

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a milestone in American history. In the aftermath of the Civil War, longhorn cattle ran free in Texas, and markets in the East had a dire need for beef. To meet that need, the Nation called on young cowboys to gather the wild cattle and move them north to the railroads in Kansas.

They brought the cattle to stockyard towns like Abilene, Wichita, and Ellsworth. As cattle diseases moved west, cattlemen needed another route to bring cattle north, and in 1874, the Western Trail was pioneered along Kansas prairies.

According to Kansas historians, the Western Cattle Trail would last longer, carry more cattle, and cover a greater distance than any other trail. These historic cattle drives set the stage for today's modern beef industry where the Big First District is the number one district for beef production in the country.

On November 1 and 2, the Western Cattle Trail and International Chisolm Trail Association will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Western Cattle Trail in Dodge City.

I commend those celebrating the history of cattle trails, while giving thanks to the farmers, ranchers, stockmen, and communities who continue the cowboy tradition while helping feed the world.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 13th anniversary of the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

For decades thousands of servicemembers were discharged, not because of any serious infraction, but because of who they are.

As ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it has been a mission of my office to chronicle some of the stories of servicemembers affected by this regressive ban. However, more deserve the chance to tell their story.

I am sponsoring a bill to create a congressional commission to investigate the historic and ongoing impacts of discriminatory military policies on LGBTQ+ servicemembers and veterans.

I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring these servicemembers and veterans who sacrificed so much to serve our country.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "MULTI-POLLUTANT EMISSIONS STANDARDS FOR MODEL YEARS 2027 AND LATER LIGHT-DUTY AND MEDIUM-DUTY VEHICLES"

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1455, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 136) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1455, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 136

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles" (89 Fed. Reg. 27842 (April 18, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The 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. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 136.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 136, led by Energy and Commerce Committee member Republican Representative JOHN JAMES.

Over and over again, the Biden-Harris Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, has doubled down on its radical rush-to-green energy agenda.

The EPA's latest tailpipe emissions rule is not really about reducing air

pollution. It is about forcing Americans to drive electric vehicles.

By the EPA's own estimation, the new rule will effectively require at least two-thirds of all new cars in the United States to be 100 percent electric by 2032, not hybrids, not plug-in hybrids, not hydrogen, not any other clean technology.

This unreasonable rule is just another example of how the Biden-Harris administration's rush-to-green agenda is handing China the keys to America's energy future, jeopardizing our auto industry, and forcing people to buy unaffordable electric vehicles they do not want.

Here are the facts: In May, the average fully electric model was \$17,326 more expensive than the average gas-burning compact crossover.

At the beginning of this year, nearly 5,000 American car dealers sent a letter to the President demanding that he hit the brakes on the EPA's unrealistic agenda after EVs stacked up on their car lots.

Moreover, recently, J.D. Power cut its projected sales of EVs by 25 percent, citing increased competition in the market for gas-powered vehicle alternatives.

Despite all of this, the Biden-Harris EPA has continued its de facto EV mandates, undeterred by the reality of what Americans actually want.

Instead of forcing Americans to spend more money on vehicles that they don't want to buy, on vehicles that only advance a political agenda, let's get back to the work of making sure that people have access to affordable, reliable, and functional means of transportation.

To ensure Americans drive what vehicle best suits their needs, vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 136 to put an end to the EPA's unrealistic tailpipe emissions rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican joint resolution, a resolution taken straight from Trump's Project 2025 playbook. The resolution invokes the Congressional Review Act to fully repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, rule setting new protective air pollution standards for light-duty and medium-duty vehicles.

Now, this resolution is yet another Republican effort to attack the Clean Air Act and roll back commonsense air pollution protections. It puts the profits of corporate polluters over the health and safety of the American people.

Not only is this CRA ripped right out of Trump's extreme Project 2025 playbook, it is just the latest attempt by House Republicans to do the bidding of their Big Oil allies and prevent the EPA from protecting public health and the environment.

Instead of focusing on funding the government, which is set to expire at the end of this month, Republicans are wasting time bringing up this resolution they know has zero chance of becoming law. Even Senate Republicans have publicly admitted that they have abandoned their strategy of using this CRA this Congress.

So one really has to ask the question: What are we doing here?

This is yet another example of House Republicans failing to be serious about governing or working to implement policies that actually benefit the American people.

Americans have the right to clean air and a safe climate, and EPA's clean vehicle rule would put us on the road to achieve those rights. The transportation sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, making up nearly one-third of total pollution in the United States. This pollution affects more than 130 million Americans who live in counties with unhealthy air. Even worse, air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in our Nation every year. Thankfully, EPA is working to address this dangerous air pollution with the tools that Congress gave it.

Now, EPA's clean vehicle standards will avoid 7.2 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide between 2027 and 2055, that is equivalent to four times the emissions from the entire transportation sector in 2021. This incredible air pollution reduction will result in tangible benefits for Americans across the country. The rule is projected to yield approximately \$100 billion in net benefits each year.

Clean vehicle standards are also a win for consumers and our economy. EPA projects U.S. auto manufacturing employment growth of up to 188,000 jobs in 2032 thanks to this rule. That is on top of the existing 200,000 jobs that have already been added in clean vehicle manufacturing since the start of the Biden-Harris administration.

Once the standards take effect, American families are expected to save an average of \$6,000 over the lifetime of a light-duty vehicle, including fuel, operation, and maintenance costs.

So today we are going to hear a lot of false claims from my Republican colleagues. They are going to falsely say that this rule is a mandate, but let me be perfectly clear. EPA's standards are not an electric vehicle mandate. They are technology-neutral and performance based, as required by the Clean Air Act. Auto manufacturers have the flexibility to meet the standards with a wide range of clean vehicle technologies, like hybrids, plug-in hybrids, fuel cell, internal combustion engines, and full battery electric.

Manufacturers can choose the best option for them and to meet the needs of their consumers.

EPA worked closely with stakeholders to ensure that the final rule is ambitious and achievable and benefits all Americans. That is why EPA's final

clean vehicle rule is supported by a diverse coalition of autoworkers, automakers, and public health and environmental groups.

Now, the Biden-Harris rule accelerates the adoption of cleaner vehicle technologies that will offer expanded, better choices for consumers, lower costs, and make sure that the United States dominates the next century's worth of clean technology.

This Republican resolution reverses course, putting all of this at risk, and replacing it with nothing. What is more, it also prevents any future administration from taking similar action, and that is a recipe for disaster for our economy, the American people, and for our climate.

Madam Speaker, I just received an SAP, the Statement of Administration Policy, from the Biden administration. I am not going to read it all, but I just want to read the last part of it where it says that this rule is supported by U.S. automakers and autoworkers and that repealing it would jeopardize development in the critical technology sector, ceding the electric vehicle and battery future to global competitors like China.

I hear all the time my colleagues on the other side talking about Communist China and talking about Beijing and how we are not keeping up with them.

□ 0930

Well, the majority will be doing exactly the opposite with this repeal of the rule. Republicans will give Communist China the competitive edge.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 136, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), the champion and prime sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to be here today, and I remind my colleagues that Communism isn't fought with Communism. That is exactly what this government takeover of our American auto industry is.

I thank, again, Chairwoman RODGERS for her unwavering support of this resolution and her leadership and Leader SCALISE for his support on getting this to the floor, as well. They have been leaders not just on this issue, but on so many issues that are important to the livelihoods of Americans.

Again, I acknowledge how personal this moment is for me. My father was just inducted into the Automotive Hall of Fame last night. In 1971, he started his trucking company with one truck, one trailer, and no excuses. He had to fight all the way up to the Supreme Court for the next 7 years for the right to be able to travel across State lines. He was a pioneer, not just as an African-American MBE, not just as an African American in the industry, but for all small businesses.

My father fought to deregulate, to preserve the American Dream in the country, and, 50 years later, his son is standing here today fighting to deregulate, to fight for the American Dream in this country, against the burdensome regulations that are choking out jobs from my district and others.

It is the end of September. In the beginning of October, in my district, in Warren, 2,450 UAW jobs are going to be sent from Warren, not to Sterling Heights, but to Saltillo, Mexico, because the automotive industry is in survival mode because of policies just like this.

The audacity of my colleagues on the left to say that we are wasting time. I hope that every single UAW worker who you just quoted, Mr. Ranking Member, hears that you say that we are wasting their time.

We are fast-forwarding right now to what the automotive industry understands is a comply-or-die moment. We must fight for the American middle class that was born in Michigan, and we must fight for the American Dream that so many people feel is dying all over the country.

This tailpipe emissions standard is not just harmful, but it is catastrophic. People with their heads in the clouds in this town, who don't understand the way people are living across this country, need to come to reality.

The reality is the automotive industry itself, if you actually listen, has told you that in order to get to 67 percent compliant of new-vehicle sales, they cannot get there with the current technology or the current infrastructure or the current software without going to battery electric vehicles. Nobody here is against battery electric vehicles, but we are against telling the American people what they can do with their money and when they can do it.

This is why we are here. In 2032, the standard requires 25 percent of all sleeper-cab tractors and 60 percent of light heavy-duty vehicles, your cars and trucks, to have zero emissions. This mandate will cripple the trucking and shipping industries and drive up costs.

Does anybody in this country have a problem with inflation or cost of living? Well, just look to your left, and you will find the source.

In Michigan, the 10th Congressional District alone, we have over 1,000 manufacturing businesses, many tied to the automotive industry. Biden's extreme EV agenda threatens 77,000 manufacturing jobs in my district alone, the number one manufacturing district in the Nation. This is not just bad policy for Michigan. It is bad for the country.

Name a district that doesn't have a dealership, and that dealership is likely the largest philanthropist in your church, to your bake sales, to your Little League team. Guess what is going to happen when they have cars on their lots that they can't sell. Guess what is going to happen with the same policies that spent \$7.5 billion for charging stations and only got 7 in 2 years.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, I will wrap up. I am fairly emotional about the livelihoods of the people who sent me here.

This CRA takes a stand and sends a clear message that we will not abandon our people or our automakers or our autoworkers. Michigan isn't afraid of the future. Republicans are not afraid of the future, but we demand that every American have a part in it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.J. Res. 136. I think about every hardworking American whom Washington has forgotten when we talk about making vehicles that are affordable and making a nation that is competitive.

This isn't about partisanship. It is about common sense. It is called pragmatism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Minerals.

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

The transportation sector is the largest source of climate pollution in our United States and also a major emitter of other dangerous pollutants.

It should not surprise anyone that EPA has finalized a rule to fulfill its obligation to protect Americans from harmful air pollution. Unfortunately, this resolution will nullify a rule that, by all analyses, will save lives, save Americans money, and bolster our domestic manufacturing.

It is, indeed, expected to result in up to \$99 billion in net benefits annually, including major consumer savings on reduced fuel costs and vehicle maintenance that can range up to \$6,000 over the life of a vehicle.

Madam Speaker, just the other night, I attended the annual gathering of the Alliance to Save Energy as they recognized heroes in our communities who have moved forward with innovation and efforts to clean the environment and to make the air we breathe more safe.

It was interesting to watch these innovators, these start-up agents, members from the business and industrial communities, all talking about progress, significant progress that has been made simply by responding to demands for a safer and cleaner environment.

It is why this rule has worked in conjunction with the industry and the union workers, to make certain that there is a rule that can indeed be re-

sponded to. Putting aside all of the public health, environmental, and economic benefits, we should see this rule as an opportunity to further drive technological innovation.

EPA's rule is in line with market trends for light-duty vehicles. More and more Americans are choosing to go electric, thanks in large part to incentives, incentives like those in the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act.

Even more of these vehicles, because of that and their components, will be made in America. In the years ahead, we expect the cost of EVs to come down and come down significantly, the performance and range of EVs to improve, and consumer demand for EVs to continue to grow.

This resolution will create tremendous uncertainty for American auto manufacturers, undermining the nearly \$200 billion in private-sector investment that has been made into our domestic EV and battery supply chains since the start of the Biden administration. Those investments are already creating hundreds of thousands of high-quality jobs.

Automakers want and need to know which standards they need to design and build their vehicles to. EPA's rule provides the certainty required to develop and produce American-made, clean-vehicle technologies. That certainty is a theme constantly brought to my attention by those who come and visit with us to advance progressive policy.

For over a century, America has been the greatest auto manufacturing nation in the world. We know other countries are competing to produce the next generation of zero-emission vehicles, and I believe there is a bipartisan agreement that the United States should not be dependent on China for EV technologies.

Here is where we depart: Republicans want to pretend that EVs are not coming, even though all the consumer trends say otherwise. The majority is okay with China dominating this market if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can stop Americans from going electric.

House Democrats know that increased adoption of EVs is going to benefit America, Americans' health, our environment, and our wallets. We believe that, if America competes, America wins. We will embrace the changes that are occurring in this sector and make certain our manufacturers have that regulatory certainty necessary to drive us forward to a cleaner and, indeed, a healthier future. That certainty is provided by the standards Republicans want to undo today.

Madam Speaker, for the sake of promoting American innovation, addressing our pollution challenges, and supporting our long-term national economic competitiveness, I urge Members to oppose this resolution.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, just to clarify, all the

incentives go away when the mandate takes full effect.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the auto capital of the world. We want to keep it that way and stop imposing China's agenda on us.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman speaks right about the auto capital of the world, Michigan.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 136 put forward by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), which blocks the tailpipe emissions rule, EPA's de facto electric vehicle mandate, not Project 2025 gaslighting coming from the other side of the aisle.

Last December, with bipartisan support, the House passed the CARS Act, a bill I led to block the EPA's proposed rule and similar rules. A few months later, the EPA finalized its rule setting stringent emission standards, which would force automakers to ensure that 56 percent of light-duty vehicle sales are battery electric, and another 13 percent are plug-in hybrid by 2032.

The final tailpipe rule is nearly as radical as the proposed rule, which this body has already unequivocally opposed. Even with government subsidies, EVs continue to be out of reach for many Americans who have already been experiencing the effects of crippling inflation worsened by the Biden-Harris administration.

Consumers are not only worried about the price tag, but EVs also pose significant practicality challenges due to limited range and battery charging times. This executive overreach would also essentially hand China the keys to our automotive future, as around 90 percent of the EV supply chain, in aggregate, is controlled by China.

Instead of implementing unrealistic emission standards that effectively mandate EVs, we should be pursuing policies that promote innovation and preserve U.S. manufacturing.

I am a proud Michigander, and I know that this industry thrives off of American ingenuity and innovation from the engineers in metro Detroit, not the bureaucrats in Washington. The industry thrives off of consumers, as well. We must encourage consumer choice so that Americans can purchase the vehicle that works best for them.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a member of our committee.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.J. Res. 136, a resolution seeking to overturn the EPA's very important tailpipe emissions rule finalized in April 2024.

This rule sets strong pollution standards for passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty vehicles for model years 2027 through 2032. It is a vital step toward cleaner air and healthier lives for all Americans.

As an emergency physician, I have witnessed firsthand the severe health impacts of air pollution on our communities. In fact, recent scientific literature shows that those communities

that live in high-polluted areas live 10 years less than those that do not.

The Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley in southern California, in my district, despite their beauty, consistently rank among the worst air quality in the Nation. Without surprise, this has led to an alarmingly high asthma rate in our district, nearly double the average national rate.

□ 0945

Approximately 27 percent of our children suffer from asthma and experience some of the highest asthma-related hospitalizations in California.

Families, particularly those in low-income, frontline, vulnerable communities, are grappling with the consequences of living in one of the worst regions for air quality in the country.

This is not just an issue in my district. Madam Speaker, this is an issue in your district. This is an issue in all of our districts.

Across the United States, air pollution is responsible for over 100,000 premature deaths each year and results in billions in healthcare costs. These are healthcare costs that the middle-class family cannot afford from preventable illnesses such as heart disease, lung disease, and asthma.

The EPA's new rule is expected to prevent nearly 1,000 premature deaths annually, reduce millions of tons of harmful emissions, and save American families who are struggling with the cost of living \$1.6 trillion in healthcare costs by 2050.

For my constituents, this rule means fewer children suffering from asthma attacks, fewer seniors rushed to the emergency room for respiratory illnesses, and cleaner air for everyone. Yet, some of my Republican colleagues are attempting to repeal it, prioritizing the profits of big polluters over the health of our families.

This resolution, in fact, is straight from Trump's 2025 playbook because it aligns with his plan to put corporate polluters in the driver's seat and prioritize Big Oil profits over Americans' health and well-being.

Repealing this rule would erase \$280 billion in net benefits and prolong the suffering of vulnerable communities from preventable diseases.

This resolution serves corporate interests at the expense of the public's health. This resolution will revoke the EPA's protections and replace them with nothing. This will not only repeal the EPA's rule but prevent any further administration from tackling this issue and taking any similar type of action.

By rejecting H.J. Res. 136 and supporting the EPA's rule, we are choosing to prioritize our constituents' health and advance justice for the most vulnerable. Clean air is a right. It is a common good.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critical EPA rule and vote against H.J. Res. 136 because our communities are suffering incredibly from the pollution that they breathe.

Asthma is a horrible illness, especially in children—children who come in from playing with their family and suddenly start wheezing. Sometimes you have minutes to give them the appropriate treatment to prevent them from dying. Sometimes, because they live in rural areas like in my colleagues' districts, they don't have the time to get to that emergency department for that treatment. I have seen it.

This would help reduce the risks that can lead to higher asthma mortality and is aimed at ensuring that we have healthier middle-class families, middle-class families that aren't burdened by the cost of disease, middle-class families that need the support to live healthy lives.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), chairman of the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, EVs have a future in our transportation system. If you want to buy an EV, that is your choice. We will happily sell you one from the State of Georgia, but I don't think government should corner Americans into buying a car based on ideological bureaucrats' preferred models.

Rushed government mandates on arbitrary timelines without consideration of geopolitical factors undermine consumer choice, manipulate markets, and will further tie us to China's whims.

Congressman JAMES' CRA resolution would restore personal freedom and protect America. I urge its support.

EPA asserts its tailpipe standards are not a mandate for widespread EV adoption, but the numbers of the regulation tell a different story.

Even more telling, the market is not ready to voluntarily go there. J.D. Power has downgraded projections for EV sales by 25 percent. Cox Automotive's research team has found that the average consumer isn't sold on going electric, and many won't be easily convinced, even with incentives.

If we are being intellectually honest, the administration's policy outcome is only possible through this unrealistic market conversion mandate. Why? In addition to buyer sentiment, the regulation's most modest compliance pathway requires increasing the market share of new 2032 all-electric or plug-in hybrid vehicles by 62 percent over 8 years.

Moreover, car manufacturers have slowed their U.S. production of electric-powered cars. They realize these vehicles with subsidies and mandates are not selling, and the automakers only have so long to offset their losses with gas-powered vehicles.

Meanwhile, this rule aids China, which is further expanding its global dominance of inputs to make electric vehicles.

This situation is madness, and gaming our regulatory system this way will cripple hardworking Americans.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Congressman JAMES' CRA.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is the ranking member of our Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, the Inflation Reduction Act, the bipartisan infrastructure law, and the CHIPS Act constitute the most important climate legislation ever enacted. EPA modeling indicates implementation of the IRA alone can achieve a reduction of the transportation sector's carbon pollution by roughly 11 to 25 percent from 2005 levels by 2030. EPA's final rule is expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from light-duty vehicles by about 11 percent every year.

Once fully phased in, the standards will save the average American driver an estimated \$6,000 in reduced fuel and maintenance over the life of a vehicle.

I am going to say that again because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to think this is bad for consumers when, in fact, it is good. Once fully phased in, the standards will save the average American driver an estimated \$6,000 over the life of a vehicle.

The beauty of this approach is that it allows automakers to do what they do best, which is innovate. EPA's rule does not mandate or ban any specific technology. Instead, it sets emission standards that apply across an entire auto fleet rather than specific vehicles. What this means is that auto companies could still produce cars with higher emissions provided that they balance out the emissions with sales from lower emission vehicles.

EPA did its homework. They worked closely with stakeholders in developing this rule, and that is why manufacturers can use a variety of approaches, from EVs to gas-powered vehicles with particulate filters, to comply. I am confident American automakers can rise to this challenge.

As States and auto companies plan, consumers are increasingly excited about lower emission and zero-emission vehicles. In my home State of Colorado, an Environmental Defense Fund analysis examined the net purchase cost of electric vehicles and found many offered thousands of dollars in lifetime savings. For example, it found cost savings as high as \$21,500 when comparing the cost of Ford's F-150 Lightning EV with the gas-powered Ford F-150.

Consumers are taking advantage. In 2023, U.S. EV sales reached 1.6 million, which is a 60 percent increase from 2022. This shows consumer demand for EVs is here and will only grow.

As the evidence shows, EPA's rule saves consumers money and reduces carbon emissions. It is not an either/or. However, to compete globally, we must continue to make progress.

One of the few countries that rivals the U.S. in EV adoption is China. Eight

of the top best-selling EVs in the world are made by Chinese companies. This administration has taken strong action to ensure U.S. automakers can compete in this critical sector.

Now, I will address a claim the EPA emissions limit will mandate electric vehicles. We hear this all the time. This is simply not the case.

EPA is relying on flexible performance-based standards. This means, as I said, instead of requiring any specific approach, automakers have the option to allow for a mix of technologies to meet the limits.

This has not stopped my colleagues on the other side of the aisle from pursuing CRAs that would raise emissions and hike costs for consumers. I find that so ironic because what we want to do is help consumers here.

Unfortunately, this isn't new. The majority has spent this entire Congress attacking progress in protecting human health and the environment, while the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee has moved numerous bills attacking energy efficiency, including the so-called Refrigerator Freedom Act.

At the end of the day, the biggest threat to energy security is our country's dependence on foreign oil and natural gas. However, with this resolution and by ignoring the threats posed to the grid by the climate crisis, frankly, the majority is fiddling while Rome burns.

The Biden-Harris EPA has led. I am grateful for their leadership. If we care about our energy security, we should all support EPA's rule to reduce our demand for a finite resource.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my support for Mr. JAMES' resolution.

I am not anti-EV, and I support innovation, however, creating supply cannot force demand, and that is exactly what these rush-to-green policies are trying to do.

Over the years, I have brought together stakeholders in my district and around Indiana for roundtables, and we know that the EV mandate is unfeasible and just not working. We simply cannot get the energy where it needs to be when it needs to be there.

With this rule, it is clear that this administration wants to leave the consumer with no choice other than an EV. The consumer has made it abundantly clear that they want choice.

This rule would be devastating to consumers, manufacturers, and the transportation industry itself.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in overturning this administration's shortsighted rule.

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

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Madam Speaker, Michigan put the world on wheels, and we are going to keep it moving forward. We are proud of our legacy that is ever-evolving, thanks to the grit of the American worker.

West Michiganders, in particular, are a key part of this legacy as folks across my district manufacture transportation components necessary to keep this country in motion.

I also take special pride in representing miles of beautiful Lake Michigan shoreline, the largest freshwater reserve in the entire world. My community knows that we must be good stewards of our Nation's most critical cargo ports.

Right now, we are fighting to preserve our resources so that our children might inherit a world where our kids can breathe, that can sustain our farms, is void of extreme weather events, and has clean water to drink and air to breathe.

This is not going to happen overnight. It requires a multifaceted approach. The EPA's effort to limit harmful air pollution from light- and medium-duty vehicles is a piece of this lifesaving puzzle.

Our Nation's transportation sector is critical, but it is also one of the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions, so to safeguard the health and well-being of Americans, we have to work to slash pollution associated with our planes, trains, ships, and cars.

□ 1000

To be clear, the EPA's technology-neutral rule is not an EV mandate. It is a call on manufacturers to innovate and expand options for consumers to choose vehicles based on their potential environmental impact.

What exactly do so many of my colleagues across the aisle have against choice?

When it comes to forging a new path forward in transportation, I would never bet against Michigan, especially Michigan automakers.

Air pollution, particularly from tailpipes, is responsible for asthma and a wide array of respiratory illnesses in children, adults, and seniors.

If this rule stays intact, families across West Michigan will save on healthcare costs an estimated \$1.6 trillion and protect the well-being of their children. As a mom of two young children, two young student athletes in particular, I take this seriously.

If you are a parent out there of a child with asthma, I stand here on your behalf today. If you are an American autoworker, I stand here on your behalf today.

If you are ready to stand up to big polluters and China and stand up for American autoworkers, I am standing for you here today.

Rolling back this rule is bending a knee to big polluters while ignoring the broad coalition of autoworkers, automakers, public health advocates, and environmental organizations who

believe in addressing climate change head-on while furthering innovation in transportation.

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

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

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Madam Speaker, I am so proud of West Michigan's critical role in the transportation sector, but this CRA won't do anything to address the reality of the sector's emissions.

This is not a mandate. It is an opportunity to innovate for families, for farmers, and to get out there and keep China from eating our lunch.

I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership in pushing back against this CRA, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, after months of falsely claiming that the Biden-Harris administration was not pursuing a ban on gas-powered vehicles, the EPA has reversed their position by finalized policies that would create a de facto ban over the course of the next 10 years.

The light- and medium-duty tailpipe rule would require 68 percent of all sales of new passenger vehicles to be electric or plug-in electric hybrid by 2032.

The fact is simple. Electric vehicles cannot meet the demands of my constituents in Pennsylvania. The mountains in Pennsylvania, along with the harsh winters and the hot summers, make driving an electric vehicle both unreliable and unrealistic for my constituents.

Simply said, they do not want to be forced into choosing what type of vehicle they can drive. At a time when inflation has skyrocketed over 20 percent and the average electric vehicle costs more than \$55,000, forcing Americans to purchase these vehicles is a disaster for working families.

The Biden-Harris EPA cannot force the American people to purchase cars that they don't want and cars that they can't afford.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and stand up to the EPA bureaucracy that continues to harass working American families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 16½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I was a little bit stunned when I came

down here today to hear the argument made on pollution.

I would just request that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do some research as to the amount of pollution that came from cars 50 years ago compared to today or just get pictures of Pittsburgh or Los Angeles 50 years ago compared to today. Things are already so wildly cleaner.

In any event, my major concern about this rule is it is another attack on the middle class. I have been told that a Chevy Silverado may cost \$20,000 more, EV or not. I mean, people cannot afford that.

It is understated, but because of the huge cost to repair and the cost of insurance, and most States, including Wisconsin, have mandatory insurance, it is dramatically more than a traditional car.

It wasn't until this week I found out that the resale value was less. If you are like a lot of people and like to trade in your new car 5 or 6 years down the road, you are going to get less for your EV vehicle.

When you combine the money you are going to lose on the depreciation, the huge increase in insurance, and the huge increased cost when you buy the car, it is just an assault on the middle class.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. This is unbelievable. I can't believe the radical left's absolutely relentless climate alarmism that has already claimed a bunch of victims: plastic straws, ceiling fans, gas stoves, you name it.

Now, the EPA is targeting our combustion engine cars, trying to shove their electric vehicle agenda down the throats of freedom-loving Americans. This is all in the name of so-called climate change, while making us even more dependent on the Chinese Communist Party.

To put this in perspective, how out of touch this friggling proposal is, there are 260 million gasoline- and diesel-powered passenger vehicles on the road today but only 3 million EVs. Let that sink in, Mr. Speaker. Of those EV drivers, 46 percent want to go back to gasoline cars. How about that?

One of the things I tell people is if you are driving an electric car, don't ever turn onto a dead-end street because you will be stuck on a road with no outlet. Let that sink in.

All jokes aside, I am absolutely proud to support my colleague JOHN JAMES' bill to protect consumer choice, allowing Americans—who would have known—to actually have realistic car options in the marketplace, which at the same time prevents further reliance on China.

I am tired of hearing all the climate alarmism. Now they are trying to make Americans do what they want them to do. Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell the climate alarmists they can blow it out their tailpipes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and let Americans drive the agenda and not some high-minded bureaucrats.

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 Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 136 and thank Congressman JAMES for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, consumer choice is a vital component of our free market economy, which has grown wealth in this country substantially over the years.

However, an endless obsession with their rush to a green agenda, the Biden-Harris administration is seeking to strip away consumer choice in the form of a tailpipe emissions rule that would effectively mandate that at least two-thirds of all new cars in the United States be electric by 2032. This is a mandate straight from the top. Let me be clear. I am not anti-EV. I am pro-American consumer.

As I represent rural Georgia, for many of my constituents, EVs are impractical, considering the high cost, lack of charging infrastructure in rural communities, and overall time commitment to get that full charge.

The American people do not need or want this administration mandating what car best suits their family's needs.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 136 and to restore consumer choice and end this unreasonable rule. The American people are sick and tired of this.

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

Madam Speaker, I keep hearing arguments from my Republican colleagues that the EPA is forcing electric vehicles onto American consumers, but nobody's forcing anyone to buy an electric vehicle, and to claim that is happening is just false.

Expanding and diversifying our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry will increase consumer choice and provide more options for all Americans.

The rule that the Republicans seek to repeal today is actually supported by the auto manufacturers as well as auto unions.

We should be empowering industry to innovate and create better-performing, more affordable options for our constituents. This is about options. There is no mandate.

EPA's consistent vehicle emission standards have empowered decades of

innovation in the vehicle industry, which have benefited all Americans.

If we want to compete with China, we have to continue to provide choice. We have to continue to make sure that electric vehicles and other options are available. Otherwise, we are going to fall behind.

I urge my colleagues again to vote "no" on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, the numbers that we are quoting are from the final rule. We are not making it up.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 136, which would disapprove of the EPA's radical tailpipe emission rule and EV mandate.

This rule would mandate that two-thirds of the new vehicles being sold by 2032 be all electric, strong-arming auto manufacturers into building cars that simply do not reflect market needs.

America is in the middle of a historic surge in power demand, yet the Biden-Harris administration has chosen to implement policies that will force the early retirement of some of our most reliable power plants.

The EPA's EV mandate will put more strain on our electric grid and further undermine the grid's reliability for years to come.

Simply put, increasing demand on the grid through forced electrification while reducing our power supply is a recipe for disaster.

With the passage of this legislation today, we can reaffirm our support of the free market and consumer choice, and we can defend America's energy security.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this action taken under the Congressional Review Act to overturn the EPA's misguided tailpipe emissions rule.

This rule, if enacted, would force the majority of Americans to buy electric vehicles instead of vehicles powered by other technologies.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear. I have nothing against electric vehicles. I do, however, think that Americans should be empowered to make their own decisions about what vehicle technology works for them and their families.

The fact is that EVs cost on average \$12,000 more than the equivalent gasoline-powered vehicle. That is just the purchase price.

The same misguided policies that the EPA is pursuing here are also forcing the cost of electricity generation to go up in this country.



In fact, in my own hometown in California, the electric provider recently submitted a rate case that seeks to raise the base rate for residential electricity to \$0.45 a kilowatt hour.

Try doing the math on what it costs to drive an electric vehicle when you are forced to pay \$0.45 a kilowatt hour for the energy to charge it.

Madam Speaker, Americans should be empowered to make their own decisions about what vehicles to buy, not forced into that decision by misguided government policies. I urge a "yes" vote.

□ 1015

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, government market mandates are contrary to the very founding principles of America. Mandating EV purchases are especially egregious and fall short of the hopped-up environmental benefits supposedly driving the logic behind the mandate.

First, I have nothing against EVs. They are innovative technology. They will be part of our transportation future, and they are actually fun to drive if you can afford them.

However, EVs are not selling, especially in rural America, where they are unreliable, unaffordable, and can't even be purchased with the massive taxpayer-funded subsidies that are available right now. EVs are not the savior of the environment nor the climate. The EPA and DOE's own data clearly show this.

First off, the United States is responsible for 13.49 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. It is another topic, but China is more than double that. The entire transportation sector in the United States makes up 29 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions. Light-duty trucks and passenger vehicles make up 57 percent of transportation. The rest of it is planes, trains, and automobiles. Finally, 40 percent of U.S. electrical production comes from noncarbon-emitting sources.

When you do the math, the claims that EVs are going to save the climate and save the planet fall far short. Emissions in America equal 13.49 percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions. Twenty-nine percent comes from U.S. transportation, all forms of transportation. Fifty-seven percent of transportation comes from light-duty trucks and passenger vehicles. Forty percent of our energy or electricity comes from noncarbon-emitting sources.

If you multiply that out, the maximum potential if every passenger car and light-duty truck in America were made an EV overnight, you reduce global greenhouse gas emissions 0.9 percent. Madam Speaker, figures don't lie, but sometimes liars figure.

Americans are being force-fed EVs, and they are being force-fed a lie, saying that driving an EV is going to save the planet. It is not going to help one iota. While we are forcing people to drive EVs, China is building a new coal-fired plant every week. I encourage passage of this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, may I ask again as to the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY). The gentleman from New Jersey has 5½ minutes remaining.

The gentlewoman from Washington has 6¼ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, we are not mandating EVs. We are not forcing anybody to use EVs. I am going to say that over and over again. However, what we are doing is trying to reduce air pollution. This resolution is a step backwards in addressing dangerous air pollution that contributes to climate change and contributes to asthma and all kinds of health disorders.

The transportation sector is responsible for a significant portion of our Nation's greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air pollutants that harm human health. Over 130 million people across the country live in counties with unhealthy levels of air pollution.

Even worse, air pollution is associated with 100,000 premature deaths every year. Let me repeat that because I don't think my Republican colleagues are getting how serious this is. Every year, 100,000 people across the country die sooner than they are expected to because of air pollution.

Congress directed the EPA to protect public health and the environment and granted it several tools to do so through the Clean Air Act. One of these tools is the authority to set vehicle emission standards for harmful pollutants emitted by vehicles, which is exactly what EPA did when it proposed and finalized the rule that the Republicans are attempting to repeal today.

This reduction in air pollution will result in fewer heart attacks, fewer respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses, fewer cases of aggravated asthma, and fewer cases of decreased lung function. The rule is also projected to prevent up to 2,500 premature deaths. With this CRA, Republicans want to wipe out these significant air pollution reductions and associated public health benefits. It is that simple.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who knows a little bit about cars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the Biden administration's proposed

rule to increase emission standards for light- and medium-duty trucks. In full disclosure, I am a car dealer. I know what I am talking about, and I am the expert in the room.

This rule is an attack on hard-working Americans and, if implemented, would require up to two-thirds of new cars and nearly 40 percent of trucks sold in the U.S. to be electric vehicles in the next 8 years, threatening consumer choice and furthering our reliance on foreign adversaries.

As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and owner and operator of car dealerships in Texas for over 53 years, I have seen firsthand the impact that overregulating can have on small businesses.

We are a country of competition, of risk and reward. The Federal Government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. We must let competition drive innovation and allow people to choose the vehicles that best suit them and their needs. The dealer must sell that vehicle, and the consumers must be able to buy it.

As you have and will hear today, this proposed rule will limit consumer choices and increase costs for Main Street America. Try pulling a two-horse trailer, a boat, and a jet ski from Weatherford, Texas, to Midland, Texas. You are never going to get there.

It is clear the Biden administration and the EPA are out of touch with the American people. While many families are struggling to pay bills and save for their future, this administration is ignoring out-of-control inflation while pushing a green energy bailout that nobody wants. Let me tell you, there is no market for EV vehicles. I can tell you firsthand.

Madam Speaker, I stand for consumers. I stand for the car dealer. I stand for the customer. I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and stop this administration's America-last energy policy. In God we trust. Does anybody want to buy a car?

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

I grew up with my father and my uncle having a used car business, and I know that because we still lease the business to another person who operates it today. They are still selling used cars. People will buy gas-powered cars, hybrids, and electric vehicles. There is nothing in here that mandates that they have to buy an electric vehicle.

The bottom line is, if we don't continue to invest in American innovation and help auto manufacturers and look for various options, we are not going to be able to compete with China.

If you pass this resolution, you are making it much, much more difficult for us to compete with China.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, we can build one battery electric vehicle for the same raw

materials as six plug-in hybrid electric vehicles or 90 hybrid electric vehicles. For one of the cars that EPA is going to mandate that Americans buy, we could build six plug-in or 90 hybrid vehicles for the same raw materials. Yet, the EPA is mandating electric, battery electric vehicles. That is how many batteries you can make with the same amount of minerals. Ninety hybrid electric vehicles reduces 37 times as much carbon as one of these vehicles the EPA is mandating, the 100 percent battery electric.

Let's get back to reality. America is leading the world in technology and innovation that is bringing down carbon emissions. Let's do it the American way, not this China forced-mandate policy on America.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, underlying the gentlewoman's point, on top of that, you can get so much more out of current vehicles. The regulators will not allow the type of mining we need in this country to get the materials, the minerals to produce these electrified vehicles and electrified everything else.

I hear all morning that, oh, this isn't a mandate, nobody is forcing anybody to buy anything. You are forcing the marketplace to build these cars. In California, you can't buy certain models of gas-powered Jeeps because they have to sell X amount of electric Jeeps, so you have to go out of State to buy what you want.

This is being forced upon the people, and it is being forced on the manufacturers. It is going to force all of our jobs over to China or Mexico for production, all ostensibly to be chasing a little bit of carbon dioxide. I remind you once again, 0.04 percent is the greenhouse gas that we are chasing, carbon dioxide.

Indeed, we are forcing the marketplace to do things people don't want, people cannot afford. These vehicles weigh at least 50 percent more than the same type of gas vehicle, and they are tearing up our highways more. People don't want this. I talk to my dealerships, and I talk to regular people. They don't want to be forced into this. We need to support Mr. JAMES' legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, again, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 2¾ minutes remaining.

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

House Democrats are united in our understanding that we must decarbonize our transportation sector while preserving consumer choice and driving technological innovation in the domestic auto industry. This resolution would undermine our ability to achieve these goals. Instead of backtracking on decades of progress like

the CRA would do, I offer a different path forward.

First, we must protect the integrity of the Clean Air Act and EPA's authority to set forward-looking vehicle emission standards that protect public health and the environment.

Next, we need to foster innovation and technological development in the clean transportation sector.

Finally, we must continue to build on the historic investments in the Inflation Reduction Act and the bipartisan infrastructure law.

With this CRA, my Republican colleagues are attempting to strand these incredible investments and stop this tremendous progress. When Republicans oppose our investments in America's manufacturing, which is what they are doing today, they are advocating for American industry to stand down.

Rather than ceding ground to Communist China, House Democrats are investing in America's ability to compete and beat out our economic competition. That is why we have to oppose this bill.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1030

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

EVs are fine technologies for those who can afford them and use them. However, they should not be forced on people against their will when their means, their circumstance, or their preference requires traditional gas, diesel, or a hybrid vehicle.

EVs come with serious negative impacts for consumers, American security, and the environment. Over its lifetime, an EV only has lower emissions than a gas-powered vehicle if it travels between 28,069 and 68,160 miles and remains in service for more than 10 years, circumstances that are not being realized today.

EVs are not for everyone. Just because some people like them doesn't mean that they are going to work.

EV batteries rely on five critical minerals: lithium, cobalt, magnesium, nickel, and graphite. Compared to the conventional internal combustion engine, an electric vehicle requires six times the mineral inputs.

Further, IEA estimates that the demand for lithium will increase 43 times by 2040. Critical minerals are critical for EVs and batteries, and China dominates much of the supply chains for EV batteries.

Additionally, raw ore needs to be processed into usable minerals. Again, China does 100 percent of the processing.

A rush to EVs will directly increase our reliance on China. China controls 90 percent of the EV supply chain. It also currently controls 78 percent of the global EV battery production, 90 percent of the global rare earth ele-

ment refining capacity, 90 percent of refining, 70 percent of global cobalt refining capacity, 68 percent of global nickel refining capacity, and 50 percent of global lithium refining capacity.

What are we doing in the United States about that? Nothing. This administration is shutting down mining and processing. It takes, on average, 7 years just to permit anything in the United States of America.

This is a mandate from the EPA that is not in the best interest of America and not in the best interest of consumers. Let's vote "yes" today on this resolution. Let's unleash American energy and American innovation in the car sector.

We have led the world in the last 100 years in car manufacturing. Our goal is to make sure that America continues to lead the world in innovation and car manufacturing and do it in a way that is affordable and that can actually be implemented, not this unrealistic, expensive, unaffordable mandate by the EPA on Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1455, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit H.R. 5717;

Passage of H.R. 5717, if ordered;

Passage of H.J. Res. 136; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 9106.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.