meuser
Obernoite

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

□ 1415

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO “CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS”

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 429, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 429, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES 11

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 Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards” (88 Fed. Reg. 4296 (January 24, 2023)), 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 Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 11.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 11, which rescinds EPA’s rule requiring impractical emission standards for heavy-duty trucks, with huge new restrictions on F-250s, semitrucks, and everything in between—trucks that not only deliver all the goods we rely on but also trucks for our farmers and ranchers, building contractors and landscapers, and countless other workers and small businesses that quite literally keep our country running.

□ 1408

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 231.

The EPA even acknowledges that the new standards are 80 percent more stringent than existing emission standards, but the Agency ignores the fact that new trucks already have 98 percent fewer nitrogen oxide emissions than trucks manufactured 35 years ago.

At a certain point, you start to see diminishing returns.

EPA's regulatory efforts are just the latest step by the Biden administration to electrify the transportation sector and burden American families in the process. The Agency itself emphasizes that the rule will cost truckers between \$39 billion and \$55 billion. In fact, the rule is expected to increase the cost of a semitruck anywhere from \$8,000 to \$42,000 per truck.

As we all know, the cost of these senseless regulations would inevitably be passed on to the American consumer through higher retail prices and increased inflation.

Ohio sits at the crossroads of America, and thousands of trucks travel across my State to transport goods to my constituents and businesses throughout the Nation. An unworkable rule like this one would stop some of these deliveries, cause delays for many others, and lead to shortages for some of our most basic staples.

We should ensure the delivery of essential goods and protect the quality of life for all Americans by passing the resolution before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11, and 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 this Republican joint resolution of disapproval to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's heavy-duty vehicle nitrogen oxide rule.

This resolution is yet another extremist, Republican attack on commonsense steps EPA is taking to protect Americans' health and the environment.

Last December, EPA finalized the rule that sets new standards for heavy-duty engines and vehicles to reduce dangerous nitrogen oxide emissions, also known as NO_x.

Before the EPA action, it had been more than 20 years since the Agency had last updated heavy-duty emission standards for NO_x pollution.

These new standards are needed now because the science is clear: This pollution poses serious threats to public health. The tragic outcomes include premature death, respiratory illnesses like childhood asthma, cardiovascular problems, and other detrimental health impacts.

The trucking industry is a leading source of this dangerous air pollution, and it is especially dangerous for the 72 million Americans who live near truck freight routes across the United States.

The EPA rule will cut NO_x pollution from these vehicles by nearly half in 2045. That is going to make a huge difference because one in three Americans

live in counties with unhealthy air, and 100,000 Americans die every year from premature deaths associated with air pollution.

This harmful air pollution has negative repercussions for all Americans but is especially dangerous for our most vulnerable communities: children, the elderly, low-income communities, and communities of color.

The EPA rule is a critical tool to protect these Americans, improve public health outcomes, and secure the right to clean air for everyone. This rule is expected to prevent up to 2,900 premature deaths, 6,700 hospital admissions and ER visits, 18,000 cases of childhood asthma, and 1.1 million lost schooldays for children.

EPA also estimates that it will result in \$200 billion in health-related benefits. What I mean by that is because you are going to prevent all these sicknesses and loss of schooldays and hours, that actually saves \$200 billion.

The Republican CRA before us that we are debating would abandon all the public health, economic, and environmental justice benefits that come with the EPA rule.

It is also worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that during the rulemaking process, EPA engaged extensively with communities and Tribal, State, and local governments. It also engaged with industry, environmental organizations, and labor groups to promulgate a final rule that is technologically feasible and realistically achievable.

Let me just say again: This rule is completely achievable. That is why industry is generally supportive. I know my colleague on the other side is going to mention different trucking groups that are not, but generally, they were supportive. In fact, the period for judicial review closed in March, and there were no lawsuits filed against it.

Some people may say, why does that matter? For the most part, there is always some group that challenges any rule that EPA puts forward.

But Republicans are moving ahead with this last-ditch attempt to prevent the EPA from protecting Americans' health. They have been putting polluters over people since the beginning of this Congress, and this is just another unfortunate example.

This Republican bill would have dire consequences for EPA's ability to fulfill its mission to protect public health and welfare from dangerous pollution. If enacted, this resolution would repeal the rule and prevent any substantially similar future action by EPA.

That outcome is simply not acceptable. Thankfully, President Biden has already vowed to veto this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, EPA's rule is common sense, achievable, and long overdue. S.J. Res. 11 is a baseless attack on EPA's Clean Air Act authority and obligation to protect Americans and the environment from dangerous air pollution.

This Republican bill would set us back years in addressing dangerous air

pollution, protecting communities, and modernizing our heavy-duty transportation sector.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this joint resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I once again have to point out that we are not only fighting for the right kinds of policies, but we have to fight against outrageous claims that are simply patently false.

That comment by my colleague that 100,000 people per year die from air pollution, that was a figure from 1990. By 2019, that figure had dropped to 60,000 people.

Now, that is not acceptable either, and I think one of the reasons that it dropped so far was because NO_x emissions from truckers had dropped some 98 percent since the late 1980s. So, we are already making great progress with this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), the sponsor of the House companion bill.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 11, which nullifies the Biden administration's heavy-duty vehicle emissions rule.

I am proud to have led this effort in the House, and I commend my colleagues in the Senate for swiftly passing this important legislation.

The joint resolution before us today would overturn the EPA's aggressive heavy-duty vehicle emissions final rule, which provides 80 percent more stringent regulations than current standards and unfairly targets our trucking industry. By imposing these new emissions reduction requirements for vehicle models that are made in 2027 and beyond, it will significantly increase the cost of heavy-duty vehicles.

Whether you own an F-250 or a semitruck, this new regulation will directly affect you. According to the EPA, it is projected to cost between \$2,500 and \$8,300 per vehicle to adhere to this new final rule. Other estimates, such as the one from the American Truck Dealers Association, stated it is closer to \$42,000 per truck.

Mr. Speaker, let me be crystal clear today. Woke bureaucrats in Washington are on a climate justice crusade, using the heavy hand of government to go after the trucking industry that keeps America moving.

In the last three decades, we have made significant strides in the right direction to decrease emissions and increase efficiency. Today's new trucks have reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 98 percent since the 1990s.

The EPA's final rule is also ineffective, given that it incentivizes older and higher emitting trucks to operate longer due to the expensive technology required for compliant vehicles.

This is unacceptable and yet another blatant example of burdensome government regulation.

Simply put, the EPA has failed to address legitimate concerns for the

trucking industry. However, the EPA unilaterally imposes this detrimental rule, which could lead to a litany of further supply chain disruptions across the country, hit the smaller mom-and-pop trucking companies the hardest, and pass along increased costs to the American consumer.

Amidst record-high inflation and supply chain challenges, more expensive freight costs and fewer truckers on the road will only further perpetuate this problem. This is exactly why it is imperative that the House pass this joint resolution to nullify this burdensome regulation.

I thank OOIDA, Senator FISCHER, and the trucking industry for being front and center on this issue. I proudly support our truckers, our small businesses, and progrowth policies to keep our economy strong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this joint resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who is the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time and for his steadfastness in standing up for the public health of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican's bill, S.J. Res. 11. What my Republican colleagues are trying to do here is roll back a very important Environmental Protection Act rule that was developed to tackle air pollution across America under the Clean Air Act, air pollution specifically that comes from heavy-duty trucks and buses.

For over 50 years, the Clean Air Act has served us well. It is one of our bedrock environmental laws that improves the air that we breathe. It tackles polluting plants and vehicles through using the latest science and technology to constantly evolve and improve.

Oftentimes, the EPA works with industry, as they did here with the trucking industry, to ensure that there is a balance, that we are improving the air we breathe and still maintaining jobs and economic growth over time.

□ 1430

What the Clean Air Act has brought us over the past 50 years has been consistent improvement in the air that we breathe. In fact, there have been dramatic improvements. When we are talking about cleaner air, we are talking about healthier communities and healthier families.

Think about your friends and family members with asthma or heart disease or some kind of lung infection. That is why it is so important to make sure that EPA is constantly evolving in the science and technology we are using in cleaning up our air.

It is important to tackle the problem of heavy-duty trucks and buses. Why? They constitute about 6 percent of the

vehicles on the road, but 59 percent of smog-producing elements: that means nitrogen dioxide, ozone, and particulate matter. The last time that EPA updated their rule relating to heavy-duty trucks and buses was 20 years ago.

Science and technology have evolved. The trucking industry has evolved. We can continue to make progress for American families. Even with the progress that we have made, one in three Americans live in counties with unhealthy air pollution. Back home in the Tampa Bay area, I can think of many communities along the interstate highways and along our industrial centers where there is a lot of traffic, especially from heavy-duty trucks and buses that are really weighing on the air quality in those neighborhoods.

This is a way, thankfully, for EPA to continue its mission to clean up the air under the Clean Air Act and make sure they are doing it in a scientifically sound manner. They are always working with industry on ways to improve and to protect public health. For all those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this Republican resolution. Allow the Environmental Protection Agency to cut pollution, improve our health, and save lives. Let's put people over politics and make sure we are doing all we can do to improve the health and lives of our American neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 11. This resolution reverses EPA's extreme emissions standards for heavy-duty trucks. President Biden is shamelessly pushing electrification of the entire transportation sector without regard for the significant environmental, economic, and national security risks it will cause.

We should not allow the Biden administration to continue implementing this plan without additional congressional guidance.

Heavy-duty trucks are essential to the transport of agricultural products and consumer goods to people across the country. In short, the availability of trucking is directly tied to our standard of living, food security, and ability to afford everyday life.

EPA's heavy-duty trucks rule applies to trucks of all sizes from the Ford F-250 to semitrucks. EPA's own estimates say it could cost more than \$8,000 per semitruck to meet their standards.

The cost will be passed directly to Americans, many who live paycheck to paycheck. Imagine someone who is already being forced to make tough choices for their family at the grocery store, the gas pump, and the pharmacy. Virtually every product they are buying—as well as the ones they can no

longer afford—is transported by a truck at some point.

With the EPA's rule, they will be paying and sacrificing even more for food, clothing, fixing their homes, and trying to provide for their families.

EPA's regulatory effort on heavy-duty trucks would impose extensive and expensive regulations; increase costs for trucking companies, many of which are small businesses; and ultimately fail to significantly reduce emissions.

The American people cannot afford the financial burdens. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress, the elected Representatives of the people, to address Agency overreach, especially when it would directly and negatively impact the lives of Americans and drive inflation higher.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator FISCHER and Representative NEHLS for leading on the Senate and the House resolutions on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

It is said that two certainties in life are death and taxes. Someone suing over an EPA standard must be a close third. Yet, when this rule was proposed, no one from industry or the environmental community challenged it based on EPA's legal authority, the Agency's analysis, or the administrative process. That is because it was carefully developed. It was developed in consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. It is achievable, and it provides flexibility for manufacturers.

Most importantly, it will result in significant health and economic benefits for all Americans—far more than the costs of compliance. Those benefits include fewer premature deaths, fewer hospital visits, fewer missed days of school and work, and yes, fewer cases of childhood asthma.

Despite being a relatively small number of vehicles on the road, heavy-duty vehicles covered by this rule, including semitrucks and buses, are significant sources of NO_x pollution.

This standard will especially help protect the tens of millions of Americans that live, work, or go to school near highways, ports, and other high-traffic, high-pollution areas along our Nation's freight network.

It is hard to believe that the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted by a vote of 401-25. Protecting public health from air pollution was a commonsense, bipartisan issue. Nearly everyone understood we had to balance industry interests with Americans' right to breathe and breathe safely.

We have reached a point where it is difficult to imagine a potential EPA

air rule that would not immediately be CRA'd by our colleagues in the majority.

This opposition is not based on rigorous analysis, but an ideological belief that anything done to reduce air pollution simply cannot possibly be worth the tradeoffs, even when the benefits would be undeniably huge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to allow EPA to move forward with flexible and achievable public health protections, like this heavy-duty rule. I ask all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 11. The legislation will disapprove of the Environmental Protection Agency's misguided heavy-duty vehicle rule that seeks to upend our economy in order to meet President Biden's extreme climate goals.

As a member of the Conservative Climate Caucus, I am not against reducing emissions—far from it. It should be done through innovation, not top-down government mandates that ignore reality. Trucks today show the power of innovation—I drive one of those—having already reduced emissions by 98 percent.

It seems like this administration has closed their eyes to any side effects of their rush to green. From tailpipe emissions regulations that will force people to buy expensive and less practical EVs to new rules on power plants that will threaten the reliability of our electric grid. It seems like the EPA hasn't even thought about the economic and energy security of our constituents.

In their final rulemaking, the EPA said they considered cost when deliberating these regulations. I am not sure how that could be true when they estimate it will cost thousands of dollars per truck to upgrade them with the necessary equipment.

The fact is small-truck owners and operators might not be able to afford these changes and will either go out of business or be forced to pass the cost on to the customer. On top of this, the rule also applies to trucks and equipment used by my farmers and farmers across the country.

Our supply chains are already stretched thin. Inflation is sky-high. Either of these scenarios worsens our economic outlook and raises prices for the consumers across the board. The trucks that haul our food, our energy resources, and our goods will be impacted. This is just the first of several, strict, heavy-duty vehicle emissions rules that the Biden administration is implementing.

In our modern digital economy, people and commerce depend on our truckers more than ever before. This rule will put further strain on our supply chain and increase costs for Michiganders and people across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 11.

Last year, more than 137 million people in the United States were living in areas with unhealthy levels of pollution, and we need to do better for them. It is currently estimated that 72 million Americans are exposed to high levels of air pollution due to their proximity to high-traffic trucking routes. These figures have real consequences, and they cost lives.

With three of California's largest trucking routes cutting through my district, the district that I represent in the San Fernando Valley, these figures are a community reality for us.

After decades of heavy-duty vehicles generating pollution in their backyards, my constituents experienced the injustice of disproportionately high rates of respiratory illnesses, cardiovascular complications, and cancer.

The EPA's heavy-duty NO_x rule is a long-overdue step in the right direction to protect the health and well-being of communities across the United States, including my own.

With this rule, the EPA could prevent up to 2,900 premature deaths per year, 6,700 fewer hospital admissions and emergency department visits, and 18,000 fewer cases of childhood asthma. These are the things that we need to work on in the House of Representatives. These are the lives of our children, grandchildren, parents, and grandparents.

Last Congress, Democrats worked and secured historic investments through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and Inflation Reduction Act to accelerate our progress in developing cleaner zero-emission technologies that will improve public health.

That includes \$5 billion for clean schoolbuses, an effort that I championed alongside Congresswoman HAYES, Senator PADILLA, and Senator WARNOCK.

The Republican-backed S.J. Res. 11 unravels the progress that we have made, and we must do more. It attacks necessary Clean Air Act protections and would repeal the meaningful actions that the EPA has taken.

Today's CRA abandons the American people. It abandons our children. It abandons our grandchildren and future generations. It forces our communities to continue to breathe polluted air and puts them on a path to an unlivable future.

It is important for us to understand that in this great Nation we have technology like no other, and we have capacity like no other. Therefore, all it takes is the political will of us on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing—to make the improvements that I just outlined here.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in Los Angeles where we had first-stage smog

alerts. Today, my children don't know what they are. Today, my grandchildren are being raised in Los Angeles. If we move the clock back, my grandchildren, unfortunately, will be able to speak of these smog alerts, just like I unfortunately had to be subjected to it as a child. We can do better, and we must do better.

Growing up in the neighborhood that I now represent, I was the first councilmember to turn down the expansion of a dump site—another polluting element. Yes, the unions came up to me and said: "We are going to lose 200 jobs. You can't do this." I said: "We must."

We found a solution to recreate those jobs on the same site, to have a cleaner, more effective way of dealing with the trash that the over 4 million people in my city create every single day.

It is really important for us to understand that for us to pass this resolution it will send us backwards and hurt generations today and more generations to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), another very passionate member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1445

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our truckers are the heartbeat of America, transporting about 70 percent of the United States freight. We depend on our truckers more than the left cares to admit or realize. Now they want to attack our truckers, even after the trucking industry has come to the table time and time again, Mr. Speaker.

In 1998, one truck emitted what 60 trucks emit today. They have removed 98 percent of what comes out of the tailpipe. Still, the climate activists and converts will continue pushing their radical green deal on Americans invariably and inevitably damaging our economy and making us reliant on, guess who, China.

The Biden administration should be ashamed of taking a page from California's radical playbook to ban gas-powered vehicles. Over 200,000 Texans are heavy-duty and tractor-trailer truck drivers. Now, let me tell you: We don't want the Federal Government messing with our way of life and our livelihoods in Texas. This dangerous EPA rule would increase costs for the trucking industry and, in turn, would increase costs for communities that rely exclusively on trucking for their freight.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of S.J. Res. 11 to reverse the Biden EPA's new burdensome trucking regulations in order to protect small business truckers and to prevent more inflation and supply chain issues. This is a matter of life and death for our truckers.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 11 to overturn the EPA Clean Trucks rule.

Tens of millions of Americans are exposed to dangerous levels of nitrogen oxide pollution from trucks. Many of them live in low-income communities and communities of color.

I know. I represent the Port of Los Angeles where I am surrounded by four freeways and trucks everywhere. Now, they do move our economy. They move goods from the port out into the communities, and so we acknowledge that, but we are all too familiar with Code Orange or Code Red air alerts warning us not to go outside.

Think about this: Our children cannot go outside and play at the local park because of the air quality, because of the pollution. We know that they are at increased risk for premature deaths, childhood asthma, and lung and heart diseases. If you go to a doctor's office in my district, the doctors there stock up on boxes of inhalers for children that they are waiting to come in because of the air pollution that is causing asthma.

These truck pollution standards were last updated 20 years ago. That is the last time we updated the standards. How long do children need to wait? How long do children need to wait to get clean air?

It has been 20 years. That is how long our communities have suffered without any help. This Republican resolution basically says too bad. We want you to wait longer for clean air. Whether it is Wilmington, California, in my district, or Wilmington, Delaware, across the country and everywhere in between, our communities just want to breathe. Delay is not acceptable.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California such time as she may consume.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Our children have been waiting too long. We must move forward with this EPA truck rule. This is what we need to make sure we are investing and moving toward clean trucks, and we will not stop until every community, no matter your ZIP Code, can go outside without worrying whether it is safe to breathe clean air.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to support clean air for all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), my good friend and another colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution which would overturn the Biden administration's reckless and aggressive emission standard for heavy-duty vehicles.

As a businessman, I came to Congress to reduce the size and scope of the gov-

ernment, and this administration's obsessive pursuit of their rush-to-green priorities would simply devastate the U.S. economy at a time when Americans can least afford it.

Democrats' radical spending spree has resulted in three in five Americans saying rising prices are a financial hardship. Our people are hurting, yet the Biden EPA is moving forward with a top-down regulation that will significantly raise the cost of vehicles and any product transported by truck, including food, clothing, building materials, and other commodities essential to life.

In my district, I have many farmers who use heavy-duty trucks. If implemented, this rule would dramatically increase the price of goods and food. We are already hearing that from folks at the grocery store.

Last year, the Environmental Protection Agency put in place emission standards for heavy-duty vehicles sold after 2027. By their own estimates, the new standards would cause vehicle prices to skyrocket.

We are not talking about a small price hike here. It would be an increase more than \$2,500 for a Ford F-250 and an increase more than \$8,300 for new equipment on semitrucks.

The EPA projects the associated costs of the new regulation could reach \$55 billion over the lifetime of the program. I repeat, \$55 billion. It would also force many commercial truck drivers out of business. This regulation's cost of compliance is so high that owners and operators of trucks would be forced to leave the market or keep less safe trucks on the road.

Mr. Speaker, America simply cannot afford the wildly out-of-control and out-of-touch priorities from this administration. I strongly encourage a "yes" vote on today's resolution to overturn the Biden administration's emission standard for heavy-duty vehicles.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Republican side of the aisle keeps talking about costs. I saw the chart that they put up that talks about costs, and the last speaker talked about \$55 billion. I think that was the cost to the truckers.

The bottom line is that the EPA has an obligation to deal with and try to protect Americans' health and safety. I gave a figure before, which is four times what the gentleman said, about how the cost in terms of lives and the loss of job hours, the loss of education hours, the cost of having to go to the doctor, EPA estimates that all that comes up to \$200 billion. We can argue about costs.

I mean, I don't doubt that there are tremendous costs involved in not putting this rule into effect because of the impact on communities like that of the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

BARRAGÁN) talking about the inhalers that are available in doctor's offices because of the impact on children and their ability to breathe.

The one thing that I really want to stress is that it is almost as if the other side doesn't feel that the EPA has an obligation to address the health impacts because of the costs to the trucking community, and I would just say that that is not true.

The reason that we have an EPA is so that they can study and see what the impact is of air pollution and smog. It is clear. No one has suggested that the EPA doesn't have the power to do this based on the facts and based on the surveys they have done to show what the harmful impact is to Americans of this air pollution that comes from trucks.

This rule would eliminate 50 percent of that by 2045. I don't think it is unreasonable to suggest that that is not a good thing to do. Furthermore, I don't hear any suggestion from the other side to say that, well, rather than do that, we would do something else. It is just: Don't do it. Don't do it. Don't do this rule that, in the opinion of the EPA and those of us on this side of the aisle, is important to save lives and to make Americans healthier.

It bothers me tremendously to see that they are simply getting up on the other side and saying, Don't do this, let's get rid of this rule rather than even suggesting an alternative.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support S.J. Res. 11, disapproving the EPA's proposed rule on new emission standards on heavy-duty trucks. The Biden administration is proposing new regulations on heavy-duty trucks that would dramatically raise costs on businesses and consumers.

These rules would require trucks to be equipped with expensive emissions control technology beginning in 2027. The EPA estimates the cost of the technology would be somewhere around \$8,300 per truck, but independent estimates say it could be more than \$40,000 per truck.

This is a huge cost on businesses, especially small businesses who rely on trucking to transport their goods. It will force them to raise their prices or go out of business because they will have to pay more for the supplies and inventories they need. In other words, it is more inflation.

Consumers will have to pay more for everything from food to clothing to building materials at a time when inflation is already at a 40-year high.

Republicans in Energy and Commerce are calling on Congress to reject these regulations. We simply can't afford them. The EPA claims they need to address nitrogen oxide and other

pollutants, yet NO_x pollutants have been reduced by 98 percent since 1988.

This is more of the blind drive to this green ideology, which is both intellectually and environmentally bankrupt. Cleaner air today is due to advancements in engine and fuel technologies, better filtration, and higher efficiencies.

The Senate passed this resolution to overturn this heavy-handed, job-killing rule. I urge the House to do the same.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), my good friend and another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman JOHNSON for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 11, a resolution nullifying the EPA's overreaching rule on American trucks.

Mr. Speaker, the American people cannot afford yet another misguided Biden policy. From the gas pump to the grocery store, costs have skyrocketed because of this administration. Now, in their infinite wisdom, they have concluded American trucks need to be regulated with the most stringent standards in our Nation's history, all in the name of the radical, climate-alarmism agenda.

Almost every item found in the grocery store, pharmacy, restaurant, or business is transported on a heavy-duty truck. If this regulation takes effect, Americans will see essential items such as food, clothing, and school supplies cost even more.

It is sad the Biden administration and regulators at the EPA decided their devotion to radical climate goals justify increased suffering for the American people. However, it is a price they are willing to make you pay to achieve their goals. Regulations like this will diminish the quality of life for constituents like mine.

Supporters of this regulation might argue the costs of compliance would be minimal. They would be wrong. The EPA's own analysis found that it would cost over \$8,000 per truck. Furthermore, the bureaucrats at the EPA have a history of underestimating the costs of their heavy-handed regulations.

In 2001, they estimated the cost of their nitrogen oxide regulation to be \$5,000 per truck, but the market analysis found it to exceed \$21,000. The American Truck Dealers Association agrees the EPA estimate is far too low and estimated the true costs to be around a \$42,000 increase per truck, which would mean more inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should not suffer higher costs because of demands made by climate activists. We must nullify this regulation. I support this resolution for the benefit of the American people.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that this EPA rule is promulgated by left-wingers, radicals; it is a radical rule. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Just to give you an example, the Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association, which is a nonprofit group that provides technical information on emission control technologies for motor vehicles, concluded that a 90 percent reduction in NO_x emissions is feasible by 2027. Not only are the heavy-duty NO_x rule standards achievable, but they can be implemented in a cost-effective manner.

Since the rule does not mandate the use of any specific technology, despite claims to the contrary, there are multiple compliance pathways available to reduce NO_x emissions.

There are existing technologies that help industry achieve the rule's NO_x requirements, and with the years of lead time built into the rule, technology manufacturers will continue to innovate new and more cost-effective solutions. The rule also supports tens of thousands of supplier jobs dedicated to the commercialization of this technology by 2027.

The problem is that with this CRA, House Republicans are throwing away decades of progress in the heavy-duty transportation sector.

This is not radical. This is not left-wing. This is just practical in a way of trying to protect people's health, while at the same time being very conscious of the impact on the trucking industry and making it possible to move forward with this without any real harm to the industry.

I urge my colleagues to support this innovation of our domestic, heavy-duty transportation technology industry and vote "no" on this resolution.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman JOHNSON for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 11, which repeals EPA's rulemaking on heavy-duty engines and vehicle standards for trucks. The Senate passed this resolution at the end of April, sending a strong message of disapproval. It is time for this body to do the same.

Today's new trucks have reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 98 percent since 1988, and the EPA's recent rulemaking requires reductions that are 80 percent more stringent. The rule outpaces available technology and would worsen an already tight equipment market.

The EPA's nitrogen oxide rulemaking for heavy-duty trucks would

dramatically increase the cost of new trucks. The EPA admits the rule would cost between \$39 billion and \$55 billion. On a per truck basis, the EPA noted the price of a class 2b truck will increase by \$2,600 and a semitruck will increase by \$8,300. As the costs of trucks increase, the cost of all goods transported by trucks will increase.

Let me give you a primer on health. If you can't afford food and you can't afford medicine, your health will worsen—that is for children, that is for families, and that is for senior citizens.

Additionally, the EPA's rulemaking potentially encourages trucking companies to retain older fleets with greater nitrogen oxide emissions, meaning the rulemaking may result in increased emissions from heavy-duty trucks. If trucking companies cannot afford the new trucks with compliant technology, they will keep older, higher-emitting trucks in operation.

Further, when we don't see the benefits of this rule, i.e., reduced asthma, reduced hospitalizations, or reduced premature deaths, they will again say the rules weren't stringent enough, didn't go far enough.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, small carriers and independent truckers simply cannot afford to overhaul their fleets, farmers cannot continue to produce crops with these standards, and American families can't afford higher prices for everyday goods, medicine, and food.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the CRA.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), the vice chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, you would think after years of supply chain disruptions and skyrocketing consumer prices, this administration would make every effort to lower costs and streamline our transportation networks.

The heavy-duty engine and vehicle standard does exactly the opposite. This rule would force owner/operators to leave the market or keep older trucks on the road.

This rule is unrealistic, given the heavy-duty vehicle technology space, and this rule would add at least \$8,000 to the cost of each new semitruck. The cost doesn't go to producers, the people who grow the grain or produce the oil or get the natural gas out of the ground. It goes to the consumers.

Instead of expanding the equipment market and recognizing the significant

reduction of nitrous oxide, this rule is another assault on liquid fuels that will further complicate the supply chain.

North Dakota is a producer State, but we have to get our products to market. We need heavy-duty vehicles to get our goods there. The rule jeopardizes our ability to feed and fuel the country.

The CRA has bipartisan support and for good reason. The underlying rule is unworkable, and I urge my colleagues to support the CRA.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I listened to Ms. BARRAGAN and she talked about the Port of Los Angeles, I was concerned because I don't think we have spent enough time during this debate talking about what I call environmental justice communities. These are communities which, because they are near the port or near places where the trucks predominate or they are concentrated, have such an impact on the local community. That is certainly true in parts of my State as well, in New Jersey.

We all know that air pollution from the heavy-duty transportation sector has serious negative impacts on everyone's health. But these communities near high-traffic roadways experience higher rates of these serious health effects.

We have an estimated 72 million people that live near truck freight routes across the United States, and residents of these communities are more likely to be low-income communities and communities of color.

It should not come as a surprise that my Republican colleagues are once again putting polluting industries over the health and safety of our most vulnerable populations.

Research has demonstrated that diesel traffic, including traffic located on freight routes, is the largest source of NO_x disparity by race in the United States.

Protecting our most overburdened communities is one of the many reasons why the heavy-duty NO_x rule is absolutely critical.

During his first days in office, President Biden made a commitment to uplifting environmental justice and making it a core tenet of his administration. To continue delivering on his promise, just last month, he signed an executive order that will further embed environmental justice into the work of our Federal agencies.

The heavy-duty NO_x rule is just another example of how far the EPA is delivering for environmental justice communities. Reducing harmful air pollution from the heavy-duty transportation sector will have immense benefits for those living near these high-traffic freight routes.

I think it is a shame that the Republicans are essentially turning a blind eye to the disproportionate health harms that are faced by these communities from circumstances outside their control.

We are not going to ignore this, as Democrats, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution in part because of the terrible impact on some of these communities that are near these freight routes and ports, including those in my home State of New Jersey.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this EPA rule would go into effect for model year 2027, which is an extremely tight timeline for compliance. The Truckload Carriers Association commented that the rule outpaces available technology, which means there is not even technology there yet to do the kinds of things that this rule is requiring.

I also point out that there are significant key groups that support S.J. Res. 11: American Trucking Association, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, Transportation Intermediaries Association, National Tank Truck Carriers, Truckload Carriers Association, and the National Federation of Independent Businesses, which represents literally thousands of small businesses, many of them small trucking operations across America.

There are some very, very serious technical issues with this rule, as well as some real economic concerns.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his incredibly important leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, every American, every single child and every single family, has the right to breathe clean air.

I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 11, the latest effort from colleagues to put American lives in danger to boost the profits of their corporate, polluter donors.

Heavy-duty vehicles make up just about 6 percent of trucks on the road but generate 59 percent of all nitrogen oxide pollution in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in southwest Detroit thinking those heavy trucks rumbling through our neighborhood, near my school, near where I lived, near the park I played in, was normal. It isn't normal.

In my district and surrounding areas, we see heavy trucks go through our neighborhoods up to 20 more times a day than any other community in Michigan. This is not the kind of life for any family or any resident of our country. It is no surprise that the rates of asthma, lung cancer, and COPD are dramatically higher in my region, in my district, than any other parts of the State.

We see heavy-duty trucks drive outside of our elementary schools, local health centers, and nursing homes every single day. We see premature

deaths, heart attacks, asthma, strokes, and maternal complications. These are just some of the effects from pollution that these vehicles spew into our neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, we have a right to breathe clean air.

Part 1 of President Biden's Clean Trucks Plan is just a small step toward environmental justice for communities that have been left behind for far too long. Our communities, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford a setback like this that is being proposed today. They cannot afford to continue to have their health, safety, and futures put at risk for corporate profits. They don't have another day, another year, another month to live like this.

President Biden will rightfully veto this ridiculous attempt to make our communities even more unhealthy and more dangerous, but I call on the EPA to go even further to make progress in cleaning up our air and water in order to give our residents a real opportunity for a better quality of life.

I invite any of my colleagues to spend a day with me in my district to see for themselves what rampant, unchecked pollution does to a community, to a neighborhood. Talk to any of my seniors who grew up with it, who are literally on breathing machines before they go to bed. This is not the life we want for any American.

I invite you to meet the children born prematurely to parents with asthma and COPD who go to work every day with headaches and chronic respiratory problems. Maybe then you would understand not only the need for this rule to remain intact but to go even further to protect the health of those we are sent here to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the CRA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Congressional Review Act that would overturn yet another radical rule from the Biden administration's EPA.

If you need any more proof of how radical the rules coming out of this EPA are, look to where this bill came from: The Senate. The last time I checked, the President's own party holds the majority in that Chamber, yet they still think this rule is too extreme.

This EPA rule would impose severe emissions reductions that are 80 percent more stringent than the previous rule.

□ 1515

Today's new trucks have already reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 98 percent since 1988. In fact, there is a chart on EPA's own website showing the U.S. reduced six common pollutants by 78 percent between 1970

and 2020, all while increasing miles driven and experiencing dramatic economic growth.

Put simply, this rule is both unnecessary and unworkable. It would make it harder for the truckers who keep our economy moving from doing their jobs—truckers from the Georgia Ports Authority in my district.

The cost of complying with this rule would force truck owners and operators off the road, and that is not acceptable.

Prices are up. Our supply chains are backlogged. We have an administration that continues to strangle our economy with antigrowth and antiworker rules like this.

Mr. Speaker, this needs to stop, and I urge passage of this matter.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress—and I said this before the Rules Committee—that the concern that I have here is this process, in part. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when you do a Congressional Review Act—which is being used today by the Republican side—to essentially get rid of this very important EPA rule to protect public health, if it is passed, not only does the rule disappear, but there can be no action by the agency in this space.

As I continue to point out, the Republican side has not come up with an alternative. Everything that I hear is to say, “We don’t want this rule in effect, and we think the rule is not a good one,” but they don’t address the fact that this rule is seeking to address public health in such a significant way.

Also, I heard my colleague from Georgia, whom I respect a great deal, say: Oh, this was passed by a Democratic Senate.

The fact of the matter is that with the exception of one, every Democratic Senator voted against this resolution, and I think there was one absent. It is hardly the case that Democrats support this. There was only one Democrat who supported it in the United States Senate.

The reason that I am so concerned is not only because this would get rid of such an important rule but because there would be no alternative at this point and no likely alternative in the future.

Let me say that the science could not be more clear. NO_x emissions are dangerous, and they have significant detrimental impacts on public health. The respiratory impacts, which have been mentioned by my colleagues on the Democratic side, associated with this air pollution include wheezing, coughing, shortness of breath, asthma attacks, and even lung cancer.

If those are not serious enough, other health impacts include susceptibility to infections, heart attacks, strokes, metabolic disorders, preterm births, low birth weights, and premature deaths.

In the United States, air pollution is associated with over 100,000 deaths every year. Despite the severity of these negative health outcomes associated with NO_x pollution, my Republican colleagues remain committed to rolling back the very standards that would protect Americans from these harmful impacts.

It is hard for me to imagine that the majority is so set on repealing a rule that would literally save lives and improve the health of millions of Americans across the country, but unfortunately, that is what we face here.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by starting with something that Mr. CARTER from Georgia just reminded us all of: A Democratic-controlled Senate passed S.J. Res. 11—a Democratic-controlled Senate. Democrats in the Senate said that this rule is unnecessary and too onerous. They passed the CRA, and they have asked us to do the same.

I heard several things today that I want to put an exclamation point on. I heard from my colleague and my friend, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, that the EPA’s job is to protect the air and water, the environment.

I actually agree with that, but let’s look at the environmental facts that surround this particular rule—a 98 percent reduction in NO_x emissions since the late eighties and early nineties. Look at the cost that this is going to place on the American economy: \$39 billion to \$55 billion.

Many trucking companies are not going to be able to comply with this, so they are not going to buy the new trucks. Instead, they are going to continue to use the old trucks. It is going to defeat the very purpose that this rule was set out to do in the first place. They are just going to keep driving those trucks until they drive the tires off of them.

I heard one of my Democratic colleagues say earlier that if we overturn this rule by passing S.J. Res. 11, we are going to create an unlivable future for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what an unlivable future looks like in rural America, where inflation is already at a 40-plus-year high. Americans—parents and grandparents—are having to raise their own grandchildren because of things like the drug epidemic and having to work two jobs to make ends meet. They are having to choose between putting fuel in the car and buying groceries or paying the electric bill or having health insurance. That is an unlivable future.

When we do something like this rule that continues to cause inflation to go up and up, it puts more strain on American families who are living paycheck to paycheck.

I also heard the term “environmental justice.” What about environmental in-

justice? Mr. Speaker, come to Appalachia. Ride up and down the roads and see the farmhouses where people live paycheck to paycheck and where they struggle like I just described.

The EPA puts forward rules that have no consideration for the economic impacts on the people whom it is going to hurt the worst. Those are the people who get up every day and put their work clothes on.

Ninety-six percent of the trucking industry are small operators. Ninety-six percent are small fleet companies. They are the ones who are the least able to go out and buy this new technology, and they are the ones who are going to more quickly go under and go out of business because of this onerous rule.

Mr. Speaker, this CRA is the right thing to do. Democrats in the Senate said so, and Republicans in the Senate said so. I urge today in the U.S. House that we also say so. Tell the EPA this is a bridge too far.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11. Let’s overturn this rule.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 11, the latest Republican attack on clean air protections.

Heavy-duty vehicles make up approximately 6 percent of vehicles on the road but generate 59 percent of dangerous nitrogen oxide (NO_x) pollution. This rule, issued in December 2022, is targeted at reducing the air quality impacts of heavy-duty engines beginning in Model Year 2027 and protecting clean air. Changing the standard for heavy-duty engines and vehicles is expected to reduce dangerous NO_x pollution by nearly 50 percent by 2045. This rule was created with trucking, engine manufacturing, and other industry stakeholders and will be the first update to heavy-duty vehicle emission standards in 20 years.

Every American deserves access to clean air, yet approximately 72 million Americans are exposed to higher levels of air pollution due to their close proximity to high-traffic trucking routes. These Americans are more likely to be low-income and communities of color. It is estimated that the EPA’s new rule will lower respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, and cases of childhood and adult asthma caused by exposure to dangerous pollution. I am proud of the historic investments Democrats made last Congress to develop cleaner, zero-emission technologies that will protect public health. Passing S.J. Res. 11 would abandon the progress we have made to address public health concerns and promote environmental justice in our Nation’s infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, not only will S.J. Res. 11 disproportionately harm children, the elderly, and communities of color, but it would block the Biden Administration, or any future administration, from taking meaningful action to curb dangerous NO_x pollution from heavy-duty vehicles.

It should be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 the 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 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BABIN) at 4 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards", 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 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 203, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Barr	Buchanan
Alford	Bean (FL)	Buck
Allen	Bentz	Bucshon
Amodei	Bergman	Burchett
Armstrong	Bice	Burgess
Arrington	Biggs	Burlison
Babin	Bilirakis	Calvert
Bacon	Bishop (NC)	Cammack
Baird	Boebert	Carey
Balderson	Bost	Carl
Banks	Brecheen	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Harshbarger	Newhouse	Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin
Chavez-DeRemer	Hern	Norman	Kuster	Omar	Smith (WA)
Ciscomani	Higgins (LA)	Nunn (IA)	Landman	Pallone	Sorensen
Cline	Hill	Ogles	Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Soto
Cloud	Hinson	Owens	Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stansbury
Clyde	Houchin	Palmer	Lee (CA)	Pascrell	Stanton
Cole	Hudson	Peltola	Lee (NV)	Payne	Stevens
Collins	Huizenga	Pence	Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Strickland
Comer	Hunt	Perry	Leger Fernandez	Perez	Swalwell
Crane	Issa	Pfluger	Levin	Peters	Sykes
Crawford	Jackson (TX)	Posey	Lieu	Pettersen	Takano
Crenshaw	James	Reschenthaler	Lofgren	Phillips	Thanedar
Cuellar	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)	Lynch	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Magaziner	Pocan	Titus
D'Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)	Manning	Porter	Tlaib
Davidson	Jordan	Rose	Matsui	Pressley	Tokuda
De La Cruz	Joyce (OH)	Rosendale	McBath	Ramirez	Tonko
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer	McClellan	Raskin	Torres (CA)
Diaz-Balart	Kean (NJ)	Roy	McCollum	Ross	Torres (NY)
Donalds	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford	McGarvey	Ruiz	Trahan
Duarte	Kelly (PA)	Salazar	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Trone
Duncan	Kiggans (VA)	Santos	Meeks	Ryan	Underwood
Dunn (FL)	Kiley	Scalise	Menendez	Salinas	Vargas
Edwards	Kim (CA)	Schweikert	Meng	Sánchez	Vasquez
Ellzey	LaHood	Scott, Austin	Mfume	Sarbanes	Veasey
Emmer	LaLota	Self	Moore (WI)	Scanlon	Velázquez
Estes	LaMalfa	Sessions	Morelle	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Ezell	Lamborn	Smith (MO)	Moskowitz	Schiff	Schultz
Fallon	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)	Moulton	Schneider	Waters
Feenstra	Latta	Smith (NE)	Mrvan	Scholten	Watson Coleman
Ferguson	LaTurner	Smucker	Mullin	Schrier	Wexton
Finstad	Lawler	Spartz	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wild
Fischbach	Lee (FL)	Staub	Neal	Scott, David	Williams (GA)
Fitzgerald	Lesko	Steel	Neguse	Sewell	Wilson (FL)
Fleischmann	Letlow	Stefanik	Nickel	Sherman	
Flood	Loudermilk	Steil	Norcross	Sherrill	
Fox	Lucas	Steube			
Franklin, C.	Luetkemeyer	Luna			
Scott	Luttrell	Stewart			
Fry	Mace	Strong			
Fulcher	Malliotakis	Tenney			
Gaetz	Mann	Thompson (PA)			
Gallagher	Massie	Tiffany			
Garbarino	Mast	Timmons			
Garcia, Mike	McCauley	Turner			
Jimenez	McClain	Valadao			
Golden (ME)	McClintock	Van Drew			
Gonzales, Tony	McCormick	Van Dwyne			
Gonzalez,	McHenry	Van Orden			
Vicente	Meuser	Wagner			
Good (VA)	Miller (IL)	Walberg			
Gooden (TX)	Miller (OH)	Waltz			
Gosar	Miller (WV)	Weber (TX)			
Granger	Miller-Meeks	Webster (FL)			
Graves (LA)	Mills	Wenstrup			
Graves (MO)	Molinaro	Westerman			
Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Williams (NY)			
Greene (GA)	Mooney	Williams (TX)			
Griffith	Moore (AL)	Wilson (SC)			
Grothman	Moore (UT)	Wittman			
Guest	Moran	Womack			
Guthrie	Murphy	Yakym			
Hageman	Nehls	Zinke			
Harris					

NAYS—203

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Garamendi
Aguilar	Cleaver	Garcia (IL)
Allred	Clyburn	Garcia (TX)
Auchincloss	Cohen	Garcia, Robert
Balint	Connolly	Goldman (NY)
Barragán	Correa	Gomez
Beatty	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Bera	Courtney	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Craig	Harder (CA)
Blumenauer	Crockett	Hayes
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Davidson (KS)	Himes
Boyle (PA)	Davis (IL)	Horsford
Brown	Davis (NC)	Houlahan
Brownley	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Budzinski	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Bush	DeLauro	Huffman
Caraveo	DeBene	Ivey
Carbajal	Deluzio	Jackson (IL)
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Jackson (NC)
Carson	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carter (LA)	Doggett	Jacobs
Cartwright	Escobar	Jayapal
Caspar	Eshoo	Jeffries
Case	Españillat	Johnson (GA)
Casten	Evans	Kamlaager-Dove
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Fletcher	Keating
Cherfilus-	Foster	Kelly (IL)
McCormick	Foushee	Khanna
	Frankel, Lois	Kildee
	Frost	Kilmer
	Gallego	Kim (NJ)

Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin
Kuster	Omar	Smith (WA)
Landman	Pallone	Sorensen
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Soto
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stansbury
Lee (CA)	Pascrell	Stanton
Lee (NV)	Payne	Stevens
Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Strickland
Leger Fernandez	Perez	Swalwell
Levin	Peters	Sykes
Lieu	Pettersen	Takano
Lofgren	Phillips	Thanedar
Lynch	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Magaziner	Pocan	Titus
Manning	Porter	Tlaib
Matsui	Pressley	Tokuda
McBath	Ramirez	Tonko
McClellan	Raskin	Torres (CA)
McCollum	Ross	Torres (NY)
McGarvey	Ruiz	Trahan
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Trone
Meeks	Ryan	Underwood
Menendez	Salinas	Vargas
Meng	Sánchez	Vasquez
Mfume	Sarbanes	Veasey
Moore (WI)	Scanlon	Velázquez
Morelle	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Moskowitz	Schiff	Schultz
Moulton	Schneider	Waters
Mrvan	Scholten	Watson Coleman
Mullin	Schrier	Wexton
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wild
Neal	Scott, David	Williams (GA)
Neguse	Sewell	Wilson (FL)
Nickel	Sherman	
Norcross	Sherrill	

NOT VOTING—10

Beyer	Napolitano	Spanberger
Bowman	Obornote	Thompson (MS)
Gottheimer	Quigley	
Kustoff	Simpson	

□ 1630

Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SANTOS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I missed today's vote due to a memorial service extending beyond its expected duration. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 232.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes due to testing positive for COVID-19. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 232, passage of S.J. Res. 11.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had technical difficulties. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 232.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes due to a family issue. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 230, "nay" on rollcall No. 231, and "nay" on rollcall No. 232.

REQUIRING EACH MEMBER, OFFICER, AND EMPLOYEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO COMPLETE A PROGRAM OF TRAINING IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES EACH SESSION OF EACH CONGRESS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on