

□ 1230

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE  
BILL RICHARDSON

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, the enchanted State of New Mexico, the United States, and families seeking justice everywhere lost a statesman, a former Ambassador, Governor, and Congressman. Governor Bill Richardson is survived by our former first lady of incredible grace, Mrs. Barbara Richardson.

In 1983, Governor Richardson began his public service career as the first Representative of the newly formed Third Congressional District of Nuevo Mexico.

My first visit to Congress was as a young attorney representing the Navajo Nation to Governor Richardson's office. I stand on the shoulders and am grateful for his sage advice on how to serve this beautiful district.

As chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, he opposed cruel immigration policies and brought attention to Latino policy priorities everywhere. As Governor, he recognized the importance of education and economic diversity as he raised teachers' salaries and increased film production.

May we honor Bill Richardson as a tenacious champion for New Mexicans, a skillful diplomat, and a committed public servant.

REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE  
BILL RICHARDSON

(Ms. STANSBURY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, as the people of New Mexico and the world are grieving Governor Richardson, I rise today here in the House, where he served, to honor his life and legacy.

Governor Richardson has left an indelible mark on New Mexico politics and public service. Throughout his career as a Governor, Member of Congress, U.N. Ambassador, Secretary of Energy, and working in international diplomacy, anyone who knew Governor Richardson knows that he lived big, he laughed big, and he loved big.

He mentored a generation of leaders in New Mexico and served our great State and Nation to the very end. I personally met Governor Richardson as a young person when he was my Congressman and, like so many others, was catalyzed onto a path of public service on behalf of our State and our communities.

Governor Richardson's loss will be felt deeply across our State and across the planet, and today, my prayers go to his family and to everyone in New Mexico who is remembering and grieving his loss and the loss of this giant in New Mexico politics.

Rest in peace, Governor. Today, we honor your legacy here in your home in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LEGENDARY  
GOVERNOR BILL RICHARDSON

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

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I join the Representatives of New Mexico to honor the legendary Governor Bill Richardson of New Mexico.

I want to highlight what his work means for the Latino community. Bill's lasting legacy of advocacy for millions of Latinos and his work on the national political stage has made all the difference in all of our lives.

As one of the most influential Mexican Americans in history, Bill devoted his life to improving the lives of New Mexicans, Latinos, and Americans at home and abroad. His unwavering commitment to the betterment of the Latino community and the Nation has left an undeniable impact. As one of the most powerful Latinos in politics this Nation has seen, he has made many of our pathways to public service possible. This year, we are celebrating the largest number of members in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

We thank Bill for his work for New Mexico, the United States, and the world. As Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we will honor his commitment to public service every day.

"Go with God, Bill"; "Que estes con Dios, Bill."

FIFTEEN DAYS AWAY FROM A  
GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the American people are getting a front-row seat at the circus that Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY and extremists in the Republican Party are unleashing on our country.

We are 15 days away from a government shutdown that will impact millions of working people, and Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY cannot even get his own party to pass any significant pieces of legislation.

The cherry on top of all of this is that, instead of getting to work to fund the government, they are trying to impeach Hunter Biden, who, I think—spoiler alert—is not the President of the United States.

This Speaker doesn't even have the votes for impeachment, doesn't have the votes to fund the government. It is unclear whether or not he even has the votes to keep his own job.

KEVIN MCCARTHY doesn't even know what KEVIN MCCARTHY stands for because it sure looks like his morals and beliefs about how this place should run

apply only when other people are holding the gavel.

So America, 15 days from now, when our country comes to a halt, remember who did this to you: Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY and the extremist House Republicans who care more about themselves and their politics than you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 1435, PRESERVING  
CHOICE IN VEHICLE PURCHASES  
ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 681 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 681

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1435) to amend the Clean Air Act to prevent the elimination of the sale of internal combustion engines. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 681, providing for consideration of H.R. 1435.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1435 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their designees. The rule does provide one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Today, the Republican majority continues to stand between President

Biden and Democrats in Congress and their disastrous policies that they want to inflict on the American public.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is pretty simple: Republicans are for consumer choice. Democrats, apparently, are not.

Democrats don't like it when consumers have choices. It seems that our friends across the aisle, however well intentioned they may be, are a bit squeamish about leaving choices in the hands of consumers because, Mr. Speaker, in their heart of hearts, they don't trust consumers. They think they will make the wrong choice.

The tendency amongst my Democratic friends is emblematic of the larger liberal movement. That perspective, Mr. Speaker, can be distilled succinctly: The general population requires guidance and directions from elites, who are more enlightened, to prevent them from making decisions that contradict progressive principles.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my good friend from Pennsylvania, Dr. JOYCE, for standing between the Democrats and their central planners and protecting American consumers.

Without this bill, Mr. Speaker, California and other Democratic States could effectively ban internal combustion engines for all Americans, regardless of where they reside. This is not what the Founders intended when they designed our federalist system.

A de facto ban on the internal combustion engine is the point, Mr. Speaker. President Biden and his surrogates in the Democratic Party said: to end fossil fuels as we know them. Shame on us if we don't take the Democrats at their word when they say things like that.

I understand that my friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee, who I have the privilege of debating today on the floor, will likely tell us the standards that California is looking to implement are the prerogative of California. In most circumstances, I would agree with that, but this isn't most circumstances, Mr. Speaker. What California is trying to do is to usher in a de facto ban on the internal combustion engine nationwide. I give my friends across the aisle credit for their cunning.

Democrats have known that several States are aligned with California in such a manner that allows California to set vehicle emission standards that other States must then follow. Why any State would surrender its own sovereignty to another is not consistent with this country's founding, but that debate, Mr. Speaker, is for another day.

This is why we Republicans, particularly Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee, oppose State attempts to ban the internal combustion engine. This will adversely affect all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, California's waiver is a Trojan horse. What Democrats can't win at the ballot box, they intend to farm out to their friends in Federal

agencies. California is part of America but does not speak for the whole of America.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. BURGESS so much for the customary 30 minutes to discuss this bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose today's rule. There are 8 legislative days left to fund the government, and under Republican leadership, what have we done? We passed 1, just 1, of the 12 appropriations bills necessary—1 of 12.

We were supposed to take up the rule for the Defense appropriations bill yesterday, but last evening, in a rushed meeting, we changed the rule to limit it to this single bill.

The only thing we have to show for an entire week in session is a bill that attacks States' rights and California's ability to decide for its own what regulations it wants under the Clean Air Act, as it is allowed to do under existing law and has been allowed to do for decades.

Do you know what? When Democrats were in the majority in the previous Congress, we didn't hear what we are hearing from Republicans. We did not hear Democrats saying we are going to shut it down. No. Democrats have always looked for solutions. We have not been calling to shut it down. We have always worked to work it out.

Over and over again, not just this week but over the summer, we have heard extreme MAGA Republicans voice their goal of a forced government shutdown. We need to remember that the times that we have faced a shutdown and suffered through a shutdown have been when Republican Speakers were in charge.

Remember 1995–1996, 2013, 2018? We needed to have Speaker PELOSI take charge so we could open our government back up. In the Rules Committee, we heard Republicans say: Let's shut it down.

Let's make clear that the "it" that is sometimes referred to is something that is not beneficial. That "it" are the people who make sure our food is safe. The "it" they want to shut down is the program that makes sure that our women, infants and children, seniors, and veterans have enough food on their table. The "it" are the people who serve and protect our country and our services. The "it" are the people who maintain our beautiful national parks and allow us to see America's wonders.

Americans don't want us to head to a goal of: We are shutting it down.

Why don't we work it out? As Ranking Member MCGOVERN noted yesterday, the last time our government shut down, it was the longest in history due to inaction by then-President Trump and Republican majorities in the House and Senate. It cost Americans \$11 billion, \$3 billion permanently, and caused sizable suffering for our constituents.

□ 1245

We are talking about people having to take out loans all through our country. I have been visited over and over again. The auto dealers came to my chambers yesterday and talked about the repercussions that a shutdown has on their business.

People are going to have a hard time paying their mortgage, putting food on the table. But it doesn't have to be this way. The White House Democrats and Republicans negotiated a bipartisan agreement in the Fiscal Responsibility Act in June that set up the pathway to how we were going to fund the government with cuts, making sure that we kept the government funding level.

Now, a mere 3 months later they are backing out on their commitment. Extreme Republicans are blowing up our commitment to the American people. My rural district will suffer. It will suffer tremendously, as will all rural districts across this country. We need to remember rural America is the backbone of this country, and they are sacrificing it.

A shutdown could delay veterans and Social Security payments. With 8 legislative days to avoid a government shutdown, we have a bill totally unrelated to funding the government.

H.R. 1435, Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, is an attack on efforts to reduce pollution and climate change.

I have noticed that the Republicans have a habit of naming their bills to do the opposite of what the bill actually does. This legislation will remove the choice that Californians have exercised as they elect their own government and as they choose to look to how do they want to make sure they exercise their right to adopt clean air standards.

For decades, the Clean Air Act has reduced harmful air pollutants leading to fewer instances of respiratory diseases, cardiovascular problems, and other health issues. That is in part due to the law's flexibility. It allows flexibility to allow choice for California and other States to adopt strict standards.

H.R. 1435 threatens our efforts to lessen air pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fight climate change. It also disrupts the U.S. vehicle market and could harm our global competitiveness and the electric vehicle market.

I will say it again, however: At a time when we have a duty to fund the government, the Republican majority is instead picking on States' rights, picking on States that want to clean up their air and fight climate change.

I urge my colleagues to change course and oppose this rule. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), a valuable member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

some time today. I rise in support of this legislation that will put a full stop to my own State of New York from banning affordable, reliable gas-powered vehicles.

Last year, Governor Kathy Hochul announced that New York State—not to be outdone by Democrats in California—would move forward with a ban on the sale of new gas-powered vehicles by 2035.

Mr. Speaker, this asinine approach is only the latest in a long list of actions taken by the Biden administration and by Democrats in my own State to foist new bans, regulations, and costs onto the backs of hardworking middle-class Americans.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they want the American people to believe that ditching our internal combustion engines for battery-powered cars is a silver bullet to a greener, cleaner future.

My constituents in rural upstate New York are facing energy costs that are 30 percent higher than previous years, and those costs are projected only to increase further and further.

Rural towns and communities in western New York and the Southern Tier along the Pennsylvania border, they cannot survive on transportation that is solely battery powered, given the long distances driven, charger accessibility, and lack of reliability that comes with the current crop of EVs.

Last week, President Biden's own Energy Secretary Granholm put on a master class on the issues rural Americans will face, from failing to find working charging stations to long wait times. Her EV road trip was a total disaster. It was like an episode of "Veep," and we cannot make this a reality of everyday Americans.

Not only is it costly, not only is it impractical, but our electric grids are not capable of handling this latest burden. The latest reports by New York's own independent service operator show that New York State's electrical grid is strained and approaching a breaking point as Governor Hochul and Democrats in Albany ban everything connected to fossil fuels, from stoves to cars to natural gas hookups in buildings and private homes.

It is very simple, Mr. Speaker—banning gas vehicles forces New Yorkers and Californians, and one day all Americans if we keep going down this path, to live in an energy future that is less affordable, less safe, and more dependent than ever on our most dangerous adversary—China.

I strongly support this underlying legislation today and this rule as a step towards ensuring America does not follow the lead of the radical left in California, and New York. Let's put a stop to these nonsensical bans that only benefit our foreign adversaries while making life much harder for everyday Americans.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as I noted, the existing rule allows choice in each State. What

works for California may or may not work for New Mexico or other States like New York, but that is why the Clean Air Act built in flexibility. We should allow California and those States that choose to follow their lead to continue to adopt stricter vehicle standards that work for them.

I also want to make a point that car makers make business plans several years in the future. For Congress to come in and change the setting of what is happening—because right now 75 percent of vehicles sold with low emissions are being manufactured here in America—is creating culture wars that also hurt our industry workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD the September 13, 2023, letter from the United Auto Workers titled: "UAW Urges to Vote NO on the So-Called Preserving Choice in the Vehicle Purchases Act."

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

There was no objection.

[FROM THE UAW, SEPTEMBER 13, 2023]

UAW URGES TO VOTE NO ON THE SO-CALLED "PRESERVING CHOICE IN VEHICLE PURCHASES ACT" [H.R. 1435]

UAW opposes this bill because union workers are not political pawns for the culture war.

The UAW strongly opposes the so-called "Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act." This bill seeks to inject American union-made vehicles as a wedge issue into the culture war that is tearing apart America, and union members will not stand for it.

Union workers will not be used as political pawns. The UAW's fight for a just transition to Electric Vehicles must put workers at the center, otherwise we risk a race to the bottom, which would be disastrous for workers, their families, and our country.

The UAW is leading the charge to make green jobs be good union jobs. The UAW organized the first EV battery plant in the country in Ohio. This bill only parrots demagogues and CEOs to pit ICE jobs against EV jobs. We must raise standards for both. UAW is committed to make EV jobs good union jobs with the same pay and safety standards UAW members have fought for and won for generations.

The EV transition will not succeed if the workers building ICE vehicles are left behind. If we have plant closures and the loss of union jobs while companies receive billions in taxpayer subsidies, it will cultivate and energize a loud constituency against the clean economy, just like this bill.

House Republicans backing this bill are pandering to the most extreme MAGA fringe that is dividing this country.

This bill is misleading its purpose and would allow House Republicans to abuse their authority to prohibit the EPA from issuing waivers that allow states to implement their own standards on greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new motor vehicles. This would chiefly target California who, for going on 50 years, has been granted waivers from the EPA to set the strongest standards on GHG emissions in the nation. California's waiver was revoked for the first time under the Trump Administration and restored by President Biden. The waiver is currently being challenged at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit by industry groups and 19 Republican-led states.

This bill misleads what it's really trying to do. UAW members build internal combustion engine (ICE) and electric vehicles (EVs). We reject this attempt to pit ICE jobs against EV jobs.

We are focused on the future of auto manufacturing in this country. The UAW is leading the charge to make green jobs be good union jobs. The real choice is whether we secure a fair share and healthy future for the workers who build and power this country or whether we continue a race to the bottom.

This bill is a distraction that does nothing to address the corporate greed plaguing our economy or the concerns of auto workers and their families. As the UAW's contracts with Ford, GM, and Stellantis are set to expire on Thursday, it is time to pick a side. Do you support 150,000 auto workers and their fight for a fair contract or are you focused on political sideshows?

The UAW supports and is ready to lead the EV transition. Our members are building the vehicles of the future, including hybrids, plug-in hybrids (PHEVs), battery electric vehicles (BEVs), autonomous vehicles, and increasingly efficient gasoline vehicles. UAW members currently build no less than sixteen models of electric vehicles. These members rely on a stable market for the products they produce.

This bill threatens to disrupt the EV consumer market for American union-made vehicles by inflaming the culture war. UAW members in Kentucky, Tennessee, Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Pennsylvania build light and heavy-duty EVs. A vote for this bill will only risk jeopardizing these union jobs.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. I remind us all that we should be funding the government this week, not attacking individual States or workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our inspiring Speaker Emerita.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank her for her leadership on this important issue and for giving us all the opportunity to speak on the rule that would bring this shameful legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the Republicans' latest assault on the health and safety of our children. Every child deserves clean air to breathe. We in California believe this is our sacred duty. That is why our State has taken strong action to reduce vehicle pollution, preserve our environment, and protect our children.

I just have one question for our colleagues across the aisle: Why? Why don't you want children to have cleaner air to breathe? Why don't you understand what this means to their health? Why do you not understand the connection between pollution and asthma and how unfair that is to children in our population?

That is why more than five decades ago this Congress acted to preserve California's authority to protect our children and has repeatedly reauthorized that since.

Despite this precedent, this bill would restrict the ability of States like California to protect families from dangerous pollution.

Now, it is important for people to understand that as the gentlewoman

pointed out, this is at the discretion of the States. Seventeen States have decided that they would use such a waiver in order to protect the children and the air that they breathe.

Why would you want to throw the American auto industry into disarray, diminishing leadership and the electric vehicle future?

Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman referenced, it is an economic decision that the auto industry makes. We have in this body, in the Democrat majority, come to the aid of the auto industry—not corporations, but the industry and the workers—and we want our auto industry to be preeminent in the world.

California is a very big market for the auto industry. For 50 years they have lived with this emissions standard, this waiver, that enables that to happen. If you are making cars for California it is easier than to make the same safe cars for the rest of the country because it is a big market in California.

Sixteen other States have followed suit, representing at least 40 percent of new auto purchases in our country—a big chunk of our auto industry economy.

Again, what would be the reason that you would interfere in the free market of the auto industry and the free breathing for our children of cleaner air? The only explanation could be that Big Oil opposes this legislation. They are so living in the past. They don't even realize that the future is upon us, and the future is for the children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, just moments ago the distinguished gentlewoman from California made the statement and asked why Republicans don't want clean air and clean water. I reject that premise because this administration would rather mine in the Congo where they use child slave labor, zero environmental standards, and zero labor standards to get to these EV vehicles.

This administration has stopped mining in the biggest copper-nickel mine in the world, which is in northeastern Minnesota, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and this administration has stopped it.

Don't come here and ask me why my Republican colleagues and I have the stance we have. We are environmentalists, and we want clean air and clean water. That is an excuse.

We can mine in this country. We do not have to sign memorandums of understanding with the Congo who use child slave labor, and that is a fact. We can mine in northeastern Minnesota using union labor with the best environmental standards and the best labor standards in the world, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow it to happen along with this administration.

Don't stand on this House floor and say this about the Republican Party and my colleagues. We are environmentalists, as well. We mine in the United States of America. We mine in northeastern Minnesota. We can show the world. Because when we allow China to meet the demands for critical minerals, those pollutants get in the jet stream and affects us all, as the gentlewoman from California says. We breathe that disgusting air that comes from the communist country of China. So let us mine here, Mr. Speaker. Allow this administration to let us mine here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule so we can consider H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

This week, we read about the horrific cross-country road trip President Biden's Secretary of Energy faced as she tried to travel the country in her electric vehicle.

At every stop, Secretary Granholm struggled to charge her government-paid EV. She had to send staffers in gas-powered vehicles ahead of her to stand in line at the EV charging station, going so far as to block families from charging their own vehicles on hot summer days.

Her gas-powered vehicle was used by her staff so they could go sit in front of a charging station waiting for her to come so she could charge her vehicle to make a statement and let that family suffer waiting for the charging station to be open.

□ 1300

Now, just imagine if Secretary Granholm tried driving across northern Minnesota in the middle of winter when it was 20 below, 37 below, or 50 below. By the way, that cold in Minnesota, we still go to work and we still mine and we still weld, in the coldest of temperatures. Can you imagine her trying to do that? I am not even sure her EV would even start.

My constituents do not have the luxury of having government-paid staffers to advance their road trips and access EV charging stations ahead of time.

My constituents cannot afford to pay an extra \$17,000, on average, for an electric vehicle, especially as Bidenomics destroys the pocketbooks of my constituents who have had to pay an average of \$10,000 more a year.

If Americans want to drive EVs, they can, but they shouldn't be forced to. It should be their choice. Today, nearly 95 percent of Americans drive an internal combustion engine, a vehicle powered by gasoline or some form of ethanol or biofuels.

If liberal elitists from California want to drive electric vehicles, so be it. My constituents should not be forced to do the same. I believe in choice, not mandates by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and supporting H.R. 1435, because it is time that Congress steps up and protects our

constituents from ridiculous mandates that affect our way of life.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I truly appreciated the Speaker Emerita is leading us to think about the why and to think about the children, to think about the children and their health. We must remember that Democrats are not against consumer choices, but what we are for is consumer safety.

Should we allow consumers to choose leaded gas once again? No. Because we know what it does to our children's lungs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a July 25, 2023, letter from the American Lung Association opposing H.R. 1435.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION,  
Chicago, IL, July 27, 2023.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Chair,  
Hon. FRANK PALLONE, Ranking Member,  
Committee on Energy & Commerce,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIR MCMORRIS RODGERS AND RANKING MEMBER PALLONE: The American Lung Association strongly supports the Clean Air Act and the success the landmark law has achieved over its fifty plus years. The air we breathe is much cleaner today than it was before Congress came together to pass this bipartisan law. The transportation sector is a major contributor to air pollution. The nation must continue to use the tools of the Clean Air Act to further transition the sector to cleaner, healthier vehicles—not see those tools blocked, weakened or delayed. Bills under consideration in today's hearing would dismantle Clean Air Act requirements to set vehicle pollution standards that protect health.

H.R. 4468 would prohibit EPA from finalizing and implementing a rule that will reduce 15,000 tons of particle pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and 66,000 tons of smog-forming nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>). The reductions in PM<sub>2.5</sub> alone are estimated to amount to between \$63–280 billion in health benefits. The rule would also eliminate around 7.3 billion metric tons of carbon pollution. These emissions of greenhouse gases are warming the climate and contributing to this summer's devastating instances of flooding, wildfire smoke and excessive heat.

H.R. 1435 would weaken the provision of the Clean Air Act that gives California the authority to set stronger vehicle emissions standards and other states the ability to adopt those standards. The Lung Association strongly supports California's pollution control authority. California faces extraordinary conditions when it comes to air pollution. That unique position was affirmed when the Clean Air Act passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in 1970 with the inclusion of a section allowing California to set standards that went beyond federal protections. This partnership between California and the federal government has continued through both Republican and Democratic administrations to achieve cleaner air not only in California but nationwide. Undermining that partnership with this legislation would reverse clean air progress and threaten public health.

The most recent “State of the Air” report from the American Lung Association noted

that approximately 120 million Americans live in communities impacted by unhealthy levels of ozone and/or PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Exposure to air pollution can contribute to asthma attacks, heart attacks and stroke, lung cancer, low birthweight and premature birth and premature death. Traffic pollution is specifically associated with premature death due to cardiovascular disease, lung cancer death, asthma onset in children and adults and other negative health outcomes. The transportation sector is also the leading source of climate pollution in the United States. Climate impacts on health include degraded air and water quality, increases in vector-borne diseases, mental health impacts and more. A rapid transition to zero-emission technologies is urgently needed to ensure cleaner air and to reverse course on climate change.

The American Lung Association's recent "Driving to Clean Air" report highlighted that approaching a 100 percent zero-emissions sales of light- and medium-duty vehicles scenario by 2035, along with a non-combustion electricity grid, could result in major health benefits. The report found that the cumulative health benefits could reach \$978 billion by 2050, including nearly 90,000 premature deaths avoided, over 2 million asthma attacks avoided and more than 10 million lost workdays avoided due to cleaner air. Prohibiting progress towards a zero-emission transportation sector is therefore not only a threat to innovation and economic opportunity, it is also a threat to health.

The American Lung Association opposes these bills and urge the Committee to reject these and other attempts to weaken the Clean Air Act.

Sincerely,

HAROLD P. WIMMER,  
*National President and CEO.*

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, 100 million Americans live in counties with unhealthy air pollution. Our children, our elders, low-income communities, and communities of color are most at risk. The good news is, we are addressing it. The good news is, with the Chips and Science Act, we are starting to do research that will lead to even bigger and better advances in how we bring down those emissions.

With the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act, we are building out the electric charging stations that we need so you can get across Minnesota, New Mexico, and everywhere in between if you choose to have an electric vehicle. That is going to be your choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY), an amazing sister who believes in fighting for the clean air of our beautiful State.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to this rule. What we should be focusing on is actually funding the government, which is our constitutional duty. Instead, we are here debating a ridiculous rule on the eve of a Republican shutdown manufactured by extremists in the GOP. I remind everyone that the last time the government was shut down, it cost the American people \$11 billion.

Now, the very same people who tried to tank our economy just months ago over the debt ceiling are threatening a government shutdown that would cost our country billions of dollars and

threaten the economies, the livelihoods, and the people of my State, in New Mexico, with far-reaching consequences.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of New Mexicans, Federal employees, Active-Duty military, and others would go unpaid, and it is shameful. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the amazing Mr. Ian Fluellen, a dedicated member of my team over the last 2 years.

Since June of 2021, Ian has fiercely and loyally served the people of New Mexico's First Congressional District. He has served as a dedicated legislative staffer for nearly a decade, serving in the offices of Congressmen JIM COSTA, G.K. Butterfield, MARK DESAULNIER, and myself.

He was raised in Las Vegas and received his bachelor's degree in political science and government at the University of Nevada, Reno. His love for government and making the world a better place is what propelled him into a career in public service.

During Ian's time in my office, he has proven to be a talented, brilliant, and truly extraordinary staffer. He has been instrumental in guiding my office, leading our legislative team, serving the constituents of our State, managing our D.C. office, mentoring young staffers, and helping them to thrive.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of New Mexico's First Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and thanking Ian for his nearly 9 years of service on Capitol Hill.

His quick wit and constant support will be missed every single day in our office. I wish him all the best. We will miss him very much.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to constantly talk about what we are not doing here today. We are not talking about the appropriations bills that we need to fund our government. Maybe it is because the other side doesn't really want us to know, does not want the American public to know all of the awful things that are in those appropriations bills.

The 2024 funding bills that the Republicans wrote are so extreme, their own conference is having a hard time swallowing the devastation the drastic cuts will do in America. These bills are a direct attack on rural America, on families, our servicemembers, on our climate goals, and the list goes on.

What are some of the terrible provisions that we have reviewed in the Rules Committee that we are not talking about on the floor today?

One, inching toward a national abortion ban. In the Defense appropriations bill, they included a ban for servicemembers, women, and their families from taking paid leave or traveling to obtain an abortion or related healthcare services related to a woman's reproductive health.

If a woman is raped and wants an abortion and lives in a State where there are no exceptions, that servicewoman, who joined to serve our country, has no choice, if she lives in 1 of 14 States in this country.

They told our servicewomen that if they choose to serve our country, they will be deprived of the care they need. In the same bill, they cut \$714 million for the Department of Defense climate change programs.

I need to tell you, we read into the RECORD the fact that it has been told that the Nation who has the advantage of addressing climate change and building resilience will have a military strategic advantage. Once again, they are taking away our military strategic advantage not just with that but refusing, the Republicans, to go ahead and allow our nomination for flag officers to serve. Over and over again in this bill, they are weakening our ability to serve and defend our country.

In the Agriculture appropriations bill, they returned funding to 2007 levels. Imagine what that kind of cut does to our rural communities, from slashing cuts for rural electric co-ops, like I have throughout my district, to making sure that our children go hungry. A mother cannot feed herself or her baby if she is cut back to 2007 levels, but that is what Republicans are prioritizing.

We are not really talking about these bills because we are not talking about funding the government, are we?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, who I am sure will address some of these issues.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, 16 days, that is how much time we have left until the government runs out of funding.

Six weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I stood here on the floor of the House with my colleagues as House Republicans gavelled the House out of session for a 45-day recess.

Now, you may recall, Mr. Speaker, the priority that House Republicans were pursuing on that day, as we gavelled out of session. I can assure you it was not to fund the government. It was, instead, a bill targeting the lesser prairie chicken and the long-eared bat, literally. This came on the heels of a summer spent on Republican bills to protect gas stoves.

Six weeks later, we are back in Washington. Republicans have gavelled the Congress back into session. Here we are on the House floor yet again. What are we spending our time doing? Perhaps a bill to fund the government? No. A bill to ensure that members of our armed

forces are paid, that the operations of our government remain up and running? No. Instead, House Republicans choose to spend the time of this body debating a bill attacking electric vehicles.

Electric vehicles, gas stoves, the long-eared bat, and the lesser prairie chicken. Those are the priorities of the House Republican caucus. Sixteen days away from a government shutdown, and this is how House Republicans choose to spend our time.

The priorities that House Republicans are pursuing are grossly out of step with the priorities of the American people.

You are in charge, Mr. Speaker. You could choose today to put bills on the floor to build safer communities or lower costs or grow the middle class. Instead, we are left with political games, and, oh, that is right, a baseless impeachment inquiry that the Speaker announced 48 hours ago. Maybe we can get back to the basic job of the U.S. House of governing, of passing a budget.

Mr. Speaker, there is a good place to start. The Fiscal Responsibility Act that this body passed a mere 4 months ago set out negotiated spending levels. I don't know if the Speaker voted for it, but 149 of your colleagues did in the Republican caucus. The ranking member, my friend from Texas, voted for it.

Now, months later, the Republican caucus, the Speaker, they have abandoned, they have revoked, reneged on that deal. Why? Because the far-right members of their caucus have demanded it. Here we are, 16 days away from a government shutdown that many members of the Republican Conference seem fixated on creating.

We had a Rules Committee hearing, which the distinguished gentlewoman joined me in, just a few days ago, where one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle was unabashed, who said: Let's shut it down.

Of course, for those Americans watching, they know that we have been here before. They have seen this movie. They have seen how it ends.

□ 1315

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, they know that if Republicans are in control of the House, there is one thing they can count on, and that is that Republicans will shut the government down as they did in the 1990s under Speaker Newt Gingrich, as they did in 2013 under Speaker Boehner, as they did in 2018 under Speaker Ryan.

I implore my colleagues to get back to the basics of governing. Work with us in good faith. Honor the agreement that you all voted for 4 months ago. Let's fund the government, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people's House's duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these vital programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this harmful, ridiculous rule because it pushes partisan provisions and does not address the issues that actually matter to the American people, as I hear in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring legislation like H. Res. 178 to the floor for a vote to reaffirm our commitment to protecting Social Security and Medicare.

These vital programs are lifelines for seniors. They provide our seniors with the financial support and health coverage they have earned and rightfully deserve.

In Virginia's Fourth, there are over 150,000 seniors on Social Security and who are eligible for Medicare.

Virginians and Americans across the Nation need Congress to focus on the issues that really matter to them, and I know hundreds of thousands of seniors in my district rely on these programs to keep food on the table and access the healthcare services and prescription drugs they need.

For years, extreme Republicans have sought to cut Social Security and Medicare benefits, privatize these programs, and raise the age of eligibility for Social Security and Medicare. House Democrats stand united in our efforts to strengthen and preserve these programs to ensure our seniors have the support that they need to live with dignity.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time for House Republicans to stop the partisan messaging bills and get back to work on the challenges that face our constituents.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, California's leadership on protecting public health and safeguarding our environment should be a national model.

When the Federal Government has failed to guarantee cleaner air to every

Californian, our State government has acted to reduce harm.

When Washington, D.C., politicians were doing the bidding of Big Oil, California had the courage to curb pollution and improve air quality.

California's recent strengthening of emission standards will save \$13 billion in healthcare costs and prevent more than 1,200 lives from being cut short. House Republicans' wrongheaded legislation would undo this progress and substitute their judgment for that of California's own representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1435 and instead work to provide cleaner air to every American.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, following up on the gentlewoman from California's comments and on the importance of looking at this industry and how it is growing, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a January 12, 2023, article.

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

There was no objection.

[From Jalopnik, Jan. 12, 2023]

EVs MADE IN THE U.S. ARE DOMINATING THE MARKET

(By Andy Kalmowitz)

A new report shows that electric vehicles built in U.S. factories by far and away lead the domestic EV market, and it doesn't seem like that trend is going to be coming to a stop anytime soon. According to Automotive News, new vehicle registration data from Experian shows that U.S.-made EVs account for about 75 percent of new electric vehicles in the first 11 months of 2022.

On top of that, U.S.-based automakers were also responsible for almost all local production, according to the outlet. The biggest exception was Nissan. Its Leaf, which is built in Tennessee, held 1.7 percent of the U.S. EV market share.

Tesla (which just dethroned BMW as the luxury sales king), General Motors and EV startup like Rivian are in the proverbial driver's seat for this manufacturing trend. The Inflation Reduction Act that was signed into law in 2022 also has something to do with it. The Act ended the \$7,500 EV tax credit for vehicles built outside of North America. It's reportedly spelling bad news for U.S. manufacturers and supply chains as the world's auto market makes the transition to electric vehicles over the coming decade.

But, because of the new stipulations in the IRA, automakers around the globe are accelerating plans to build electric vehicles in the U.S., according to Auto News. Volkswagen and MercedesBenz actually started delivering U.S.-made EVs at the end of last year.

Asian and European brands own a comparatively very small piece of the EV sales pie. On the other hand, Texas-based Tesla leads the pack with 64 percent of the market share in the first 11 months of 2022, according to Experian's data. Ford came in second place with 7.4 percent of the market. It was followed by Chevrolet at 4.7 percent, Kia at 4 percent, Hyundai at 3.7 percent, Volkswagen at 2.4 percent, Audi at 2.2 percent and Rivian at 1.9 percent.

"This increased domestic EV production, inspired by the IRA, will build the supply chain quicker than anyone previously thought possible," Sam Fiorani, vice president of global vehicle forecasting at



AutoForecast Solutions, said. "As long as the IRA remains open-ended, without time or volume limitations, the battery and component infrastructure will grow in North America until the market becomes saturated sometime after 2035."

As you may have expected, the best selling EVs on the market in the first 11 months of 2022 were led by the Tesla Model Y. The automaker reportedly sold 200,592 crossovers. Coming in second was another Tesla, the Model 3 sedan, which sold 175,661 units. Third was the Ford Mustang Mach-E with 34,643 registrations, with fourth and fifth place again occupied by Tesla vehicles: the Model X and Model S, which had 30,125 registrations and 25,362 registrations respectively. Rounding out the top 10 U.S. EV registrations were the Chevrolet Bolt EUV with 22,421 registrations, Hyundai Ioniq 5 with 21,086 registrations and the Kia EV6 with 19,163. After that we have the Volkswagen ID.4 with 16,345 registrations, and finally the Rivian R1T pickup with 11,637 registrations.

It'll be interesting to see how these market dynamics shift over the next few years as more and more automakers qualify for the \$7,500 EV tax credit.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that there are health benefits from the Clean Air Act, but there are also benefits to our manufacturing sector, as well.

H.R. 1435 completely ignores the benefits of EV production. They are completely going to be undermining the importance of manufacturing in the United States, what we need in the United States. Why would we want the industry to move to other countries when we can make it here in America?

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the reason why so many of us have stood up today in opposition to this rule and have stood up in opposition to this rule for what it does not do. It does not address the looming crisis that the extreme Republicans and, apparently, the entire Republican Conference—because they are all moving toward that. My colleagues on the other side could meet and work with us, but no. Once again, they want to shut it down.

It is our duty to govern. Under Republican leadership, we have not seen any governing happening. We have not passed the appropriations bills that America needs to keep our government open.

Would that be acceptable in any other arena? It would not be acceptable in my State of New Mexico to allow a party to actually just shut down our government. That would be reprehensible. It should be reprehensible here, as well.

The Republicans cannot escape that this is their playbook. They do it over and over again. When they hold the gavel in this House, they shut down the government.

For what? For extreme demands that we have already discussed, demands that attack women and their ability to make choices about their own reproductive healthcare in consultation with their own faith, with their own family and those they love, and not with their Congressperson but with their doctors.

For what? Because they don't want to, and they are protecting their millionaire friends and the big corporations. They do not want to make sure that they pay their fair share of taxes, so they prefer to shut down the government, a government that serves the American people in so many different ways.

Our Democratic voices that are coming to this Chamber, that are coming to the people's House from districts as diverse and beautiful as mine, know that we must bring their voices to this table, to this House, and say to keep it open and keep offering the services that protect us, that keep us safe, that make sure that our education is broad and has help where it is needed, that our Native American communities that we serve continue to receive the healthcare and law enforcement that we need, that we make sure that our Department of Justice is doing its job—because it is—and that we do all that work so our railroads are safe and our food is safe.

We must do all that work to make sure our government is kept open.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose today's rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

On the subject of paying taxes, I do hope the special prosecutor is successful in ensuring that the President's family pays their fair share in taxes. I know that is an ongoing issue before the courts now.

Mr. Speaker, according to a Stanford University study, California will need to triple its electricity supply just to fuel all the additional electric vehicles on the road as a result of the ban on gas and diesel vehicle sales. The grid expansion alone is going to cost Californians at least \$75 billion in higher electric rates.

I want to reference a document prepared by the Committee on Energy and Commerce because, obviously, that committee was responsible for our underlying bill, and their discussion on electric vehicle mandates, on how they are unaffordable and impractical.

The majority of vehicles, 95 percent on the road today, run on internal combustion engines. Electric vehicles are still too expensive for many Americans. I would reference that, basically, these are subsidized toys for rich people.

The average transaction price of an electric vehicle was \$17,000 more than a gas-powered vehicle in 2022. Gas-powered vehicles continue to outperform EVs with significantly higher ranges and greater towing capacity, and they are less susceptible to issues caused by severe weather conditions.

Electric vehicles lose 40 percent of their range in cold weather. We are going to put all of our kids on electric schoolbuses in northern States in wintertime and hope they get to their destination okay. If they don't, the bus is not going to have enough power to

keep the children warm until they get a rescue vehicle out there.

The lack of vehicle charging infrastructure in many parts of the country, especially rural areas, makes electric vehicles impractical. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Secretary of Energy for so eloquently demonstrating that fact last week.

Rampant EV expansion could overwhelm the electric grid and compromise grid reliability, which would result in blackouts and other issues.

We had a really hot summer in Texas. It made the newspapers in several locations. Good news—solar energy did supply the grid with a lot of solar power.

Here is a news flash for you, and you can't make this stuff up. The Sun goes down every night. Just when everyone is getting home and plugging in their electric vehicles, or maybe their electric schoolbuses, and they come in the back door and: Oh, my gosh, this house is hotter than Hades. Crank up the AC, and guess what? The Sun set. Solar power is offline. The grid can't handle it. That is a dangerous situation.

Finally, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out to us so eloquently, China controls the vast majority of the mining, processing, and manufacturing of critical minerals for electric vehicles, including 75 percent of lithium-ion batteries, as well as the processing and refining capacity for over half of the world's lithium, cobalt, and graphite. The administration unwisely prohibited mining in the northern range of Minnesota, so the administration was all too eager to go to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and employ child slave labor in order to get those critical elements.

I thank my fellow members of the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing us this important piece of legislation to begin to roll back some of the damage that President Biden has placed on the middle class.

I don't know why this administration has declared war on the middle class, but they have, and it has been, unfortunately, readily apparent every day since Inauguration Day 2021.

Republicans remain united in pursuing a legislative agenda that puts the welfare of the American people above the special interests of a few.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the rule and support the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 681 OFFERED BY  
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one

hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Ms. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 198, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

#### YEAS—214

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

Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Strong  
Tennet  
Thompson (PA)

Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Dwyne  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

#### NAYS—198

Adams  
Aguilar  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragan  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cardenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick

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

Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Phillips  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Trahan  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

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 yeas appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SCANLON. 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—yeas 215, noes 200, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

#### AYES—215

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

#### NOT VOTING—21

Allred	Jackson Lee	Peltola
Castro (TX)	James	Pingree
Crenshaw	Lucas	Salazar
D'Esposito	Luna	Sewell
Davis (IL)	McBath	Takano
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
Ivey	Nehls	Trone

□ 1353

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. GREEN of Texas, ROBERT GARCIA of California, JEFFRIES, and MAGAZINER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.



## NOES—200

Adams	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Aguilar	Gomez	Pappas
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pascarell
Balint	Vicente	Payne
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Bera	Grijalva	Peters
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Phillips
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Porter
Bonamici	Horsford	Pressley
Bowman	Houlahan	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Brown	Huffman	Raskin
Brownley	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Budzinski	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Bush	Jacobs	Ruppersberger
Caraveo	Jayapal	Ryan
Carbajal	Jeffries	Salinas
Cardenas	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
Carson	Kamlager-Dove	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Kaptur	Scanlon
Cartwright	Keating	Schakowsky
Casar	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Case	Khanna	Schneider
Casten	Kildee	Scholten
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Schrier
Cherfilus	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)
McCormick	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Chu	Kuster	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Landsman	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Cohen	Lee (NV)	Soto
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Spanberger
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Spartz
Costa	Levin	Stansbury
Courtney	Lieu	Stanton
Craig	Lofgren	Stevens
Crockett	Lynch	Strickland
Crow	Magaziner	Swalwell
Cuellar	Manning	Sykes
Davids (KS)	Matsui	Takano
Davis (NC)	McClellan	Thamendar
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McGovern	Titus
DelBene	Meeks	Tlaib
Deluzio	Menendez	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	Meng	Tonko
Dingell	Mfume	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Moore (WI)	Trahan
Escobar	Morelle	Underwood
Eshoo	Moskowitz	Vargas
Espallat	Moulton	Vasquez
Evans	Mrvan	Veasey
Fletcher	Mullin	Velázquez
Foster	Nadler	Wasserman
Foushee	Napolitano	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Neal	Waters
Frost	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Nickel	Wexton
Garamendi	Norcross	Wild
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garcia (TX)	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Garcia, Robert	Pallone	

## NOT VOTING—18

Allred	Ivey	Nehls
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Peltola
Crenshaw	Lucas	Pingree
D'Esposito	Luna	Sewell
Davis (IL)	Mace	Torres (NY)
Hoyer	McBath	Trone

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1402

Ms. SHERRILL changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

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.

## PRESERVING CHOICE IN VEHICLE PURCHASES ACT

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 681, I call up the bill (H.R. 1435) to amend the Clean Air Act to prevent the elimination of the sale of internal combustion engines, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1435

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act”.

## SEC. 2. STATE STANDARDS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7543(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking the “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “part.” and inserting “part, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) such State standards directly or indirectly limit the sale or use of new motor vehicles with internal combustion engines, as such term is defined in section 63.9375 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect January 1, 2023.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The Administrator may not determine that any State standards amended after the date of enactment of this paragraph are within the scope of a waiver granted under paragraph (1) before the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

(b) EFFECT ON CERTAIN EXISTING WAIVERS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall revoke a waiver granted under section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7543(b)) during the period that begins on January 1, 2022, and ends on the date of enactment of this Act if the Administrator finds that such waiver does not comply with subparagraph (D) of section 209(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7543(b)(1)), as added by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The bill 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 gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1435.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 1435 from my colleague and an Energy

and Commerce Committee member, Dr. JOHN JOYCE.

For more than a century, the internal combustion engine has allowed people to increase their mobility and raise their standard of living. Restrictive government mandates aren't how we are going to lead the next 100 years, yet that is what EPA and California are trying to do by mandating that new vehicles sold in the State be electric. Seventeen other States are ready to follow suit if the EPA approves the recent waiver request from California.

The reality is that gas-powered cars are much less expensive than EVs and continue to outperform them in range, towing capacity, and their ability to operate in severe weather conditions. Studies have also warned that a rushed EV expansion could overwhelm our electric grid.

In California, Governor Newsom has resorted to asking people not to charge their EVs during blackouts. EVs currently make up just 4 percent of the vehicles in his State.

The decision to choose should apply across the board, whether that is for gas powered, EVs, or hybrid.

H.R. 1435 prevents EPA from granting California a waiver to limit the sale or use of new gas-powered cars. It is vital that we stop this effort to force an electricity transition on Americans, especially when you consider how China dominates the industry and supply chains and has even taken steps to build its own electric vehicle foothold in Mexico, specifically so it can access the U.S. market.

We need to focus on ensuring access to affordable, reliable transportation and ensuring our electric grid is dependable so people can keep their lights on, keep going to the store to get their groceries, stay warm, and live their lives.

Protecting people's way of life and their ability to provide for their families is the fundamental goal of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” 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 opposition to H.R. 1435.

Tens of millions of Americans battled extreme heat, flooding, and storms this summer, threatening their health, homes, and livelihoods. Last month, Hurricane Idalia became our Nation's 23rd billion-dollar weather disaster this year. That is a record, and it is only September.

The damage caused by climate change and dangerous pollution cannot be ignored, yet that is exactly what House Republicans are doing with this bill. They are, once again, doing the bidding of their corporate polluter friends at the expense of Americans' health and security and our Nation's economy.

The transportation sector is the single largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air