

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

pollution, but, once again, Republicans want to bury their heads in the sand and ignore reality, even while more than 100 million Americans are right now living in counties with unhealthy levels of air pollution.

Thanks to decades of innovation in the American auto industry, spurred forward by technology-driven standards, we have a large and growing fleet of cleaner, more affordable cars that benefit all Americans. These standards have helped cement the United States as a global leader in the transportation sector.

Congress carefully crafted the Clean Air Act to recognize the diverse air pollution challenges facing each State. Due to a history of severe air quality problems, the EPA can grant California waivers to set vehicle emission standards that are more protective than those at the Federal level, and other States can voluntarily adopt California's standards if they choose to do so. EPA has granted dozens of these waivers, and 17 States and the District of Columbia have followed California's lead, including my home State of New Jersey.

The law ensures that any State has the freedom to choose to adopt these stronger vehicle emission standards if it works for them. H.R. 1435 would gut that freedom of choice.

The bill directs the EPA to revoke all existing waivers and future waivers under the Clean Air Act for any California vehicle emission standards related to internal combustion engines.

□ 1415

This bill would turn back the clock over 50 years of both Congress and the EPA recognizing California's statutory authority to set more protective vehicle emission standards. It infringes on the rights of States like my home State of New Jersey to voluntarily adopt those standards to protect people from dangerous air pollution. This bill would also cause chaos and uncertainty for the American automotive industry by forcing the EPA to revoke waivers going all the way back to 2013.

Now, Republicans' portrayal of this bill as protecting consumer choice is completely detached from reality. This bill will discourage any manufacturing of hybrid or electric vehicles. There would be no incentives for automakers to invest in the production of hybrids and EVs, and they would simply not be available as a cleaner and cheaper choice. The bill blocks any State's ability to break free from the grip of Big Oil.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker: Nobody is taking away your gas-powered vehicle. Republicans are fear-mongering in a deliberate effort to mislead the American people. The truth is, Republicans are trying to legislate away years of American innovation in cleaner transportation in yet another attempt to do the bidding of their Big Oil friends. They are once again putting polluters over people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

There is truly nothing more American than the freedom of the open road. Americans have built their lives around reliable and affordable transportation, and now, government overreach is threatening to put the cars, trucks, and SUVs that hardworking Americans need out of reach.

At its core, the vote on H.R. 1435 asks a very simple question: Should consumers or the Federal Government decide what type of vehicles Americans can drive?

This legislation is designed to address an issue created by California's Advanced Clean Cars II regulations that seek to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles in the next decade by requiring 35 percent of new vehicle sales to be electric vehicles in 2026 and fully 100 percent of sales to be electric vehicles by 2035.

Because of the fact that 17 other States have adopted portions of California's Clean Air Act regulations, this decision could potentially impact over 40 percent of the American auto market, and if enacted, would create a de facto ban on all gas-powered vehicles in the United States.

As originally created, California's carve-out in the Clean Air Act of 1970 was designed to combat smog and pollution in and around Los Angeles, and it was never intended to be used as a tool to ban the vehicles that have transported Americans for over 100 years.

Currently, the only thing standing in the way of California's implementation of this policy is a required EPA waiver.

That is why I, along with Representatives Latta, Bilirakis, and Obernolte, introduced H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act. This bill would prevent the EPA Administrator from granting a waiver to any regulation that would limit the sale or use of new vehicles with internal combustion engines.

We cannot expect vehicle manufacturers to build one car for California and another one for Pennsylvania.

In areas like my district in central and western Pennsylvania, electric vehicles are unable to perform in the mountainous terrain and lose range in high heat and in extreme cold.

On a recent trip, Energy Secretary Granholm was unable to use a fleet of electric vehicles to travel across the State of Georgia without using a gas-powered vehicle to block a public charging station ahead of her arrival.

Mr. Speaker, not every family will have an advance staffer ready to reserve a charger for their vehicle. Even the Biden administration's EPA Ad-

ministrator Michael Regan did not support the banning of internal combustion engines.

In May, when I asked Administrator Regan if he supported such a ban during an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing he responded: "No, not at all."

It is clear that more government interference cannot deliver innovation that Americans rely on.

There are fundamental issues of our Nation's infrastructure that would prevent us from transitioning to an all-electric model, including the state of our electric grid.

Under President Biden's Green New Deal agenda, we have seen coal-powered plants close, we have seen him stop the production of natural gas, and we have seen new drilling leases canceled from Alaska to the Gulf of Mexico.

Instead of utilizing the power sources underneath the feet of my constituents, President Biden's administration has attempted to subsidize energy sources like wind turbines and solar panels that have been proven to be ineffective at providing our grid with the power necessary for charging electric vehicles en masse.

As we look towards the future of electric vehicles, the Chinese Communist Party is taking aggressive steps to position themselves as the leader in developing EV battery technology.

Through the CCP's control of the critical minerals and resources needed to make electric batteries, a full transition to these vehicles would be a boon for the Chinese economy while hurting Americans.

It has become clear that transitioning to a fully electric auto market would put China and not American autoworkers in the driver's seat.

Today, it is time for the House to pass the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act and allow American families and American consumers to choose the vehicles that they want and the vehicles that they can afford.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. The Governor of California does not have the right to determine what type of vehicle my constituents in Pennsylvania are able to buy. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee.

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1435. Make no mistake, we are at a critical moment in history. The climate crisis is here, and over 100 million Americans

live in counties with unhealthy levels of traditional air pollution.

Thanks to vehicle standards, incentives, and R&D policies, the U.S. auto industry is poised to lead the world in clean transportation innovation.

We should focus on supporting these policies, not weakening them.

Sadly, H.R. 1435 would toss aside decades of legal precedent, upending the California waiver process and threatening the innovation already underway.

Rather than restate what my Californian colleagues have said and will say about the history of the Clean Air Act and the importance of the waiver process to protecting public health, I want to look forward.

For over 100 years, America has been the greatest auto manufacturing nation in the world. This is largely because we have embraced innovation and we have embraced our skilled unionized workforce.

If we want to continue to retain this title, we need to embrace the changes that are occurring in that sector.

The transportation revolution is here. It is already creating jobs and reducing pollution, in large part thanks to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Inflation Reduction Act.

When we hear concerns about inadequate charging options, we need to remember that charging infrastructure is going to become much more widespread and better performing in the near future thanks to the \$7.5 billion enacted in the infrastructure law.

When we hear about stresses on the grid, let's remember that there are tens of billions of dollars in the infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act to make our electric system smarter, more resilient, and, yes, more capable of meeting these new demands.

When we hear that clean vehicles will support China, let's acknowledge that this will only be true if we fail to develop our own domestic supply chains.

Just 2 weeks ago, DOE announced \$15.5 billion in grants and loans to support retooling existing factories for the transition to EVs. This will be complementary to so many public and private investments that are enabling critical mineral processing and battery manufacturing here in the U.S.

We can continue to be the world's leader in automotive innovation for the next century, but only if we embrace the regulatory policies and the incentives that will drive us forward to a cleaner and healthier future, which is why I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, States are not free under the Clean Air Act to regulate cars any way they want. Section 209 has conditions.

Also, the bill does not repeal or weaken any of the Clean Air Act levels. We have the strictest clean air regulations of any place in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank our chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, which is legislation I co-lead.

California's Air Resources Board has made the decision to ban the sale of new internal combustion engines by the year 2035. This action was a major component in the State's radical climate agenda that is being forced on their citizens.

Normally, the actions of one State would not require a Federal response; however, in this case, California's actions extend far beyond their State's borders and will have consequences for all Americans. This is because 17 other States follow California's standards, representing 40 percent of the Nation's car market.

When Congress first set up this process, it never intended for California to be able to dictate to the rest of the country what types of vehicles they can purchase. Instead, Congress wanted to give California additional tools to combat smog levels.

To make matters worse, California has not clearly considered the impact these actions will have on the Nation's electric grid. As officials from the DOE and FERC confirmed to me this week, we are going to need more power, not less power, in this country to meet consumer demand. If California's Governor is already calling on his residents to conserve energy now to avoid blackouts and brownouts, how in the world will the grid be able to handle the load with millions of additional electric cars?

Additionally, the Biden administration is doing nothing to address the problem of accessing all the rare earth minerals that we need to manufacture an all-EV fleet. These materials are controlled by Communist China who will stand to reap the windfall of these policies.

H.R. 1435 is a commonsense bill because it institutes a check on any State that seeks to exploit the Clean Air Act. The American people are the better arbiters of what vehicles will serve their families' needs, not bureaucrats with political agendas.

Let me be clear: This legislation does not prevent California from being able to retain a waiver from the U.S. EPA to combat their smog issues, which was the original intent of the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), who is the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 1435.

California has long been a global leader in the fight against air pollution. Whether it is greenhouse gases, smog, or other harmful pollutants,

California has often been the first State to protect our citizens from the terrible health impacts of dirty air.

You get a lot of criticism when you are a leader, and Californians are no strangers to criticism. Time and again, that criticism fades as the rest of the country, and often other countries, see the benefits of California's emissions policies.

In 1966, California established the first tailpipe emissions standard in the Nation. The country soon followed with the Clean Air Act of 1970, which created the EPA, and established the first national air pollution standards.

The Clean Air Act also recognized California's leadership by explicitly affirming California's authority to set more stringent emission standards.

Thanks to that authority, California continued to lead the fight against air pollution and adopted the first NO_x standards and the first particulate matter standards for motor vehicles.

□ 1430

In 2004, California adopted the first greenhouse gas pollution standards for vehicles. The EPA followed in 2010 with the first national standards for greenhouse gas pollution from vehicles.

Now, the impacts of climate change, caused by fossil fuel pollution, are becoming more numerous and deadlier. More frequent and more intense floods, hurricanes, wildfires, and heat waves threaten to make our communities unlivable.

This bill, however, enshrines the internal combustion engine in the Clean Air Act. We are leading the Nation with cutting-edge vehicle emission standards that will reduce greenhouse gas pollutants and lead the world in the fight against climate change. This bill is a love letter to Big Oil, legally mandating that Americans think first of the internal combustion engine before considering air quality or public health.

We have a chance to stop climate change before it is too late, but this bill would keep dirty gas and diesel cars on the road forever, dooming our children to face the worst impacts of climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1435.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, Chairwoman RODGERS is doing a great job. We are so fortunate to be on this committee. I think it is the best committee in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation that I co-lead with Representatives JOYCE, LATTA, and the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

The California ban would have far-reaching national effects, not only indirectly forcing EV vehicles onto consumers outside of California and the 17

other States tied to California standards, but also likely increasing the cost of all new vehicles nationwide and giving consumers fewer choices. We are all about choices, Mr. Speaker.

Currently, auto manufacturers face significant losses with their EV divisions and rely on the profits from their gas-powered vehicle sales to maintain profitability.

If this California rule stands, auto manufacturers will likely be forced to increase retail costs on all their vehicle options to remain profitable.

Many of my constituents are on fixed incomes and cannot afford to humor California's or the Biden administration's radical green policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this particular bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), a member of our committee.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1435.

Despite its name, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, this bill would actually reduce choice for both consumers and the States they live in.

By making egregious changes to the Clean Air Act's Section 209 waiver authority, this bill would add significant impacts on our collective ability to adopt clean vehicle technologies, combat climate change, and promote environmental justice.

It would not only imperil California's statutorily granted ability to seek waivers to implement more protective standards for vehicle emissions, but it would also significantly hamper the rights of any States that have chosen or may choose to follow California's lead.

Under Section 177 of the Clean Air Act, States may voluntarily adopt any California vehicle emissions standard that has been granted a waiver from EPA. To date, 17 States, including the State of Maryland, where I live, have done so.

No one is forcing States to adopt California's standards, but for many State across the country, like Maryland, doing so makes a lot of sense.

That is why, in March of this year, our Governor, Governor Moore, announced the adoption of the Advanced Clean Cars 2 Rule, which will align our State with the emissions standards pioneered by California and speed our transition from internal combustion engines to electric vehicles.

According to the Maryland Department of the Environment, this will provide in-State health benefits of nearly \$40 million per year by 2040, to say nothing of the energy savings, climate impacts, and economic benefits of building out our green economy.

The bill before us today would take away Maryland's freedom to adopt regulatory standards like these that meet its needs and would encroach on the rights of all States that choose to follow California's lead in adopting vehi-

cle emissions standards that will provide benefits to each and every one of our communities.

H.R. 1435 is a blatant attack on States that are taking ambitious steps to curb air pollution from cars and trucks and create greener, healthier futures for their residents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a leader and subcommittee chairman on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choices in Vehicle Purchases Act.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Environment, I am proud to support this bill led by my Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues, Representatives JOYCE, LATTA, BILIRAKIS, and OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 1435 is a critical step in protecting consumer choice and safeguarding Americans' access to affordable and reliable vehicles.

The legislation would prohibit the EPA from granting California a waiver for vehicle emission standards if the State's standards directly or indirectly limit the sale of new gas-powered vehicles.

Why is this important? California recently submitted a waiver request, which would require all new passenger vehicles in the State to be zero-emission vehicles by 2035, effectively phasing out new gas-powered cars.

Even worse, if California is granted that EPA waiver, 17 States, representing 40 percent of the U.S. market for new vehicles, are poised to adopt California's exact standards.

This would result in California effectively forcing their values and their mandates on all of us. How would that work out? Ask the Secretary of Energy. It was recently reported that on a road trip with her entourage to tout electric vehicles, her advance staff actually blocked a family with their baby in the car from the one functioning EV charging station at a particular stop until the Secretary arrived to recharge her luxury EV. Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that my constituents don't get that privilege.

Now, I want to be clear. This legislation does not prevent Americans from purchasing EVs if they want one. House Republicans are simply ensuring that all Americans can choose the car that best fits their needs right now and in the decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1435.

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1435.

H.R. 1435 would have disastrous consequences, not only on California's

ability to regulate dangerous air pollution from its own transportation sector, but for all of the other States who have adopted its standards, including my home State of New York.

My colleagues, climate change is accelerating in real-time, and we are experiencing the impact to our own detriment.

The transportation sector accounts for nearly one-third of the Nation's greenhouse gas contributions. Heavy-duty transportation makes up a significant piece of this polluting sector. Heavy-duty vehicles make up approximately 6 percent of vehicles on the road but generate 59 percent of the nitrogen oxides and other dangerous pollutants that contribute to ozone and particulate matter.

An estimated 72 million people live near truck freight routes across the United States. These communities, whose residents are more likely to be people of color and vulnerable populations, have lower incomes and experience higher rates of adverse health effects.

This bill would harm and potentially reverse decades of progress on cleaning up our heavy-duty transportation sector.

Republicans are putting polluters over people by attempting to block States' ability to regulate air pollution from heavy-duty trucks, in direct contradiction to the Clean Air Act.

While my Republican colleagues continue to try to block commonsense air pollution control efforts, I, along with my fellow House Democrats, will continue to fight for cleaner air and a clean energy future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1435.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just noting for the record, in a 2017 midterm review, the California Air Resources Board confessed this law could lead to long-term job losses in industries tied to manufacturing, supplying, and servicing of conventional vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. I feel like I am repeating myself, but this is yet another bill that would overturn a radical rule from the Biden administration's EPA.

The agency's recent actions to provide California a waiver request to strictly regulate vehicle emissions and its proposed emissions standards combine to a de facto EV mandate.

Allowing California to ban the sale of internal combustion engines by 2035 will significantly distort the market and manufacturing of vehicles throughout our country. This is entirely inappropriate.

The Federal Government is not in the business of dictating consumer choice, especially when it can be detrimental to the lives of Americans from all walks of life.

If people want an EV, they can make that choice. Many people have already

made that choice, and I suspect more will as these vehicles improve and become more accessible.

However, they are not the right choice for all Americans. For most, they are simply out of reach. They are too expensive, even with existing incentives, and do not have the range nor the reliability consumers desire yet.

Portions of my district are incredibly rural and simply not practical for EVs. My constituents deserve access to affordable vehicles that can be depended on.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), a member of our committee.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues like to attack California for its forward-thinking policies to address dangerous air pollution, especially from the transportation sector.

California has indeed been a leader in reducing air pollution for decades because of our unique air pollution challenges. In fact, we were the very first State to regulate tailpipe emission pollution from vehicles.

The Federal Government followed California's lead by enacting the first iteration of the Clean Air Act in 1970, over 10 years after California had legislation to adopt standards for community air quality and motor vehicle emissions.

Since California already had tailpipe emission standards on the books, Congress drafted the Clean Air Act to accommodate their ongoing innovation and progress in addressing air pollution from the transportation sector, and all of this occurred under the governorship of Ronald Reagan.

Over the years, EPA has granted California dozens of waivers for its emission standards. That has enabled California to not only address its significant air pollution challenges but has also cemented California as a worldwide leader in deploying emissions reduction technologies.

Our ambitious standards in California paved the way for the invention of the catalytic converter and the dashboard "check engine" lights, in addition to the development of zero-emission vehicles.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1435 seeks to erase decades of historic progress on addressing air pollution, driving innovation, and protecting public health.

Frankly, the goal of this short-sighted bill is to keep us stuck in the past and our heads in the sand while the real, tangible dangers of climate change continue to harm our communities, our environment, and our economy.

We should not reverse decades of California's historic leadership in protecting public health and addressing air pollution from the transportation sector.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1435.

□ 1445

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

Electric vehicles will be part of our energy matrix for a long time, our transportation matrix. No Republicans deny that, but government is trying to pick what you drive, America.

Our electric grid does not support electric vehicles now. Power generation isn't there, and the infrastructure is far from ready across most of America.

Stripping away Americans' freedom to choose, government picking the type of car that you have to drive, that is like saying: I am from the government, and I am here to help. I know better than you do, America.

That is wrong. Americans ought to have the freedom to choose. If electric vehicles are going to be part of our mix in rural South Carolina, we have a long way to go to build out that infrastructure. I can tell you that Wyoming, Nebraska, Montana, and Washington State are a long way from ready.

Most of the pollution California talks about is not generated in California. It is coming from Asia. China is building all the infrastructure, all the solar panels, a lot of components for electric vehicles. They are using coal-fired power plants to produce those renewable components, creating pollution that ends up on the West Coast.

This is wrong for America. Government should not tell people in South Carolina or Washington State or anywhere else what kind of vehicle to drive.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

It is disappointing and, quite frankly, dangerous that this political messaging bill is intentionally being brought to the floor, given its potential impact on ongoing labor negotiations that expire at midnight tonight.

Unfortunately, this is yet another Republican attack on the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to keep Americans safe from dangerous air pollution, and it will have widespread, harmful effects on the future of the domestic automotive industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this false choice between protecting our environment and protecting our working families. We can and must do both.

The UAW opposes this bill. Sierra Club opposes this bill. LCV opposes

this bill. We must stand with men and women who know what is best and oppose this bill.

This bill prevents the EPA from granting a waiver of Federal preemption under the Clean Air Act for any California vehicle emissions standard that directly or indirectly limits the sale or use of vehicles with an internal combustion engine. On top of this, it directs the EPA to revoke waivers that were already granted more than a decade ago that don't comply with this vague metric. This would immediately put existing waivers dating back a decade in jeopardy.

This doesn't affect just California. It has nationwide ramifications that every Member should be concerned about. It infringes on States' ability to voluntarily adopt standards to protect their citizens from dangerous air pollution and climate change.

My Republican colleagues are always saying that we have to protect States' rights. They are not doing it in this.

Let's be clear: The Clean Air Act is explicit in the EPA having the authority to protect all Americans from dangerous air pollution, including in the transportation sector.

Do you know what worries me the most? It is whether we are going to be prepared to be competitive in a global marketplace.

Revoking past waivers would throw unnecessary uncertainty into the marketplace. Companies need certainty to be competitive. This creates confusion for both industry and consumers.

Beyond undoing standards to protect citizens from dangerous air pollution, it will also stymie future automotive innovation that drives this Nation forward.

I will not cede our American leadership in the transportation sector to any other country in the world. Europe has already exceeded selling electric vehicles beyond the 50 percent mark, and we can't allow partisanship to stand in the way of building these cars here in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let future mobility be dictated to us by foreign competitors when we put the world on wheels.

I love my Republican colleagues, and they know that I do, but we couldn't get the defense bill this week so we are playing this game with the livelihood of my constituents, the autoworkers in my district.

I am not going to let these cars be built in China. I am not going to let them be built anywhere but in America, and that means we have to compete. I will fight for them every single day, and I am not going to stop.

This bill is not good for the American automobile industry, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

When I first read the Biden administration's plan to increase fuel standards, which require 67 percent of all new vehicles manufactured be all-electric by 2032, I was appalled. This plan does nothing to benefit America and everything to benefit our greatest adversary, China.

Electric vehicle batteries require at least a 1,000 percent increase in materials extracted from the Earth compared to a gasoline-powered vehicle.

Who dominates the extraction and processing of these materials? You guessed it: China. Nearly all the growth in mining to meet this demand is expected to come from offshore, non-U.S. mines. Who has been buying these mines? You guessed it: China.

China is the only one that stands to benefit from this drastic change in policy, and American consumers will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1435, the so-called Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act. The only choice H.R. 1435 preserves is Big Oil's choice to worsen the climate crisis.

In California, we boldly led the way on pollution reduction standards. H.R. 1435 is a direct attack on the progress we are just starting to make in transitioning cars from fossil fuels to clean energy.

It would devastate California's goal to transition to EVs by 2035, a groundbreaking policy I proudly supported while serving in the California State Legislature.

This bill is a regressive measure that would doom not only California's goals but also undermine the entire Nation's efforts to combat the climate crisis.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act. I thank Congressman JOHN JOYCE for his leadership on this bill.

The electrification or nothing timeline of this administration is far ahead of what is possible, practical, and affordable.

Giving California authority to dictate to the transportation industry for almost half the Nation is just another tool this administration is using to force EVs on the American people.

Fuel distribution for our transportation industry was built over the course of 100 years. It is not reasonable to assume the same can be done for an EV industry in just a few short years.

While this administration seeks to mandate and subsidize electric vehicles at every turn, they lack any sense of a coherent plan to put this into reality.

EV inventories are piling up on dealer lots because, simply put, nobody is buying them. This legislation would make important strides to protect Hoosiers' ability to choose the car that they think best fits their families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I hear the Republicans constantly talk about choice, a choice of vehicles. Let me just stress again that nobody is taking away your gas-powered vehicle.

We are actually providing you the choice, and the States that are adopting the California standards are providing you a choice of vehicles because if you pass this bill, then you are basically insisting that people have to have gas-powered vehicles because nobody's going to develop EVs.

The fact of the matter is, contrary to my colleague from Indiana's remarks, people are buying EVs, more people than ever. Even Republicans are buying electric vehicles.

This bill will discourage any manufacturing of hybrid or electric vehicles because there will be no incentives for the automakers to invest in the production of hybrids or EVs, and they would simply not be available.

People won't have a choice of a cleaner car either because of better emission standards if it is gas powered or because they might want to buy a hybrid or an EV.

The other argument that is being made here is about China, and I have to dispute that, as well. Republicans are making the claim that this bill protects America from playing into China's hands. I totally disagree.

Basically, Republicans think that China is leading in the EV space. Rather than relying on American industry and American ingenuity to compete with China, Republicans think we should step aside. They basically say we will just stand down.

While the global demand and the American demand for EVs is rising, if we don't compete, China benefits. If we step back, China ends up controlling all the supply chains.

Democrats aren't denying that China is very active in this space and controls a lot of the existing supply chains for electric vehicles, but rather than ceding more ground, we are investing in America's ability to compete. We are investing in domestic battery manufacturing, creating jobs here and reducing our dependence on foreign supply chains.

Republicans are operating under the assumption that by stepping away from electric vehicles, China's dominance in the space disappears. That is nonsense. In reality, it means that the growing global demand for electric vehicles will be met by China, and American progress and competitiveness just recedes.

One of my colleagues—I think it was Mr. PETERS—said that the Republicans are stuck in the past. That is exactly the problem here. They don't understand that the auto industry is innovating. The auto industry has been creating gas-powered cars with less emissions.

The auto industry is creating EVs here. Let them flower. Let them do what they can so, ultimately, we are in charge of manufacturing these vehicles so that Americans buy and the rest of the world buys our electric vehicles.

Don't let China continue to dominate the market. That is what this bill will do.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), the gentleman who is all about winning the future.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Madam Chair for that great introduction.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act. We are here today because lawmakers in California want to outright ban the sale of new vehicles with an internal combustion engine. They are fed up with the pace of the free market and want to force their consumers to switch to more expensive electric vehicles.

This bill would simply prevent President Biden's EPA from granting California the waiver needed to approve this ban.

If the California waiver is approved, over a dozen other States could adopt identical standards to ban the internal combustion engine.

House Republicans believe that Americans should be able to purchase the vehicle that meets their needs. The fact of the matter is that consumers across America are wary of making the shift to electric vehicles.

As Cox Automotive experts pointed out in July, the unsold inventory of EVs across the Nation swelled nearly 350 percent this year. There are 92,000 EVs currently sitting unsold on dealer lots.

As shown during the Secretary of Energy's recent EV road trip, there are still major problems with owning and charging an EV in America outside of big cities.

Regardless of whether you want to buy an EV or a traditional internal combustion vehicle, House Republicans believe that you should have the choice to purchase the vehicle that is best for you and your family. This bill will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this common-sense bill.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Ohio). The gentleman from New

Jersey has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 10¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1435.

This legislation specifically targets the ability of my home State of California and the ability of 17 other States to set their own auto emission standards, improve public health, and tackle the climate crisis.

With this legislation, my Republican colleagues are propping up the fossil fuel industry at the expense of the environment and pushing their polluters over people agenda, which endangers the health of the American people.

Over 100 million people live in counties with unhealthy air pollution, and air pollution is linked to more than 100,000 premature deaths in the United States every year. The transportation sector is the largest contributor to the emission of greenhouse gases, making up one-third of total pollution.

In the mid-20th century, California was plagued by smog from vehicles that spewed pollution into the air and caused hazardous health conditions for residents. With this reality in mind, my State took action.

California has been a national leader in addressing air pollution from the transportation sector for decades and has regulated vehicle emissions for years. In fact, California established the first tailpipe emission standards in the country in 1966, well before the Federal Government did.

A year later, then-Governor Reagan approved the Mulford-Carrell Air Resources Act to create the State Air Resources Board. You heard that right. Ronald Reagan, a conservative Republican, established a statewide agency to address air pollution. Clean air protections were bipartisan for years, with President Nixon signing the Clean Air Act into law, another Californian, I might add.

The Clean Air Act granted California the ability to receive a waiver from the Environmental Protection Agency to establish vehicle emission standards that are more protective and aggressive than those at the Federal level. With that authority, Governor Reagan's Air Resources Board adopted the Nation's first nitrogen oxide emission standards for motor vehicles.

Here is what we have seen in the years since: Ambitious vehicle emission standards empower the auto industry to produce better, cleaner cars. They are a win-win-win for consumers, growing our domestic auto industry, and meeting our climate goals.

For more than five decades, the EPA has granted dozens of waivers to California, which has enabled my State to cut pollution from as much as 35 parts per million in 1970 to under 9 parts per million in 2018. The waivers have helped improve conditions for residents and have driven innovation in the auto industry.

California's ambitious emission standards have led the way for historic technological breakthroughs, such as the invention of the catalytic converter, the dashboard check-engine light, and, yes, the development of zero-emission vehicles.

H.R. 1435 looks to erase decades of progress on tackling air pollution, advancing technological innovation, and protecting public health. This bill attacks the Clean Air Act and the long-standing authority of States to make their own decisions to keep their air clean and climate pollution low.

Republicans frequently tout States' rights. Why is this case any different?

This bill would also force the EPA to revoke existing waivers going back to 2013, causing chaos and confusion for the entire auto industry and disrupting the transition to electric vehicles that is already underway across the country.

The regulatory framework that California and its 17 partner States have in place empowers the auto industry to produce better and cleaner cars that are cheaper to maintain and provide significant cost savings for American families.

H.R. 1435's reckless requirement that the EPA revoke existing Clean Air Act waivers jeopardizes over 50 years of progress and innovation. Not only would the auto industry suffer, but the American consumer would lose out on cheaper, cleaner vehicle options today and in the future.

Let's be clear. The only party that would benefit from this regulatory uncertainty in vehicle emission standards is the fossil fuel industry.

Ultimately, H.R. 1435 is not based on science, and it fails to recognize the effects that our constituents are already feeling from unmitigated climate change. It fails to acknowledge the public health consequences of air pollution. For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would strike the section of the bill that requires the EPA Administrator to revoke all existing waivers, which would throw the U.S. auto industry into chaos and regulatory uncertainty.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Representative JOYCE's H.R. 1435, Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, to prevent the EPA from imposing new regulations that would ban the sales of new motor vehicles with gas-powered internal combustion engines.

Last year, California enacted new requirements on automakers, effectively banning the sale of new gas-powered cars and light trucks by 2035 and limiting consumer choice in new vehicles to electric vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice presented before us today. We can expand California's failed and expensive green energy mandates to the rest of the Nation, or we can invest in liquid fuels to restore American energy independence, make gas affordable again, and secure our energy future. H.R. 1435 will accomplish these goals.

Electric vehicles are not for everybody. Just ask Secretary Granholm about her recent road trip throughout the United States. Spoiler alert: The police were called.

When you think about the costly and ineffective proposals like those from California and the Biden administration, they reject the proven benefits of the liquid fuel sector. Investing in ever-cleaner liquid fuels, like biofuels and conventional fuels, provides immediate environmental benefits, supports our domestic economy, and bolsters national security while keeping costs low.

When we asked the Secretary recently about how much electricity the United States uses on an annual basis, she couldn't answer it, nor can any administration official answer it, but yet they want to mandate this not just in California but throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1435, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time. I don't have much time left.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, the car capital of the world, (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today supporting the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

Why wouldn't I? I deal in a sense of reality. I live in a State that produces automobiles. I live in a State right now that is at risk of having a major disruption due to a strike potential. I have autoworkers who are concerned about their jobs because of the push on EVs that isn't working. We even had one of the major chairmen of the auto companies attempt to take an EV trip across the Nation. They couldn't make it because we don't have the infrastructure available.

Beyond that, H.R. 1435 prevents a waiver for California to effectively ban the internal combustion engine. California's political agenda does not reflect how the rest of America operates, and I would suggest it doesn't reflect what a lot of Californians need.

Look no further than EV sales to know the American people don't want this forced transition. They may like the F-150 Lightning. It is a hot rod, but it doesn't do the job.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, autoworkers in Michigan also don't want this mandate. Let consumers and

innovators in the auto industry guide the future, not California's politicians.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time because I have very little time remaining.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, of which I am an original cosponsor.

Americans want choice. Consumers deserve it when they buy a vehicle. It is one of the biggest purchases they will make other than their home. Whether they choose an internal combustion vehicle or an electric vehicle, that decision should be left up to the consumer, not Federal bureaucrats. I amend that to say unelected bureaucrats.

This administration's rush to electrification has blinded their ability to recognize the inevitable consequences and shortcomings of such restrictive government mandates.

Take the Secretary of Energy's recent 4-day EV road trip debacle. Due to the limited availability of EV chargers in America, including in Grovetown in my district, the Secretary's advance team chose to use non-EV vehicles to reserve working chargers for the Secretary's use at the expense of my constituents. I didn't have a thing to do with that.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents do not have advance teams. Georgians who don't wish to wait for working chargers on a family trip should not have to do so. Demand for electric vehicles should be market driven, not government manufactured. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 1435.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The Golden State is turning into a Soviet state. California's attempt to ban gas vehicles is yet another step toward Marxism.

It is no wonder people are fleeing California in droves, as their State attempts to partner with Biden's radical EPA by handcuffing customers with requirements to purchase electric vehicles.

The Biden administration is weaponizing Federal agencies to pursue his radical Green New Deal agenda, while saddling Americans with the costs involved.

Limiting consumer choice is a veiled attempt to force Marxist principles down the throats of consumers. Support of this bill pushes back against radical ideals and promotes the opportunity for free markets to prevail.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining on both sides again?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes

remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am urging support for the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, which will prevent California from banning gas-powered vehicles.

I am as strong a supporter as anyone of clean energy, and I could not be more excited about the future of clean energy that awaits us, but the way to move rapidly towards that future is through innovation. It is not through regulation. No State has gone further down the road of overreaching, overbearing, inattentive regulation to the needs of its citizens than California has.

This particular measure that California is now attempting is more radical than any that came before it. Specifically, the California Air Resources Board approved a plan in August and is now asking the Environmental Protection Agency to approve a waiver under the Clean Air Act to implement its new rules that set yearly rising zero-emission vehicle rules starting in 2026 and would end the sale of vehicles only powered by gasoline by 2035.

This is no trivial matter. The majority of vehicles on the road today in the United States, 95 percent, run on internal combustion engines.

What is the consequence of this going to be?

First and foremost, there is the cost. The price of an electric vehicle is \$17,000 higher than a gas-powered car. This is going to make life even harder for people in California where we already have the highest energy prices, the highest gas prices, the highest cost of living, the highest poverty rate, and far too many people having to leave our State because it is simply too hard to get by.

Make our State more affordable. This bill will save Californians from this burden and help many of my constituents.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the so-called Preserving Choice in Vehicles Purchases Act. Not only does this bill hinder our efforts and investments in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and addressing the climate crisis, but it also reverses successful work already implemented across the country and in my home State of California.

This bill would stop California from getting waivers that allow it to implement stronger and more aggressive emission standards than the Federal Government sets. This waiver was signed into law by Richard Nixon.

Over the last 50 years, California has received over 100 Clean Air Act waivers; over that same time span, many pollutant levels have decreased between 75 and 99 percent, even while the State's population doubled and vehicles have quadrupled.

Mr. Speaker, 17 States and the District of Columbia have adopted all or part of California's stronger regulations. With California's leadership, we have seen benefits to the environment, the economy, and public health.

As someone who was appointed by two Republican Governors and one Democrat, I strongly oppose this bill.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, a bill that I introduced with several of my colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural district in California. This bill does nothing more or less than preserving their ability to choose for themselves what vehicle works best for them.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I represent over 100,000 people who commute long distances to get to work and back every day. If electric vehicles were a less expensive and more efficient way for them to perform that commute, they would already own them.

In addition, we have heard testimony that we do not have even a quarter of the copper we would need to convert the current fleet of vehicles to electric vehicles; not even a quarter for the current production year, and that is not to mention other critical minerals, such as graphite, manganese, cobalt, and lithium.

It would be much more efficient to convert our current vehicles to hybrid vehicles that only require a battery one-fifth the size. We can do five times as many hybrids as we could electric vehicles.

Unfortunately, the waiver that is being sought by the State of California would completely prevent hybrid vehicles from being sold in the State starting in the year 2035.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is common sense. If you believe in being good stewards of the environment, which I think everyone in this Chamber does, we should vote for this bill because five times as many hybrids is much better than one times as many electric vehicles.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to make a few things clear.

Our environmental groups are opposed to this legislation. The UAW, for those who don't know, the United Auto Workers, are opposed to this legislation.

This is not States' rights, and, frankly, it is absolutely mind-blowing that

after the hottest summer on record, this is what the majority party is pushing forward amidst talks of a government shutdown and the need to take on climate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

Democrats’ radical Green New Deal agenda is once again being forced on the American people. This comes on the heels after the Biden administration has sold 40 percent of our oil reserves and none have been replenished, endangering our national security.

They passed the Green New Deal and multiple bills, the infrastructure bill, to build 500,000 electric vehicle charging stations in the U.S., even though there is no mass demand for electric vehicles. They are also forcing Americans to go net zero by 2035, a date that our current President will unlikely ever even see.

Forcing Americans to have no choice in the type of automobile that they drive, on the type of engine that they prefer is forcing every American’s knee to bend to China, our worst enemy.

This is traitorous to autoworkers, traitorous to auto unions, and traitorous to every American auto consumer.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I hear a lot of complaints about what it is going to do for California. Well, don’t cry for California. We do a lot of bad ideas that affect the whole country. Indeed, we have one-eighth of the country’s population and a little over one-eighth of the country’s auto sales.

So what does that mean? Well, we are not going to get a whole lot of help from the manufacturers or the CEOs because they want to get along with Washington, D.C., but we are here about preserving choice for all Americans on automobiles.

The California Air Resources Board is an unelected board appointed by Governor Gavin Newsom, who is not the guy that is on your side for freedom.

As well, recently, after this mandate in California came out by 2035, a few days later he said, oh, people, will you please not charge your electric vehicles right now because it is going to affect our grid because we don’t have enough power in our grid—rolling blackouts, bans on hydroelectric dams. They almost took down our last nuclear power plant.

So California is not the place a lot of solutions are going to come from. You

said Republicans put these in place. Well, these have been weaponized in the 50 years since then with the Air Resources Board and all the other entities that have been put in place.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1435 will preserve choices for people. I have actually lived it myself as I have had a real job on a farm.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit and “yes” on H.R. 1435.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey has the only time remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear again. Nobody is taking away your gas-powered vehicles. If this bill were to become law, there would be no choice because the United States would not build electric vehicles and we would fall further and further behind China.

The Republicans are trying to legislate away years of American innovation and cleaner transportation in yet another attempt to do the bidding of their Big Oil friends. They are once again putting polluters over people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 681, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Levin of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1435 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LEVIN is as follows:

Mr. Levin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1435 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike section 2(b) (relating to effect on certain existing waivers).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LEVIN. 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 212, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—212

Aderholt	Biggs	Carter (GA)
Alford	Bilirakis	Carter (TX)
Allen	Bishop (NC)	Chavez-DeRemer
Amodei	Boebert	Ciscomani
Armstrong	Bost	Cline
Arrington	Brecheen	Cloud
Babin	Buchanan	Clyde
Bacon	Buck	Cole
Baird	Bucshon	Collins
Balderson	Burchett	Comer
Banks	Burgess	Crane
Barr	Burlison	Crawford
Bean (FL)	Calvert	Curtis
Bentz	Cammack	Davidson
Bergman	Carey	De La Cruz
Bice	Carl	DesJarlais

Donalds Johnson (LA) Palmer
Duarte Johnson (OH) Pence
Duncan Johnson (SD) Perez
Dunn (FL) Jordan Pfluger
Edwards Joyce (OH) Posey
Ellzey Joyce (PA) Reschenthaler
Emmer Kean (NJ) Rodgers (WA)
Estes Kelly (MS) Rogers (AL)
Ezell Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY)
Fallon Kiggans (VA) Rose
Feenstra Kiley Rosendale
Ferguson Kim (CA) Rouzer
Finstad Kustoff Roy
Fischbach LaHood Rutherford
Fitzgerald LaLota Salazar
Fitzpatrick LaMalfa Santos
Fleischmann Lamborn Scalise
Flood Langworthy Schweikert
Foxy Latta Scott, Austin
Franklin, C. LaTurner Self
Scott Lawler Sessions
Fry Lee (FL) Simpson
Fulcher Lesko Smith (MO)
Gaetz Letlow Smith (NE)
Gallagher Loudermilk Smith (NJ)
Garbarino Luetkemeyer Smucker
Garcia, Mike Luttrell Spartz
Gimenez Mace Stauber
Gonzales, Tony Malliotakis Steel
Good (VA) Mann Stefanik
Gooden (TX) Massie Steil
Gosar Mast Steube
Granger McClain Strong
Graves (LA) McClintock Tenney
Graves (MO) McCormick Thompson (PA)
Green (TN) McHenry Tiffany
Greene (GA) Meuser Timmons
Griffith Miller (IL) Valadao
Grothman Miller (OH) Van Drew
Guest Miller (WV) Van Dwyne
Guthrie Miller-Meeks Wagner
Hageman Mills Walberg
Harris Molinaro Waltz
Harshbarger Moolenaar Weber (TX)
Hern Mooney Webster (FL)
Higgins (LA) Moore (AL) Wenstrup
Hill Moore (UT) Westerman
Hinson Moran Williams (NY)
Houchin Murphy Williams (TX)
Hudson Newhouse Wilson (SC)
Huizenga Norman Wittman
Hunt Nunn (IA) Womack
Issa Obernolte Yakym
Jackson (TX) Ogles Zinke
James Owens

NOT VOTING—28

Allred Jackson Lee Perry
Castro (TX) Lee (CA) Pingree
Cohen Lucas Ramirez
Crenshaw Luna
D'Esposito McBath
DeLauro McCaul
Diaz-Balart McCollum
Himes Meeks
Hoyer Nehls
Ivey Peltola

□ 1547

Messrs. MOLINARO, NUNN of Iowa, COMER, MURPHY, CISCOMANI, GREEN of Tennessee, LAMBORN, BISHOP of North Carolina, LAWLER, and POSEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. CLARK of Massachusetts, SHERRILL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. SCHNEIDER, LARSON of Connecticut, and NORCROSS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 390.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 390.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 390.

Stated against:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 390.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—222

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

Van Orden
Vasquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—22

Allred Jackson Lee Pingree
Castro (TX) Lucas Sewell
Cohen Luna Stewart
Crenshaw McBath Torres (NY)
D'Esposito McCaul Trone
Diaz-Balart Meeks Velázquez
Hoyer Nehls
Ivey Peltola

□ 1556

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 391, H.R. 1435, Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 388, "nay" on rollcall No. 389, "yea" on rollcall No. 390, and "nay" on rollcall No. 391.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances, I was unable to participate in voting. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 388, "yea" on rollcall No. 389, "nay" on rollcall No. 390, and "yea" on rollcall No. 391.

TREATING TRIBES AND COUNTIES AS GOOD NEIGHBORS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1450) to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to modify the treatment of revenue from timber sale contracts and certain payments made by counties to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior under good neighbor agreements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2023, TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2023

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, September 18, 2023, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5081

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 5081.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is granted.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF COOK'S CORNER SHOOTING

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, first built in 1884 in south Orange County, Cook's Corner has become a historic and iconic staple in Califor-

nia's 40th Congressional District in Trabuco Canyon for local residents, motorcycle enthusiasts, and for tourists from all over southern California and from all over the Nation.

On August 23, 2023, our community was rocked by a horrific shooting at Cook's Corner that resulted in three deaths and six wounded.

We are grateful for our local law enforcement, especially the Orange County Sheriff deputies and first responders who responded quickly at the scene.

As our community mourns and picks up the pieces, we also know we are stronger together.

Today, I rise with bipartisan Members of our California delegation and ask all Members to join me in a moment of silence in the memory of the victims: Tonya Clark of Arizona; Glen Sprowl, Jr., of Stanton; and John Leehey of Irvine; and in solidarity with the communities that I represent.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING GOVERNOR BILL RICHARDSON

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and the many friends who hold him dear, we rise today to honor a beloved lifetime public servant, Governor Bill Richardson.

I first want to acknowledge his wife, Barbara Richardson, a woman of incredible grace who is leading a State, a Nation, and a world in mourning the Governor today in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

I thank Chairwoman NANETTE BARRAGÁN for her leadership in organizing this moment of silence for our colleague, who like you, also served as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

I say Governor and chair, but Bill had many other titles during his illustrious career: U.S. Congressman, House Deputy Majority Whip, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, U.S. Secretary of Energy, candidate for President, hostage negotiator, and professor.

We are all humbled by his achievements, and most importantly, by the people he helped along the way.

Guided by an unflinching sense of duty, service, and justice, Bill opened the door for countless people throughout his career. He opened the door of opportunity for Americans seeking a better future. He unlocked the jail cells of political prisoners imprisoned by the most dangerous dictators. He never hesitated to seek dialogue with those he knew had the power to release the powerless, and he opened the doors of service, inspiring Latino leaders working tirelessly to improve their communities.

I am honored to stand shoulder to shoulder with my Hispanic Caucus "hermanos y hermanas," "brothers and sisters," and all of the colleagues who

have joined us today. We are sharing with each other in these last 2 weeks and hearing from so many of our colleagues moving and also fun stories of those who now serve in the people's House, either as Members or as staff who have come up to me and told me the stories of how they are in America today and serving in this House because of Governor Richardson.

Bill, we do not merely stand in this well of the people's House, as you did for over 14 years; we stand on your shoulders. We stand because giants like you blazed the trail for countless Latinos to serve their country in our Nation's highest offices.

From 12 members, when you served as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, to 42 members today, including Representative VELÁZQUEZ who served with you, the CHC traces our lineage back to you and others who "caminando hicieron el camino," "walking we make the road," who built the trail with each bold step you took forward.

Whether it is a minimum-wage worker who earned a bit more because of your work, a hostage who saw the sun again, or a young leader inspired to serve, you created hope in many of the most overlooked places and overlooked people.

Please join all of us as we bow our heads in a moment of silence honoring the legacy of former Congressman, Governor, Ambassador, and Secretary, Bill Richardson.

Governor, "que descansa en paz," "may you rest in peace," and God bless you.

CONGRATULATING STATE REPRESENTATIVE DANNY PEREZ

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate State Representative Danny Perez on being formally selected as the next Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives.

Most importantly to me and all of my fellow explorers, Danny Perez will be the first Christopher Columbus High School graduate to serve as Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives.

Senator MARCO RUBIO paved the way as the very first Cuban-American Speaker of the Florida House, and now Speaker-Designate Perez will be just the third Cuban American to ever serve in that role.

Speaker-Designate Perez is happily married to his wife, Stephanie, and has two beautiful children, Camila Lucia and Matias Daniel. He is an attorney by trade and a passionate advocate for children. He also serves as national chair of the American Legislative Exchange Council.

I look forward to continuing to work with Speaker-Designate Perez. I am confident that he will continue to be a champion for Miami-Dade County and