Diversified Reporting Services, Inc. 1 RPTS EUELL 2 3 HIF208000 4 MARKUP OF: 5 6 H.R. 1435 (JOYCE), THE PRESERVING CHOICE IN VEHICLE PURCHASES 7 ACT; H.R. 4468 (WALBERG), THE CHOICE IN AUTOMOBILE RETAIL SALES 8 ACT OF 2023; 9 H.R. 4469 (PENCE), THE NO FUEL CREDITS FOR BATTERIES ACT OF 10 2023; 11 H.R. 4510 (LATTA), NTIA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2023; 12 H.R. 3385 (PLASKETT), DIASPORA LINK ACT; AND 13 H.R. 3369 (HARDER), AI ACCOUNTABILITY ACT 14 THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2023 15 House of Representatives, 16 17 Committee on Energy and Commerce, 18 Washington, D.C. 19 20 The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m. in 21

22	Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cathy McMorris
23	Rodgers [chair of the committee] presiding.
24	
25	Present: Representatives Rodgers, Burgess, Latta,
26	Guthrie, Griffith, Bilirakis, Johnson, Bucshon, Hudson,
27	Walberg, Carter, Duncan, Palmer, Dunn, Curtis, Lesko, Pence,
28	Crenshaw, Joyce, Armstrong, Weber, Allen, Balderson, Fulcher,
29	Pfluger, Harshbarger, Miller-Meeks, Cammack, Obernolte;
30	Pallone, Eshoo, DeGette, Schakowsky, Matsui, Castor,
31	Sarbanes, Tonko, Clarke, Cardenas, Ruiz, Peters, Dingell,
32	Veasey, Kuster, Kelly, Barragan, Blunt Rochester, Soto,
33	Craig, Schrier, Trahan, and Fletcher.
34	

35 Staff Present: Sarah Alexander, Professional Staff Member, Energy and Environment; Sean Brebbia, Chief Counsel, 36 37 Oversight & Investigations; Jolie Brochin, Clerk, Health; Sarah Burke, Deputy Staff Director; Michael Cameron, 38 Professional Staff Member, IDC; Jerry Couri, Deputy Chief 39 Counsel for Environment; Lauren Eriksen, Clerk, O&I; Sydney 40 Greene, Director of Operations; Slate Herman, Counsel, C&T; 41 Jessica Herron, Clerk, IDC; Nate Hodson, Staff Director; Tara 42 Hupman, Chief Counsel; Noah Jackson, Clerk, C&T; Sean Kelly, 43 Press Secretary; Peter Kielty, General Counsel; Emily King, 44 Member Services Director; Giulia Leganski, Professional Staff 45 Member, C&T; John Lin, Senior Counsel, C&T; Mary Martin, 46 Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment; Jacob McCurdy, 47 Professional Staff Member, Energy; Brandon Mooney, Deputy 48 Chief Counsel for Energy; Kate O'Connor, Chief Counsel, C&T; 49 Emma Schultheis, Staff Assistant; Olivia Shields, 50 Communications Director; Peter Spencer, Senior Professional 51 52 Staff Member, Energy; Michael Taggart, Policy Director; Evan Viau, Professional Staff Member, C&T; Hannah Anton, Minority 53 Staff Assistant; Jennifer Epperson, Minority Chief Counsel, 54 Communications and Technology; Waverly Gordon, Minority 55

56	Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio,
57	Minority Staff Director; Caitlin Haberman, Minority Staff
58	Director, Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Minerals;
59	Perry Hamilton, Minority Member Services and Outreach
60	Manager; Mackenzie Kuhl, Minority Digital Manager; Dan
61	Miller, Minority Professional Staff Member; Emma Roehrig,
62	Minority Staff Assistant; Kylea Rogers, Minority Policy
63	Analyst; Michael Scurato, Minority FCC Detailee; Andrew
64	Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach, and
65	Member Services; Medha Surampudy, Minority Professional Staff
66	Member; Johanna Thomas, Minority Counsel; Rebecca Tomilchik,
67	Minority Junior Professional Staff Member; Keegan Cardman,
68	Minority Intern; and Nicole Lu, Minority Intern.

70 *The Chair. The committee will come to order, and the chair recognizes herself for an opening statement. 71 72 Good morning, everyone. For decades, America has led the world in technologies 73 that have transformed people's lives and raised their 74 standard of living, from state-of-the-art communications 75 networks to cutting-edge automotive technologies. To win the 76 future we must continue to lead. Right now, China is our 77 number one national security, economic, and technological 78 threat. They are challenging the global influence of the 79 U.S. in these key industries. We must confront these 80 challenges by promoting American innovation and 81 82 entrepreneurship. Our bill to reauthorize NTIA will help us beat China by 83 providing NTIA the tools needed to use resources like 84 spectrum more efficiently, streamline regulations, and 85 advance connectivity across the United States. This will 86 87 enhance Internet and public safety services across the country, and create more economic opportunities for millions 88 of Americans. The bill promotes broadband deployment by 89 strengthening agency coordination, and secures our networks 90

91 from foreign threats.

We also have several solutions before us that will 92 93 ensure Americans continue to have the ability to choose the vehicles and the fuels that best serve their needs. This is 94 a critical moment in history. We must be honest with the 95 American people about how forcing them to switch to electric 96 vehicles plays right into China's scheme to control our 97 98 automotive future. China already controls access to critical minerals necessary for EVs. It controls 76 percent of global 99 battery cell production capacity for EVs, around 75 percent 100 of all lithium ion batteries, and the majority of processing 101 and refining capacity for over half of the world's lithium, 102 cobalt, and graphite. And last quarter it became the largest 103 exporter of new motor vehicles in the world, surpassing 104 Japan. 105

Instead of forcing Americans to switch to EVs, let's get back to the true goals, which are reducing carbon emissions, improving fuel efficiency, and preserving Americans' access to affordable transportation choices. The legislative solutions today will ensure that we don't hand our automotive or communications future to the Chinese Communist Party.

112	America, not China, must lead the way in cutting-edge
113	technologies. We need to stay focused on securing America's
114	leadership in these sectors through innovation,
115	entrepreneurship, and promoting a free, competitive market to
116	lower costs for people. That is how we have led for decades,
117	and that is how we win the future.
118	I now recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr.
119	Pallone, for five minutes for an opening statement.
120	*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Madam Chair.
121	Today is our last markup before we depart for the August
122	recess.
123	Committee Democrats have been laser focused on efforts
124	to grow our economy and lower costs to the American people.
125	Three laws passed during the last Congress the Bipartisan
126	Infrastructure Law, the Inflation Reduction Act, and the
127	CHIPS and Science Act are beginning to make a real
128	difference. We continue to work to build upon these
129	successes, and we continue to fight back efforts by committee
130	Republicans to undermine these laws, which would only weaken
131	our economy and raise prices on Americans. Those Republican
132	efforts will, unfortunately, continue at this markup.

133 Today we are considering six bills, and I am pleased that we will begin with three bipartisan bills that advanced 134 135 out of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee. H.R. 4510, the NTIA Reauthorization Act, is bipartisan 136 legislation from Subcommittee Chairman Latta and Ranking 137 Member Matsui. It reauthorizes the National 138 Telecommunications and Information Administration and 139 140 elevates its leadership in the Department of Commerce by making the administrative position as undersecretary. This 141 change and the other provisions will help to better reflect 142 the agency's current mission and responsibilities. It also 143 now incorporates bills led by Representatives Kuster, Eshoo, 144 and Walberg, among others. 145 Then there is H.R. 3369, which directs the NTIA to 146 assess the degree to which AI systems are accountable to 147

assess the degree to which AI systems are accountable to
consumers, and the measures needed to reduce the risks AI
poses. Congress must consider these important issues as this
new, but rapidly growing technology becomes more mainstream.
And third is H.R. 3385 that will require NTIA to assess
the value of developing a transatlantic submarine fiber cable
connecting the United States, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Ghana,

154 and Nigeria to increase the security of our networks and 155 protect them from untrusted actors.

156 Unfortunately, that is where the good ideas end. Today Republicans are also pushing through three highly partisan, I 157 think, extreme and anti-EV bills, despite the fact that tens 158 of millions of Americans are right now struggling with 159 extreme heat made worse by climate change. In fact, earlier 160 this month more than 100 million Americans were under 161 excessive heat warnings and heat advisories. The climate 162 crisis is here. And while Democrats are fighting it with 163 investments to reduce pollution and grow our economy, 164 Republicans are fighting to take away those investments and 165 166 reverse our progress.

The transportation sector is a significant contributor of climate pollution, but thankfully, decades of ambitious clean vehicle standards have driven historic innovation, delivering cleaner air and better technologies, and positioning the U.S. as the global leader in cleaner transportation.

173 It has become clear that the Republican agenda is 174 focused entirely on propping up big oil corporations. The

bills on today's agenda are no different. They abandon homegrown American innovation and reverse hard-won climate progress, progress that Americans both need and deserve as we continue to face the record-breaking consequences of climate change.

H.R. 1435 would turn back over 50 years of recognizing 180 California's authority to set more protective vehicle 181 emissions standards. It infringes on the rights of states 182 like my home state of New Jersey to voluntarily adopt those 183 standards to protect people from dangerous air pollution. 184 Then there is H.R. 4468, which would outright bar EPA 185 from finalizing its light and medium-duty vehicle emission 186 standards for model year 2027. This bill also jeopardizes 187 EPA's ability to finalize new vehicle emission standards, 188 effectively preventing the agency from fulfilling its 189 obligation to protect Americans from motor vehicle pollution. 190 And finally, there is H.R. 4469 that would hamper 191 192 biofuel opportunities across the country.

All three of these bills prove that Republicans are willing to sacrifice Americans' right to clean air and a safe climate. They prove Republicans are willing to abandon

American innovation and global leadership in order to support big corporations. And reversing our progress on clean transportation and doubling down on our fossil fuel dependance would make the United States weaker, in my opinion, not stronger.

We already have the technology and the ingenuity to be the global leader in clean transportation. These efforts will lower energy costs, protect public health, fight the climate crisis, and strengthen our economy. But these three Republican bills would abandon our position in favor of maintaining the status quo of putting polluters over people. And that is why I will oppose all three bills.

And with that, Madam Chair, I yield back. Thank you. The Chair. The chair reminds members that, pursuant to committee rules, all committee members' opening statements will be made part of the record.

212 Are there further opening statements?

213 The chair recognizes Mr. Latta for five minutes.

*Mr. Latta. Thank you, Madam Chair, and good morning.

215 Today we are considering several bipartisan pieces of

216 legislation from the Subcommittee on Communications and

217 Technology.

Over the last several months the subcommittee has worked to reauthorize for the first time in over 30 years the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, or NTIA. Our steadfast work will provide the agency with new tools and direction to carry out its 21st century mission in connecting unserved and underserved communities across America.

In May the subcommittee held an oversight hearing with NTIA administrator Alan Davidson to receive an update on his work and hear his perspective on draft legislation. That testimony informed the bipartisan bills we are considering today.

I am pleased to have introduced legislation with the 230 gentlelady from California, the ranking member of the 231 Communication and Technology Subcommittee, H.R. 4510, the 232 NTIA Reauthorization Act, that would modernize NTIA's mission 233 234 and codify several key offices within NTIA, including the Office of Spectrum Management, the Office of Public Safety 235 and Communications, the Office of International Affairs, and 236 the Institute for Telecommunications Sciences. It would also 237

238 reinforce NTIA's role in cybersecurity policy by codifying and renaming the Office of Policy Development and 239 240 Cybersecurity. I want to thank my colleagues across the committee for 241 their work on the important initiatives, including the 242 legislation. With our work we will ensure that NTIA more 243 effectively coordinates Federal broadband and manages Federal 244 245 spectrum. The committee also is considering H.R. 3369, the 246 Artificial Intelligence and Accountability Act, which would 247 direct NTIA to conduct a study on the accountability measures 248 for AI systems used by communications networks, and H.R. 249 3385, which will study the feasibility of a transatlantic 250 submarine cable that would provide national security benefits 251 to the United States. 252 And again, I want to thank the minority for working with 253 us in a bipartisan fashion, and I look forward to advancing 254 these bills to the House for full consideration. 255

And I yield back the balance of my time.

257 *The Chair. Are there further opening statements? The 258 chair recognizes Ms. Matsui for five minutes.

259 *Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As I said at the Communications and Technology 260 261 Subcommittee markup, oversight of the NTIA is one of the most crucial functions of our subcommittee and this full 262 committee. That role is more than just ensuring Federal 263 funds are being used wisely; it means defending the agency's 264 jurisdiction and supporting its statutory role as manager of 265 266 the Federal Government's use of spectrum. This role has never been more important. 267

In the middle of a protracted lapse in the FCC's auction 268 authority, and in the run-up to one of the most consequential 269 world radio conferences in a generation, we need NTIA doing 270 its job. With a bipartisan NTIA reauthorization act, we are 271 providing new tools and authority to ensure the agency can 272 fulfill its mission. That means elevating the NTIA 273 administrator from assistant to under secretary, and 274 modernizing the agency's mission to reflect the challenges of 275 276 today and the opportunities of tomorrow.

I am also glad this bill includes my Spectrum Coexistence Act. This language will require NTIA to conduct a review of Federal receiver technology to support more

280 intensive use of spectrum. The FCC released a set of receiver principles for commercial equipment, and it is 281 282 important to do the same -- that we do the same for Federal tech. We can't afford to have outdated equipment on the 283 commercial side or government side, preventing opportunities 284 for more efficient uses of spectrum. As greenfield 285 opportunities become fewer and further between, it is steps 286 287 like this that would keep the spectrum pipeline strong. This bill will also include the SMART Act Congressman 288 Guthrie and I introduced to develop an incumbent informing 289 capability. This would allow Federal users to share spectrum 290 with commercial users by telling them when and where they are 291 operating in real time. Taken together, this bill will be a 292 powerful tool for a more concerted Federal approach to tech 293 and telecom policy. I look forward to seeing it on the floor 294 295 soon.

And while it is not on the agenda today, I know there is still bipartisan interest from leaders of the subcommittee and full committees to advance my Spectrum Relocation Enhancement Act as soon as possible. I appreciate that shared goal, and look forward to working with the majority to

301 get it on the next full committee markup.

302 With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

303 *The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Are there 304 further opening statements?

305 The chair recognizes Mr. Johnson for three minutes. I 306 got that wrong on the other --

*Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Chair Rodgers, for recognizing
me at today's important markup. Three of the bills we are
considering today were advanced by the Environment,
Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee to protect

311 consumer choice and access to affordable, reliable, and

312 secure vehicles and fuels.

We discussed in depth in multiple hearings, as well as our recent subcommittee markup, that the American people are concerned. But here we are, at the height of summer driving season, and the Biden Administration is attempting a litany of tactics to interfere with the American people's choice and mobility. Thankfully, Republicans on this committee are listening to the people's concerns.

Americans rely on their cars and trucks to commute to work, take their kids to school, check in on grandparents and

322 loved ones, run to the grocery store, to the bank, to receive medical care, and many others. In my rural part of the 323 324 country, in Appalachia, any number of these could be 30 or 40 miles away. And it is well known that mobility is essential 325 for the well-being and welfare of all Americans. But not 326 just physical mobility, it is also economic mobility, upward 327 mobility. People must be able to have the vehicles they 328 329 choose and need to get the job done and provide for their families. 330

Unfortunately, the Biden Administration has issued 331 regulation after regulation to force electric vehicles on the 332 American people before either consumers or the grid are ready 333 for it, not to mention they ignore the true global 334 environmental impact of EVs, which is likely not as "green' 335 as proponents say. Luckily, Republicans have solutions to 336 ensure that Americans can buy the cars they want at a price 337 they can afford now and into the future. 338

First, H.R. 1435 would prevent the EPA from issuing California a waiver for vehicle emission standards if the state standards directly or indirectly limit the sale of new vehicles with internal combustion engines. This bill is

timely because California recently submitted a waiver for its Advanced Clean Cars II proposal, which would require all new passenger vehicles to be zero emission vehicles by 2035. We can't let California force its disastrous policies on the rest of the country.

Next, H.R. 4468, the CARS Act, would prevent the EPA 348 from implementing what we refer to as the tailpipe emissions 349 350 rule, which would require two-thirds of new car sales to be electric by 2032. Cox Automotive estimates that there are 351 90,000 battery electric vehicles sitting on dealership lots 352 right now because American consumers don't want to buy them, 353 this while automakers from Tesla and Ford slash prices and 354 manipulate tax credits in an attempt to entice buyers. 355 We aren't against the EVs, but such government mandates are not 356 letting the free market play out. It is not sustainable. 357

And lastly, we have got H.R. 4469, which would clarify that the EPA is not authorized to create an eRINs program. So with that I want to again be very clear that none of

these bills prevent the Americans from purchasing EVs if it makes sense for them and they want them. But we must ensure that they do not have to live with the de facto government EV

364 mandates if they prefer another type of vehicle.

I look forward to advancing this legislation on our agenda today, and I yield back.

The gentleman yields back. The chair *The Chair. 367 recognizes the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Tonko, 368 for three minutes for the purposes of an opening statement. 369 Thank you, Madam Chair. I express my *Mr. Tonko. 370 371 opposition to the three partisan bills that have been advanced by the Environment Subcommittee. These bills seek 372 to deny Americans the public health and economic benefits of 373 our nation's ongoing transition to cleaner, more innovative 374 vehicle technologies. 375

H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases
Act, would restrict EPA from allowing California to set more
protective vehicle emissions standards to address its
extraordinary pollution challenges and cause uncertainty to
the auto industry by revoking previously issued waivers.
H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act,
would prejudge the outcome of EPA's ongoing tailpipe

383 standards rulemaking process, and prohibit the agency from
384 finalizing a rule that provides vastly greater benefits than

385 costs. Ultimately, this bill will prevent EPA from carrying 386 out its mission that is to protect human health and the 387 environment.

And H.R. 4469, the No Fuel Credits for Batteries Act, prohibits the EPA from finalizing eRINs under the Renewable Fuels Standard program, which will limit and, in some cases, prevent wastewater plants, landfills, and farms that capture eligible biogas feedstocks from participating in the RFS. These bills seek to create uncertainty for the private

394 sector, disrupting the tens of billions of dollars of 395 investments being made to develop and produce the next 396 generation of clean vehicle technologies in the United 397 States.

There is no doubt that there is an innovation revolution 398 happening in the transportation sector right now. It is 399 already creating jobs and reducing pollution, in large part 400 due to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the 401 402 Inflation Reduction Act. Today we will hear that somehow this innovation-driven transition to clean vehicles plays 403 into China's hands. But the reality is that the exact 404 opposite is true. 405

406 Failure to develop our own domestic supply chains and manufacturing capabilities will guarantee that foreign 407 408 competitors win the race to become the global leader in manufacturing clean vehicles and their components. I believe 409 in America. I believe in American workers and automakers and 410 battery producers. We can continue to be that leader in 411 automotive innovation. But winning this global race requires 412 consumer trends, financial incentives, and, yes, regulatory 413 policies to all pull in the same direction. 414

Unfortunately, the bills under consideration seek to upend this third leg of the innovation stool, which will undermine the rapidly growing domestic clean vehicle industry. So I urge members to reject the three Environment bills before us today, and work together to further the United States' efforts to lead the world in clean vehicles.

And with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

422 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Are there 423 further opening statements?

The chair calls up H.R. 3385, as amended by the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, and asks the clerk to report.

427	*The Clerk. Committee print of H.R. 3385, a bill to
428	direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications
429	and Information to submit to Congress a report containing an
430	assessment of the value
431	*The Chair. Without objection, the first reading of the
432	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment
433	at any point.
434	So ordered.
435	[The bill follows:]
436	
437	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
438	

439	*The Chair. Does anyone seek to be recognized on the
440	bill?
441	*Mr. Fulcher. Madam Chair?
442	*The Chair. Who seeks recognition, and for what
443	purpose?
444	Oh, Mr. Fulcher. For what purpose do you seek
445	recognition?
446	*Mr. Fulcher. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
447	desk.
448	*The Chair. The clerk will report.
449	*The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to
450	the committee print of H.R. 3385, offered by Mr. Fulcher.
451	*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the
452	amendment is dispensed with.
453	[The amendment of Mr. Fulcher follows:]
454	
455	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
456	

457 *The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment. 458 459 *Mr. Fulcher. Thank you, Madam Chair. My amendment to revise H.R. 3385 to require the 460 Secretary of Commerce to study the value, cost, and 461 feasibility of running a transatlantic undersea fiber optic 462 cable line from the U.S. Virgin Islands in the Caribbean to 463 464 specific U.S. military commands in Africa. The previous version had NTIA conducting the study, but now it is NTIA and 465 other agencies within the Commerce Department. 466 I want to thank my colleagues, Stacey Plaskett, for 467 working with me on this improved AINS. 468 Undersea cables carry more than 95 percent of 469 international data. This is due to their ability to provide 470 high capacity, cost effective, and reliable data delivery to 471 meet a variety of military and civilian needs. The key here 472 is national security. We strengthen the movement of critical 473 474 data between Africa Command and Special Forces Command to relevant military and civilian leaders in the U.S. 475 It is a good improvement to the bill. 476 Besides counter-terrorism and other security concerns, 477

the U.S. may benefit from trade and investment and countering 478 China in the region. This amendment ensures the private 479 480 sector has information from the Commerce study to evaluate whether to invest in such a project. 481 The final change was to strike the short title to the 482 bill, reflecting the focus on national security and specific 483 military commands in Africa. 484 485 Again, I thank Delegate Plaskett for working with me on this important issue. I urge passage of this amendment. 486 Ι vield back. 487 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The chair 488 recognizes Ms. Clarke for five minutes in -- on the 489 490 amendment. 491 *Ms. Clarke. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last 492 word. *The Chair. The lady is recognized for five minutes. 493 *Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Madam Chair. 494 495 This amendment makes technical changes to H.R. 3385, the Diaspora Link Act, specifically regarding the scope of the 496 report of the bill. 497 Under this legislation the National Telecommunications 498

499 and Information Administration is required to study the 500 value, cost, and feasibility of a transatlantic submarine 501 fiber optic cable connecting the United States to Ghana and 502 Nigeria through a link in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The study would also direct NTIA to report to Congress on the current state of telecommunications connecting the United States Virgin Islands and contiguous United States, including an assessment of the lifespan and security of telecommunication networks linking the two.

This legislation is a critical step to enhance American 508 communications security and competitiveness around the world. 509 In recent years, the United States and many allies have 510 recognized the threat posed by untrusted Chinese 511 telecommunications equipment to our national security. 512 Thanks to the work of this committee and our colleagues, we 513 have taken steps to remove suspect equipment from American 514 communications networks to protect against attacks or 515 516 sabotage by our adversaries. The assessment required in this bill is an important step to further that security, and 517 ensure a critical global communications channel is protected 518 from the prying eyes of our adversaries. 519

520 I thank our colleagues, Representatives Plaskett and Fulcher, for their leadership of this effort. 521 522 This legislation is critical to enhancing U.S. national security and the security of communications between the 523 United States and our African partners, and I look forward to 524 reviewing the results of the NTIA's assessment. 525 I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in the 526 527 nature of a substitute and underlying bill, and I yield back. *The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there 528 further discussion? 529 Seeing none, the vote occurs on H.R. 3385, as amended. 530 Oh, yes, on the AINS, yes. Okay, the vote occurs on the 531 amendment in the nature of a substitute. 532 All those in favor, say aye. 533 Those opposed, nay. 534 The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. 535 Are there further amendments? 536 537 No? Okay. The question now occurs on approving H.R. 3385, as amended, and a roll call vote has been requested. 538 The clerk will call the roll. 539 *The Clerk. Burgess? 540 27

541	[No response.]
542	*The Clerk. Latta?
543	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
544	*The Clerk. Latta votes aye.
545	Guthrie?
546	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
547	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes aye.
548	Griffith?
549	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
550	*The Clerk. Griffith votes aye.
551	Bilirakis?
552	*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.
553	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes aye.
554	Johnson?
555	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
556	*The Clerk. Johnson votes aye.
557	Bucshon?
558	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
559	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes aye.
560	Hudson?
561	*Mr. Hudson. Aye.

562	*The Clerk. Hudson votes aye.
563	Walberg?
564	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
565	*The Clerk. Walberg votes aye.
566	Carter?
567	[No response.]
568	*The Clerk. Duncan?
569	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
570	*The Clerk. Duncan votes aye.
571	Palmer?
572	[No response.]
573	*The Clerk. Dunn?
574	*Mr. Dunn. Aye.
575	*The Clerk. Dunn votes aye.
576	Curtis?
577	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
578	*The Clerk. Curtis votes aye.
579	Lesko?
580	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
581	*The Clerk. Lesko votes aye.
582	Pence?

583	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
584	*The Clerk. Pence votes aye.
585	Crenshaw?
586	[No response.]
587	*The Clerk. Joyce?
588	*Mr. Joyce. Aye.
589	*The Clerk. Joyce votes aye.
590	Armstrong?
591	*Mr. Armstrong. Yes.
592	*The Clerk. Armstrong votes aye.
593	Weber?
594	*Mr. Weber. Aye.
595	*The Clerk. Weber votes aye.
596	Allen?
597	*Mr. Allen. Aye.
598	*The Clerk. Allen votes aye.
599	Balderson?
600	*Mr. Balderson. Aye.
601	*The Clerk. Balderson votes aye.
602	Fulcher?
603	*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is aye.

604	*The Clerk. Fulcher votes aye.
605	Pfluger?
606	*Mr. Pfluger. [Inaudible.]
607	*The Clerk. Pfluger votes aye.
608	Harshbarger?
609	*Mrs. Harshbarger. [Inaudible.]
610	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes aye.
611	Miller-Meeks?
612	[No response.]
613	*The Clerk. Cammack?
614	*Mrs. Cammack. Aye.
615	*The Clerk. Cammack votes aye.
616	Obernolte?
617	*Mr. Obernolte. Aye.
618	*The Clerk. Obernolte votes aye.
619	Pallone?
620	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
621	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
622	Eshoo?
623	*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
624	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.

625	DeGette?
626	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
627	*The Clerk. DeGette votes aye.
628	Schakowsky?
629	[No response.]
630	*The Clerk. Matsui?
631	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
632	*The Clerk. Matsui votes aye.
633	Castor?
634	[No response.]
635	*The Clerk. Sarbanes?
636	[No response.]
637	*The Clerk. Tonko?
638	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
639	*The Clerk. Tonko votes aye.
640	Clarke?
641	*Ms. Clarke. Aye.
642	*The Clerk. Clarke votes aye.
643	Cardenas?
644	[No response.]
645	*The Clerk. Ruiz?

646	[No response.]
647	*The Clerk. Peters?
648	*Mr. Peters. Aye.
649	*The Clerk. Peters votes aye.
650	Dingell?
651	[No response.]
652	*The Clerk. Veasey?
653	[No response.]
654	*The Clerk. Kuster?
655	*Ms. Kuster. Aye.
656	*The Clerk. Kuster votes aye.
657	Kelly?
658	[No response.]
659	*The Clerk. Barragan?
660	[No response.]
661	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester?
662	[No response.]
663	*The Clerk. Soto?
664	*Mr. Soto. Aye.
665	*The Clerk. Soto votes aye.
666	Craig?

667	[No response.]
668	*The Clerk. Schrier?
669	[No response.]
670	*The Clerk. Trahan?
671	[No response.]
672	*The Clerk. Fletcher?
673	[No response.]
674	*The Clerk. Rodgers?
675	*The Chair. Aye.
676	*The Clerk. Rodgers votes aye.
677	*Mr. Cardenas. Cardenas, aye.
678	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes aye.
679	*The Chair. Madam Chair [sic], how is Mr. Palmer
680	recorded?
681	*The Clerk. Hmm?
682	*The Chair. Mr. Palmer.
683	*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.
684	*Mr. Palmer. Aye.
685	*The Clerk. Palmer votes aye.
686	*The Chair. How is Mrs. Miller-Meeks recorded?
687	*The Clerk. Ms. Miller-Meeks is not recorded.

688	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. [Inaudible.]
689	*The Clerk. Miller-Meeks votes aye.
690	*The Chair. How is Mrs. Fletcher recorded?
691	*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher is not recorded.
692	*Mrs. Fletcher. Fletcher votes aye.
693	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
694	*The Chair. How is Mr. Ruiz recorded?
695	*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz is not recorded.
696	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
697	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.
698	*Mr. Veasey. How is
699	*Voice. Mr. Sarbanes.
700	*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey is not recorded.
701	*Mr. Veasey. Veasey is aye.
702	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
703	*The Chair. How is Mr. Sarbanes recorded?
704	*The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes is not recorded.
705	*Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
706	*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes aye.
707	*The Chair. Madam Clerk, how is Ms. Craig recorded?
708	*The Clerk. Ms. Craig is not recorded.

709 *Ms. Craig. Ms. Craig votes aye. *The Clerk. Craig votes aye. 710 711 [Pause.] *The Chair. The clerk will report. 712 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers, on that vote we have 41 ayes 713 and 0 nays. 714 *The Chair. The ayes have it, and the bill is adopted. 715 The chair calls up H.R. 3369, as amended by the 716 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, and asks the 717 clerk to report. 718 *The Clerk. Committee print of H.R. 3369, a bill to 719 direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications 720 and Information to conduct a study and hold public meetings 721 with respect to artificial intelligence systems. 722 *The Chair. Without objection, the first reading of the 723 bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for 724 725 amendment at any point. So ordered. 726 [The bill follows:] 727 728 729 730 36
731	*The Chair. Does anyone seek to be recognized on the
732	bill?
733	[Pause.]
734	*The Chair. Are there any amendments?
735	Mr. Obernolte.
736	*Mr. Obernolte. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
737	desk
738	*The Chair. The clerk will report.
739	*Mr. Obernolte in the nature of a substitute.
740	*The Chair. The clerk will report.
741	*The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to
742	the committee print of H.R
743	*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the
744	amendment is dispensed with.
745	[The amendment of Mr. Obernolte follows:]
746	
747	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
748	

749 *The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment. 750 751 *Mr. Obernolte. Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I am 752 proud to be a bipartisan cosponsor of this bill. Obviously, artificial intelligence is going to be of 753 critical importance in developing human productivity and 754 creativity over the next 20 years. But also, it comes with 755 756 some substantial risks and concerns about safety. Congress is in the process of thinking about what a 757 regulatory framework for AI might look like, but along the 758 way we have to determine how we are going to investigate AI, 759 to investigate whether or not it is accountable, it is 760 responsible, and it is safe for consumers. This is 761 particularly true in spaces such as telecommunications, which 762 is why this bill is so important. It directs the NTIA to 763 conduct a study on the accountability of AI algorithms as 764 765 respect our telecommunications systems to ensure that they 766 are safe and that they don't create risks for American 767 consumers.

768 In our subcommittee hearing we had a discussion about 769 the fact that some of the language that we use when we talk

about AI and how we would like AI to be -- words like trustworthy and responsible and human-centric -- those are emotional words. They are -- express values, but they don't have technical definitions. So this amendment in the nature of a substitute adds the definition of those words and the way that they relate to technical standards to the subject of the study that NTIA will create.

So I think that this is very worthy of support. This is a good first step in establishing these accountability measures for the use of AI in telecommunications, and I would respectfully request adoption of the AINS and your aye vote on the underlying bill.

782 I yield back.

783 *Mr. Burgess. Will the gentleman yield?

784 *Mr. Obernolte. Yes, sir, I yield.

*Mr. Burgess. Now I want to thank Mr. Obernolte of
California for bringing this amendment forward.

There is so much that so many of us don't understand in this space. Talking with doctors who practice radiology a few weeks ago, there are significant advances that are being made in the ability to read films and studies with a level of

791 precision that was not possible previously so that even 792 something as simple as a diagnostic mammogram may be over-793 read by an AI algorithm, which could detect problems that in 794 fact might escape the human eye. So I think this is 795 extremely important that we have the right parameters around 796 it.

At the same time, it is extremely important that we do not delay the development of these types of interventions. So I just want to thank the gentleman who is probably, again, the most the most facile with this topic of anyone on this committee, and I really appreciate his participation in providing us the AINS, and I will be happy to vote for it and the underlying bill.

804 Thank you, Mr. Obernolte.

805 *Mr. Obernolte. I thank the gentleman from Texas. 806 Would anyone else like me to yield time?

Well, I would like to thank Congressman Harder for working with me on this bill, and again urge your support. I yield back, Madam Chair.

810 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there 811 further discussion of the amendment?

The chair recognizes Mrs. Trahan for --812 *Mrs. Trahan. I move to strike the last word. 813 814 *The Chair. To strike the last word, five minutes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am proud that *Mrs. Trahan. 815 the committee is voting today on the AI Accountability Act, 816 and I thank my colleagues, Representatives Obernolte and 817 Harder, for their attention to this issue. 818 819 The unparalleled promise of artificial intelligence brings with it serious accountability questions for a simple 820 reason. When an AI system makes a mistake or causes harm, it 821 can be very difficult to identify exactly what went wrong. 822 From the collection and curation of a data set to training 823 and testing of a model to the implementation and oversight of 824 that model when it is actually used, there are many steps in 825 the AI development process that, if irresponsibly or 826 improperly completed, can cause an AI system to discriminate 827 against an individual, hallucinate false information, or 828 829 simply make a mistake.

And as excited as we all are to develop and deploy AI to solve difficult problems, we must ensure that it is not only consumers and businesses who have access to the information

833 they need to understand AI systems and hold them accountable, but also researchers. Independent researchers are the reason 834 835 that we as policymakers and consumers have any insight at all into the workings of and the harms perpetuated by Big Tech 836 and social media companies. The technologies that we have 837 grown accustomed to already operate at such an individualized 838 and personalized level that it has been difficult to hold 839 840 these decisions accountable.

Independent research and the public interest provides 841 the unbiased and expert insights that society needs to guide 842 the responsible development of technology, and that is why I 843 have introduced legislation like the Digital Services 844 Oversight and Safety Act, which would create a system for 845 qualified, independent researchers to safely and responsibly 846 access data on social media companies and other tech 847 platforms, and it is why I am thankful to the chair, the 848 ranking member, and the sponsors of this bill for including a 849 850 small but important change in the AINS to ensure that the bill considers what information should be available to the 851 researchers who study AI systems. 852

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan

854	legislation, and I hope that it is just the first step in our
855	bipartisan efforts to responsibly develop and regulate this
856	technology.
857	Thank you, I yield back.
858	*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there
859	further discussion on the amendment?
860	If there is no further discussion, the vote occurs on
861	the amendment.
862	All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
863	Those opposed, nay.
864	The ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.
865	The question now occurs on approving H.R. 3369, as
866	amended. A roll call has been requested. The clerk will
867	call the roll.
868	*The Clerk. Burgess?
869	*Mr. Burgess. Burgess votes aye.
870	*The Clerk. Burgess votes aye.
871	Latta?
872	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
873	*The Clerk. Latta votes aye.
874	Guthrie?

875	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
876	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes aye.
877	Griffith?
878	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
879	*The Clerk. Griffith votes aye.
880	Bilirakis?
881	*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.
882	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes aye.
883	Johnson?
884	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
885	*The Clerk. Johnson votes aye.
886	Bucshon?
887	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
888	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes aye.
889	Hudson?
890	*Mr. Hudson. Aye.
891	*The Clerk. Hudson votes aye.
892	Walberg?
893	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
894	*The Clerk. Walberg votes aye.
895	Carter?

896	*Mr. Carter. Aye.
897	*The Clerk. Carter votes aye.
898	Duncan?
899	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
900	*The Clerk. Duncan votes aye.
901	Palmer?
902	[No response.]
903	*The Clerk. Dunn?
904	*Mr. Dunn. Aye.
905	*The Clerk. Dunn votes aye.
906	Curtis?
907	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
908	*The Clerk. Curtis votes aye.
909	Lesko?
910	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
911	*The Clerk. Lesko votes aye.
912	Pence?
913	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
914	*The Clerk. Pence votes aye.
915	Crenshaw?
916	[No response.]

917	*The	Clerk.	Joyce?
918	*Mr.	Joyce.	Aye.
919	*The	Clerk.	Joyce votes aye.
920	Armst	crong?	
921	*Mr.	Armstron	ng. Yes.
922	*The	Clerk.	Armstrong votes aye.
923	Weber	<u>c</u> ?	
924	*Mr.	Weber.	Aye.
925	*The	Clerk.	Weber votes aye.
926	Aller	ı?	
927	*Mr.	Allen.	Aye.
928	*The	Clerk.	Allen votes aye.
929	Balde	erson?	
930	*Mr.	Balderso	on. Aye.
931	*The	Clerk.	Balderson votes aye.
932	Fulch	ner?	
933	*Mr.	Fulcher	. Fulcher is aye.
934	*The	Clerk.	Fulcher votes aye.
935	Pflug	ger?	
936	*Mr.	Pfluger	. Aye.
937	*The	Clerk.	Pfluger votes aye.

938	Harshbarger?
939	*Mrs. Harshbarger. [Inaudible.]
940	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes aye.
941	Miller-Meeks?
942	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Aye.
943	*The Clerk. Miller-Meeks votes aye.
944	Cammack?
945	*Mrs. Cammack. Aye.
946	*The Clerk. Cammack votes aye.
947	Obernolte?
948	*Mr. Obernolte. Aye.
949	*The Clerk. Obernolte votes aye.
950	Pallone?
951	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
952	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
953	Eshoo?
954	*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
955	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.
956	DeGette?
957	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
958	*The Clerk. DeGette votes aye.

959	Schakowsky?
960	*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.
961	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes aye.
962	Matsui?
963	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
964	*The Clerk. Matsui votes aye.
965	Castor?
966	*Ms. Castor. Aye.
967	*The Clerk. Castor votes aye.
968	Sarbanes?
969	*Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
970	*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes aye.
971	Tonko?
972	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
973	*The Clerk. Tonko votes aye.
974	Clarke?
975	*Ms. Clarke. Aye.
976	*The Clerk. Clarke votes aye.
977	Cardenas?
978	*Mr. Cardenas. Aye.
979	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes aye.

980	Ruiz?
981	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
982	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.
983	Peters?
984	*Mr. Peters. Aye.
985	*The Clerk. Peters votes aye.
986	Dingell?
987	*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
988	*The Clerk. Dingell votes aye.
989	Veasey?
990	*Mr. Veasey. Aye.
991	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
992	Kuster?
993	*Ms. Kuster. Aye.
994	*The Clerk. Kuster votes aye.
995	Kelly?
996	*Ms. Kelly. [Inaudible.]
997	*The Clerk. Kelly votes aye.
998	Barragan?
999	*Ms. Barragan. Aye.
1000	*The Clerk. Barragan votes aye.

1001	Blunt Rochester?
1002	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
1003	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes aye.
1004	Soto?
1005	*Mr. Soto. Aye.
1006	*The Clerk. Soto votes aye.
1007	Craig?
1008	*Ms. Craig. Aye.
1009	*The Clerk. Craig votes aye.
1010	Schrier?
1011	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
1012	*The Clerk. Schrier votes aye.
1013	Trahan?
1014	*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.
1015	*The Clerk. Trahan votes aye.
1016	Fletcher?
1017	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
1018	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
1019	Rodgers?
1020	*The Chair. Aye.
1021	*The Clerk. Rodgers votes aye.

1022 [Pause.] *The Chair. The clerk will report. 1023 1024 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers, on that vote we have 50 ayes and 0 nays. 1025 *The Chair. The ayes have it, and the bill is adopted. 1026 1027 The chair calls up H.R. 4510, and asks the clerk to report. 1028 1029 *The Clerk. H.R. 4510, a bill to reauthorize the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to 1030 update the mission and --1031 *The Chair. Without objection, the first reading of the 1032 bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment 1033 1034 at any point. So ordered. 1035 [The bill follows:] 1036 1037 1038 1039

1040 *The Chair. Does anyone seek to be recognized on the bill? 1041 For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition? 1042 Mr. Guthrie. 1043 *Mr. Guthrie. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last 1044 1045 word. *The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes. 1046 1047 *Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just like to support -- voice my support for 4510, the NTIA 1048 Reauthorization Act. 1049 I would like to thank Chairman Latta and Ranking Member 1050 Matsui for including two of my bills in title 2 of the 1051 package, specifically the SMART Spectrum Act, which would 1052 require the National Telecommunications Information 1053 Administration to establish an incumbent informing capability 1054 system to improve spectrum management and facilitate spectrum 1055 sharing between Federal entities, as well as sharing a 1056 1057 Federal spectrum between Federal and non-Federal users. Mv other bill, the Novel Advanced Spectrum and Communications 1058 Technology Network Promotion Act, would direct NTIA to 1059 develop standard processes that will better inform Federal 1060

1061	Government spectrum and management decisions.
1062	As my colleagues on this subcommittee know, spectrum is
1063	a valuable and increasingly scarce resource. And I believe
1064	we need to do all we can to ensure spectrum users are as
1065	efficient as possible. I encourage the support of this bill,
1066	and I will yield time to someone or yield back.
1067	I will yield back.
1068	*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there
1069	further discussion?
1070	The chair recognizes Ms. Matsui. For what purpose?
1071	*Ms. Matsui. I have an amendment at the desk.
1072	*The Chair. The clerk will report.
1073	[Pause.]
1074	*Ms. Matsui. AINS 01.
1075	*The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to
1076	H.R. 4510, offered by Ms. Matsui of California. Strike all
1077	after the enacting clause, and insert the following. Section
1078	1, short title, Table of Contents. Short title. This act
1079	may be cited as the National Telecommunications and
1080	Information Administration
1081	*Mr. Latta. [Presiding] Without objection, the reading
	50

1087 *The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five minutes support of her amendment. 1088 1089 *Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am offering this amendment today to incorporate important feedback from 1090 both the NTIA and the FCC. 1091 Maintaining the clear jurisdictional boundaries of the 1092 two agencies while also encouraging deeper coordination is 1093 1094 important to keep our spectrum governance regime harmonized. By reinforcing the traditional roles of the respective 1095 agencies, we can maintain regulatory predictability and avoid 1096 conflict. This amendment ensures consistency in 1097 responsibilities, and provides needed flexibility for the 1098 1099 rapidly evolving telecommunications marketplace. I appreciate the bipartisan work that went into 1100 developing this amendment, and know that it gives us a 1101 stronger bill to report to the full House. I want to thank 1102 Chairman Latta for his ongoing collaboration and cooperation 1103 1104 with this bill, and look forward to a vote on the House on 1105 the floor soon. With that, I yield back the balance of my time. 1106 *Mr. Latta. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman 1107

1108 from Georgia seeks recognition.

1109 For what purpose?

1110 *Mr. Carter. I move to strike the last word.

1111 *Mr. Latta. The gentleman is recognized for five

1112 minutes.

Mr. Carter. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the AINS, of H.R. 4510, the NTIA Reauthorization Act of 2023, which is crucial to helping close the digital divide. This Federal agency has not been reauthorized in over 30 years, and these updates are necessary to keep up with the recent advancements.

H.R. 4510 also includes my bill, which codifies NTIA's Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, or ITS. The ITS provides NTIA with complex testing and analysis, which is important for making spectrum policy decisions.

Strengthening the statutory authority of ITS is essential to U.S. global competitiveness and innovation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation to modernize NTIA, and I yield back.

1127 *Mr. Latta. The gentleman yields back the balance of1128 his time. The gentleman from Florida seeks recognition.

Does the gentleman from Florida seek recognition? Mr. Soto. I move to strike the last word. Mr. Latta. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes to strike the last word.

1133 *Mr. Soto. Thank you, Chairman.

You know, last Congress we worked with President Biden 1134 on a bold vision to ensure high-speed Internet access for all 1135 1136 Americans, much like President Johnson many years earlier in the 1960s sought to electrify the nation. We are now making 1137 sure that Internet, which is essential for everything from 1138 telehealth to small businesses to high-tech agriculture to 1139 just a quality way of life in rural America, that they would 1140 1141 have access too. And so the infrastructure law passed with \$65 billion for broadband investment, including 42 billion 1142 for the Broadband Equity Access and Deployment Act, the BEAD 1143 Act. 1144

And Mr. Chairman, I am excited. Florida just got \$1.17 billion to help with areas including rural areas in our district. In addition to the American Rescue Plan, this money is going to help with areas like East Orange County, rural South Osceola. We already see areas like Kenansville,

1150 Bull Creek, and Deer Park getting rural broadband finally to them. And that is why making sure to reauthorize the 1151 1152 National Telecommunications and Information Administration is critical, because they need to be ready to go to implement 1153 this ambitious plan to close the digital divide, to modernize 1154 their equipment, strengthen our networks against cyber 1155 attacks, and improve public safety communications, especially 1156 1157 for a state like Florida, where we get a lot of hurricanes, 1158 unfortunately.

1159 For that and more, I urge my colleagues to vote for this 1160 great bill, and I yield back.

Mr. Latta. The gentleman yields back. For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

1163 *Mr. Obernolte. I move to strike the last word.

1164 *Mr. Latta. The gentleman is recognized for five 1165 minutes to strike the last word.

1166 *Mr. Obernolte. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in 1167 strong support of this bill and the AINS.

This agency hasn't been reauthorized in over 30 years. I am glad to see that Congress is doing the work that the people sent us here to do in reauthorizing these agencies and

1171 making some of the necessary changes that let us keep up with 1172 technology.

1173 I would also like to thank the committee and yourself, Mr. Chairman, for including my bill, H.R. 1360, the American 1174 Cybersecurity Literacy Act, in the reauthorization. 1175 Obviously, cybersecurity is something that is of growing 1176 importance to the American public, and we have seen, 1177 1178 unfortunately, in recent months the consequences when cybersecurity is ignored. Eighteen months ago we had a hack 1179 of the Colonial pipeline that shut down and disrupted oil and 1180 gasoline distribution to the entire east coast of the United 1181 1182 States.

1183 A lot of people don't know that that cybersecurity breach was caused by the hack of a single employee password. 1184 And unfortunately, Americans are dangerously lax in their 1185 password discipline. That is illustrated by the fact that 1186 currently it is reported that the number-one password in use 1187 1188 by Americans is the word "password,' ' followed closely in second place by the numbers "12345.' ` So obviously, this is 1189 something that, if we don't fix, is going to continue to 1190 cause problems with our supply chains and our infrastructure, 1191

1192	and we certainly don't want something like the Colonial
1193	pipeline hack to happen again.
1194	So my bill, the American Cybersecurity Literacy Act,
1195	will direct NTIA to conduct an educational campaign on topics
1196	like password discipline and cybersecurity to make sure that
1197	some of these problems are fixed.
1198	I would like to thank you for including my bill in the
1199	underlying bill. I urge support for the AINS and the
1200	reauthorization, and I yield back.
1201	*The Chair. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back. Is
1202	there further discussion?
1203	The chair recognizes Mr. Johnson for five minutes.
1204	*Mr. Johnson. I move to strike the last word.
1205	*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.
1206	*Mr. Johnson. I strongly support H.R. 4510 to
1207	reauthorize NTIA for the first time in over 30 years.
1208	As innovation in communications and technology, and
1209	particularly broadband, has drastically evolved over the last
1210	three decades, this bill will also modernize NTIA to better
1211	reflect its current mission and provide it with the necessary
1212	tools to complete it.

1213 I am very pleased that title 6 of this bill includes the amended text of my legislation, H.R. 4506, the Team Telecom 1214 1215 Act. This legislation would codify the Team Telecom interagency review process that is used to review 1216 applications with foreign ownership for which the FCC has 1217 referred for national security and law enforcement 1218 implications in a timely and transparent manner. It builds 1219 1220 on the policy coordination role of NTIA with communicating executive branch views with the FCC, and also tasks NTIA to 1221 develop an issue procedures for these reviews. 1222

As we see foreign countries such as China and Russia continually try to undermine America's telecommunications market, we must provide the FCC with all the tools they need to keep our telecom industry safe from harmful manipulation. And codifying this interagency review process at NTIA will do just that.

1229 So I urge all my colleagues to support this important 1230 reauthorization bill, and I yield back.

1231 *Mr. Latta. [Presiding] Thank you much very much. The 1232 gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the 1233 gentlelady from California's 16th district.

1234 *Ms. Eshoo. Very good, Mr. Chairman. *The Chair. Would you like to strike the last word? 1235 1236 *Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. *Mr. Latta. Five minutes. 1237 *Ms. Eshoo. I move to strike the last word. I will be 1238 brief. It is really a puzzle to me as to why NTIA has not 1239 been reauthorized for so many decades, not just a handful of 1240 1241 years, but decades. But here we are. And thank you, Madam 1242 Chairman, for taking this up. This is a relatively small agency in the Commerce 1243 Department, but it is limber and does, I think, extraordinary 1244 work. We made a really once-in-a-generation investment in 1245 the infrastructure bill, and it is -- that investment is in 1246 broadband. We know that it is part of our nation's 1247 infrastructure just the way electricity was at a different 1248 time in the life of America. 1249 No one can function without broadband. Not a business, 1250 1251 not a family, not an individual, not a student. Go on and This is -- it is ubiquitous. But we know that there are 1252 on.

too many Americans, some 24 million Americans, that are

either underserved or not served at all. This is an 1254

1253

1255 enterprise to democratize that so that everyone, everyone has an opportunity in America because they have this. 1256 1257 So I am so pleased that we are doing this, and I am grateful to Mr. Obernolte for being the co-lead on the bill 1258 that he just spoke to, and also Representative Cammack for 1259 her co-leading of the other bill, Understanding Cybersecurity 1260 of Mobile Networks Act that we have done together. 1261 1262 So thank you, Madam Chairwoman, and to all of the members that have contributed to this undertaking today. 1263 This is -- in this particular area, I think this is more than 1264 important work. 1265 So with that, I yield back. 1266 1267 *Mr. Latta. Thank you very much. The gentlelady yields back and the chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio to 1268 strike the last word for five minutes. 1269 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you 1270 for bringing this legislation before the committee today. 1271 1272 The NTIA is a crucial part of the Department of Commerce. The agency manages Federal spectrum and is 1273 responsible for distributing tens of billions of dollars to 1274 states for broadband buildout. If you use a cell phone, have 1275

WiFi in your home, or use any sort of wireless technology, how we manage our nation's spectrum directly impacts you. The NTIA has not been reauthorized in 30 years, despite the fact that these technologies and the use of spectrum is used -- has evolved rapidly during the time.

This reauthorization also includes the Spectrum 1281 Coordination Act, which I introduced with my colleague, 1282 1283 Representative Kuster. This language ensures the NTIA and the FCC are on the same page when it comes to spectrum 1284 actions. The language requires those agencies to update 1285 their MOU on spectrum coordination every four years, and 1286 provides much-needed transparency for the agencies and the 1287 American public. Strong coordination between these two 1288 agencies will ensure that we are using our nation's valuable 1289 spectrum in efficient and innovative ways, while also 1290 protecting existing users. 1291

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

1294*Mr. Latta. Thank you very much. The gentleman yields1295back the balance of his time. Is there any further

1296 discussion on the AINS?

1297		Hearing none, if there is no further discussion, the
1298	vote	occurs on the AINS.
1299		All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
1300		All opposed, nay.
1301		The ayes have it. Is there further discussion?
1302		Hearing none oh, does the gentleman from Texas wish
1303	to be	e recognized?
1304		Thank you. Any other further discussion?
1305		Hearing none, the I assume you want the yeas and
1306	nays.	
1307		Okay, there will be a roll call vote, and the clerk will
1308	call	the roll.
1309		*The Clerk. Burgess?
1310		*Mr. Burgess. Burgess votes aye.
1311		*The Clerk. Burgess votes aye.
1312		Latta?
1313		*Mr. Latta. Aye.
1314		*The Clerk. Latta votes aye.
1315		Guthrie?
1316		*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
1317		*The Clerk. Guthrie votes aye.

1318	Griffith?
1319	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
1320	*The Clerk. Griffith votes aye.
1321	Bilirakis?
1322	[No response.]
1323	*The Clerk. Bilirakis?
1324	*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.
1325	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes aye.
1326	Johnson?
1327	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
1328	*The Clerk. Johnson votes aye.
1329	Bucshon?
1330	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
1331	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes aye.
1332	Hudson?
1333	*Mr. Hudson. Aye.
1334	*The Clerk. Hudson votes aye.
1335	Walberg?
1336	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
1337	*The Clerk. Walberg votes aye.
1338	Carter?

1339	[No response.]
1340	*The Clerk. Duncan?
1341	*Mr. Duncan. Duncan, aye.
1342	*The Clerk. Duncan votes aye.
1343	Palmer?
1344	[No response.]
1345	*The Clerk. Dunn?
1346	*Mr. Dunn. Aye.
1347	*The Clerk. Dunn votes aye.
1348	Curtis?
1349	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
1350	*The Clerk. Curtis votes aye.
1351	Lesko?
1352	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
1353	*The Clerk. Lesko votes aye.
1354	Pence?
1355	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
1356	*The Clerk. Pence votes aye.
1357	Crenshaw?
1358	[No response.]
1359	*The Clerk. Joyce?

1360	*Mr. Joyce.	Aye.
1361	*The Clerk.	Joyce votes aye.
1362	Armstrong?	
1363	*Mr. Armstr	ong. Yes.
1364	*The Clerk.	Armstrong votes aye.
1365	Weber?	
1366	*Mr. Weber.	Yes.
1367	*The Clerk.	Weber votes aye.
1368	Allen?	
1369	*Mr. Allen.	Aye.
1370	*The Clerk.	Allen votes aye.
1371	Balderson?	
1372	*Mr. Balder	son. [Inaudible.]
1373	*The Clerk.	Balderson votes aye.
1374	Fulcher?	
1375	*Mr. Fulche	r. Aye.
1376	*The Clerk.	Fulcher votes aye.
1377	Pfluger?	
1378	*Mr. Pfluge	r. Aye.
1379	*The Clerk.	Pfluger votes aye.
1380	Harshbarger	?

1381	*Mrs. Harshbarger. [Inaudible.]
1382	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes aye.
1383	Miller-Meeks?
1384	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. [Inaudible.]
1385	*The Clerk. Miller-Meeks votes aye.
1386	Cammack?
1387	[No response.]
1388	*The Clerk. Obernolte?
1389	[No response.]
1390	*The Clerk. Pallone?
1391	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
1392	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
1393	Eshoo?
1394	*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
1395	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.
1396	DeGette?
1397	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
1398	*The Clerk. DeGette votes aye.
1399	Schakowsky?
1400	*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.
1401	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes aye.

1402	Matsui?
1403	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
1404	*The Clerk. Matsui votes aye.
1405	Castor?
1406	*Ms. Castor. Aye.
1407	*The Clerk. Castor votes aye.
1408	Sarbanes?
1409	*Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
1410	*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes aye.
1411	Tonko?
1412	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
1413	*The Clerk. Tonko votes aye.
1414	Clarke?
1415	*Ms. Clarke. Aye.
1416	*The Clerk. Clarke votes aye.
1417	Cardenas?
1418	*Mr. Cardenas. Aye.
1419	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes aye.
1420	Ruiz?
1421	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
1422	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.

1423	Peters?
1424	*Mr. Peters. Aye.
1425	*The Clerk. Peters votes aye.
1426	Dingell?
1427	*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
1428	*The Clerk. Dingell votes aye.
1429	Veasey?
1430	*Mr. Veasey. Aye.
1431	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
1432	Kuster?
1433	*Ms. Kuster. Aye.
1434	*The Clerk. Kuster votes aye.
1435	Kelly?
1436	*Ms. Kelly. Aye.
1437	*The Clerk. Kelly votes aye.
1438	Barragan?
1439	*Ms. Barragan. Aye.
1440	*The Clerk. Barragan votes aye.
1441	Blunt Rochester?
1442	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
1443	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes aye.

1444	Soto?
1445	*Mr. Soto. Aye.
1446	*The Clerk. Soto votes aye.
1447	Craig?
1448	*Ms. Craig. Aye.
1449	*The Clerk. Craig votes aye.
1450	Schrier?
1451	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
1452	*The Clerk. Schrier votes aye.
1453	Trahan?
1454	*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.
1455	*The Clerk. Trahan votes aye.
1456	Fletcher?
1457	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
1458	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
1459	Rodgers?
1460	*The Chair. [Presiding] Aye.
1461	*The Clerk. Rodgers votes aye.
1462	[Pause.]
1463	*The Chair. How is Mr. Palmer recorded?
1464	*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.
1465 *Mr. Palmer. Aye. *The Clerk. Palmer votes aye. 1466 1467 [Pause.] *The Chair. The clerk will report. 1468 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers, on that vote we have 48 ayes 1469 and 0 nays. 1470 *The Chair. The ayes have it, and the bill is adopted. 1471 1472 The chair calls up H.R. 1435, and asks the clerk to 1473 report. *The Clerk. H.R. 1435, a bill to amend the Clean Air 1474 Act to prevent the elimination of the sale of internal 1475 1476 combustion engines. *The Chair. Without objection, the first reading of the 1477 bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment 1478 at any point. 1479 So ordered. 1480 [The bill follows:] 1481 1482 1483 1484

1485 *The Chair. Does anyone seek to be recognized on the bill? 1486 1487 Mr. Latta, for what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition? 1488 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Madam Chair, to strike the 1489 last word. 1490 *The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes. 1491 *Mr. Latta. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to speak in 1492 favor of preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, which is 1493 legislation I am leading with the gentlemen from 1494 Pennsylvania's 13th district, Florida's 12th district, and 1495 California's 23rd district. 1496 1497 Last year, when California Air Resources Board announced 1498 its plan to implement new requirements that would ban the sale of new internal combustion engine vehicles in the state, 1499 the board was essentially moving to impose their policy 1500 decision on the rest of the country. This is due to the fact 1501 1502 that at least 17 other states are bound to follow California's Clean Air Act standards. Taken together, these 1503 states constitute 40 percent of the entire nation's new car 1504 sales. No industry would continue to spend resources to 1505

1506 manufacture and sell products they would be restricted from 1507 accessing 40 percent of the market. This truly makes this a 1508 national issue.

In addition to concerns that California is dictating to the rest of the country that -- vehicles Americans can purchase, I am deeply concerned with how a de facto ban on the sale of internal combustion engine vehicles will impact grid reliability, and what it would mean for our energy needs.

1515 If the goal of California's Air Resources Board and the 1516 U.S. EPA is to pursue an all-electric vehicle fleet on our 1517 roadways, then we are going to have to generate higher 1518 amounts of electricity.

1519 We examined this bill in a legislative hearing earlier this summer. EPA indicated that going to an all-EV fleet 1520 would mean that the United States would only have to generate 1521 four percent more electricity to meet charging demands. 1522 1523 However, when the Energy Information Administration looked at this question in 2019, they indicated that the U.S. would 1524 need to generate at least 20 to 50 percent more electricity 1525 to meet the needs of an all-EV fleet. 1526

1527 It would behoove policymakers, both at the state and 1528 Federal levels, to make sure they have their numbers 1529 straight, and understand what is reasonably possible to 1530 accomplish on the power generation front before mandating 1531 these types of policies that are based on ideological 1532 desires.

To build on the electricity generation question, the 1533 1534 officials pushing an all-EV fleet are also part of the same 1535 group that want to transition to using only renewable energy, which is intermittent power. This will undermine the 1536 reliability of our electric grid, especially if there is a 1537 high demand from consumers to charge their government-1538 1539 mandated vehicles, but not enough generated electricity to 1540 power those vehicles.

We need to pass H.R. 1435 to ensure all Americans maintain their ability to choose what vehicles they want to drive, to keep energy prices low for struggling families, and avoid straining the critical infrastructure like our electric grid.

1546 Madam Chair, again, I thank you for yielding to me, and 1547 I yield back the balance of my time.

1548 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there further discussion? 1549 1550 The chair recognizes the ranking member, Mr. Pallone, for five minutes. 1551 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Madam Chair. 1552 H.R. 1435, in my opinion, is a short-sighted, 1553 politically-motivated bill that would disregard decades of 1554 1555 legal precedent, upend the Clean Air Act's California waiver process, and imperil technological advancement in the 1556 transportation sector. Instead of joining Democrats and 1557 addressing dangerous air pollution, strengthening our 1558 domestic vehicle manufacturing supply chains, and driving 1559 1560 innovation, House Republicans are sticking to their usual polluters over people agenda. 1561 Many states, including my home state of New Jersey, 1562 voluntarily adopted California's stronger vehicle emission 1563 standards. This flexibility, built into the Clean Air Act, 1564 1565 allows states to make regulatory decisions that work for them. And all that is to say this bill would endanger the 1566 rights of every state, not just California, to control air 1567 pollution from the transportation sector. 1568

1569 The bill's abrupt and extreme reversal of longstanding vehicle policy would also create substantial disruption in 1570 1571 the U.S. vehicle market, and put us at a global competitive disadvantage. At a time when we need to be doing everything 1572 we can to grow our clean energy economy to compete with 1573 China, we should be focusing on supporting innovation driving 1574 policies in the transportation sector, not tearing them down. 1575 1576 This bill only helps my Republican colleagues' corporate polluter friends at the expense of public health, 1577 technological innovation, states' rights, and a stronger, 1578 cleaner economy. And for these reasons I urge my colleagues 1579 to vote no on H.R. 1435. 1580 1581 And I yield back, Madam Chair. *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. 1582 *Mr. Pallone. Oh, maybe the --1583 *The Chair. Oh? 1584 *Mr. Pallone. Mr. Cardenas would like me to yield to 1585 1586 him. I yield to the gentleman from California. *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you for yielding. I move to 1587 strike -- H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle 1588 Purchases Act, introduced by my colleague from Pennsylvania. 1589 78

I have talked at length about the work we need to do to address the climate crisis, and my home state of California has shown what a meaningful climate response can look like. But my Republican colleagues seem dead set on undermining our ability to moving toward a cleaner energy future for everyone.

Simply put, this bill would reverse the strides 1596 1597 California has made to improve air quality. Unlike my colleague who introduced this bill, I was born and raised in 1598 Pacoima, Los Angeles, California. As a child in the 1960s 1599 and 1970s, I remember not being allowed to have a choice to 1600 play outside because of smog alerts. You see, California has 1601 historically had significantly quality -- air quality 1602 challenges. And luckily, the state lawmakers responded. 1603 Since the 1960s California has regulated air pollution from 1604 the transportation sector, which is the leading source of 1605 ozone-forming emissions. 1606

1607 When the U.S. Congress drafted the Clean Air Quality 1608 Act, lawmakers allowed California the authority to set more 1609 protective vehicle emission standards than those set by the 1610 Federal EPA to accommodate my state's ongoing work to address

pollution. This has allowed California to continue to cut 1611 emissions, protect air quality, and drive innovation, 1612 1613 including production of cleaner fuels and low and zeroemission cars and trucks. As a result, California leadership 1614 have -- some cars today are 99 percent cleaner than in the 1615 1970s. I will repeat: 99 percent cleaner car technology due 1616 to, largely, the California -- what California instituted. 1617 1618 As a result, we also have cleaner air, which not only means fewer days missed from school and work due to 1619 respiratory diseases, but also it means that, unlike when I 1620 was a child, my children never had to learn about a smog 1621 1622 alert. And my hope is that now -- and that my grandchildren, 1623 they also never have to learn about smog alerts. I want my grandchildren to be able to play outside. I do not want my 1624 grandchildren to be denied the choice to play outside. 1625 Unfortunately, today's bill reverses California's 1626 authority to enact clean air programs, and attacks the 1627 1628 ability of other states to adopt these standards. H.R. 1435 overlooks 50 years of lifesaving innovation and leadership, 1629 and erases decades of clean air progress. It cuts us off at 1630

1631 the knees, our efforts to combat the climate crisis, and

1632	condemns Californians and all Americans, starting with low-
1633	income, hard-working people, to that air quality, the
1634	breathable air that we all deserve to have.
1635	I remember how much it hurt to breathe during a bad,
1636	smoggy day when I was growing up. Now I don't have that
1637	feeling. I don't want any person or any generation of people
1638	to have to go through what some of us had to go through.
1639	I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1435. Thank
1640	you.
1641	*Mr. Pallone. And I yield back.
1642	*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there
1643	further discussion?
1644	The chair recognizes Mr. Bilirakis.
1645	*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Madam Chair. I move to
1646	strike the last word.
1647	*The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes.
1648	*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you. Chair Rodgers, thank you
1649	again for holding this full committee markup on these very
1650	important bills.
1651	We have seen coordinated and wide-ranging attacks by the
1652	Biden Administration on products, infrastructure, and now

vehicles that Americans rely on every day. These attacks are in pursuit of a radical green agenda that is disconnected from reality, it really is, and will only result in decreasing consumer choice and unnecessarily raising costs for Americans.

I would like to speak now to bill 1435, the Preserving 1658 Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, the one that we are 1659 1660 discussing right now. I co-lead this, and the main sponsor 1661 is Mr. Joyce. I commend him for that. And of course, Representative Latta and Representative Obernolte. 1662 This bill would prevent the collaboration between 1663 California and the EPA to ban the sale of new internal 1664 combustion engines in California by 2035. While this might 1665 look -- on the surface it seems like a states' rights issue. 1666 However, 17 other states are bound to follow California's 1667 regulations, which would put 40 percent of the entire 1668 nation's new car sales under this onerous ban. This would 1669 1670 have far-reaching national effects, since auto manufacturers would be forced to adjust their manufacturing plans to comply 1671 with California's ban, not only indirectly forcing EV 1672 vehicles onto consumers outside those 17 other states, but 1673

1674 also causing major disruptions in many other adjacent 1675 industries across the nation.

1676 While there are some Americans -- some Americans might prefer EV vehicles, there is nothing wrong with that, we are 1677 all about choice -- there are many others, however, more 1678 Americans, that don't feel EV vehicles are best suited to 1679 fulfill their unique transportation needs, whether that be 1680 1681 because EVs don't offer the range or reliability needed, the consumer lives in a rural -- if they live in a rural area, 1682 the consumer, without easy access to public chargers, well, 1683 they may not want an EV. The EV's performance may not hold 1684 up in hot or cold climates, or simply the consumers prefer a 1685 1686 non-EV.

1687 Consumer data is clear that American consumers prefer 1688 gas-powered cars over EVs. According to Cox Automotive, 1689 90,000 EVs are sitting on dealership car lots, a rate twice 1690 that of gas-powered cars. We have to look at the facts, 1691 folks.

1692 The California rule would also ban hybrid vehicles, 1693 ignoring the environmental benefits and choice these cars 1694 offer to consumers. In fact, these vehicles are in such high

1695 demand that they have a lower daily supply than both regular 1696 gas-powered vehicles and EVs.

1697 Perhaps one of the biggest issues with the California rule would be that it would force Americans to purchase 1698 vehicles they simply cannot afford. The Kelley Blue Book 1699 notes that EVs cost 17,000 more than gas-powered cars, on 1700 average. I mean, again, goodness, 17,000 in itself is what 1701 1702 many Americans currently pay for a new car, at least in my In fact, according to Car and Driver, there are no 1703 district. new EVs in the 16,000 to 20,000 price range. There are, 1704 however, 10 gas-powered models in that range. 1705

This California rule, if granted the EPA waiver, will place car ownership out of the reach of many Americans who would otherwise be wholly dependent on those affordable options to work and live.

Finally, it is hard to imagine that this rule would indirectly result in increased costs for many constituents seeking to purchase a new vehicle. Again, yesterday in my hearing I talked about affordability. You don't have access if you can't afford the vehicle.

1715 Currently, auto manufacturers face significant losses

1716	with their EV divisions, and rely on the profits from their
1717	gas-powered sales to maintain profitability.
1718	Okay, I am out of time, and I appreciate the extra time,
1719	Madam Chair. I will yield back.
1720	*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there
1721	further discussion?
1722	The chair recognizes Ms. Eshoo.
1723	*Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I move to
1724	strike the last word.
1725	*The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes.
1726	*Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.
1727	My Republican colleagues claim that today's bill is
1728	about preserving choice, but I think it is really an attack
1729	on electric vehicles. In fact, I think it is more than
1730	obvious. And evidently, the future is menacing.
1731	Because of our geography and large population,
1732	California has historically faced some of the worst air
1733	pollution in the country. We were the first state to
1734	regulate tailpipe emissions, leading the way for the Clean
1735	Air Act at the Federal level. And that is why the Clean Air
1736	Act recognized California's leadership in protecting the

1737 health of our residents by allowing the EPA to grant California waivers to establish its own stronger emission 1738 1739 standards under presidents of both parties. Hear that, my Republican colleagues? Under presidents of both parties, the 1740 EPA has approved numerous waivers over more than 50 years. 1741 Seventeen states have voluntarily -- no one has forced 1742 them -- voluntarily adopted California's standards, meaning 1743 today's bill is an attack on states' rights, as well. 1744 H.R. 1435 prohibits the EPA from allowing California to 1745

1746 issue any standards that directly or indirectly limit the 1747 sale or use of gas-powered cars. That is an incredibly vague 1748 and sweeping standard that seems intended to tie the hands of 1749 the EPA and prevent California from addressing the number-one 1750 source of air pollution.

1751 It is true that sales of electric vehicles are 1752 increasing, but it is not because of government mandates or -1753 - from either the EPA or California. It is because more and 1754 more consumers are choosing -- choice, the word that you are 1755 using -- choosing EVs because they are increasingly 1756 affordable and they meet their driving needs.

1757 Automakers have responded to consumer demand by

1758 announcing \$210 billion -- with a B -- in investments in EV manufacturing in the U.S. over the next 7 years. 1759 1760 The argument that promoting cleaner vehicles means ceding our leadership in the auto industry to China just does 1761 not match the facts. It is ironic that Republicans have 1762 framed their support for this bill around the idea of choice, 1763 when their legislation requires EPA to prop up a specific 1764 1765 technology, one that consumers are increasingly turning away from. 1766

My constituents are already facing the impacts of 1767 climate change in the form of wildfires, extreme heat, and 1768 sea level rise. Californians are not attracted to coddling 1769 the fossil fuel industry. They recognize the existential 1770 threat to our country and our planet, and they have chosen to 1771 take action. California has done more than any state in the 1772 union to address climate change, including requiring all new 1773 vehicles sold by -- be electric by 2035. 1774

Welcome to the future. These regulations are critical to meeting our state's climate goals because the transportation sector is not only the largest source of air pollution, but it also accounts for nearly one-third of our

1779 nation's carbon emissions.

1780 With that, I would like to yield the balance of my time 1781 to my colleague from California.

1782 *Mr. Peters. Thank you. I just certainly endorse the 1783 words of my colleagues, Ms. Eshoo and Mr. Cardenas, who spoke 1784 very well about California's leadership in this.

I would just also note that, you know, California had 1785 1786 drafted tailpipe emission standards in 1966 under the leadership of Governor Ronald Reagan, who insisted on this 1787 waiver at the time because he was worried that the Federal 1788 Government would be lax on air pollution. The waiver has led 1789 to tremendous innovation, not just in pollution reduction but 1790 1791 in things like the catalytic converter, the dashboard check engine light, and indeed, in the development of zero-emission 1792 vehicles, which will help us be competitive around the world 1793 in our auto companies and our auto workers. 1794

The goal of this bill seems to be to keep us stuck in the past, keep our heads in the sand, while the real tangible dangers of climate change continue to affect climate's

1798 environment and the economy.

1799 We should not reverse California's historic leadership

1800	in protecting public health and addressing air pollution from
1801	the transportation sector. We should embrace it, and we
1802	should hope that it continues. So I urge my colleagues to
1803	vote no on H.R. 1435.
1804	I yield back to Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.
1805	*Ms. Eshoo. And I yield back the balance of my time.
1806	*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there
1807	further discussion?
1808	The chair recognizes Mr. Pfluger for five minutes. For
1809	what purpose?
1810	*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Madam Chair, to speak to
1811	strike the last word and speak on behalf of this bill.
1812	[Pause.]
1813	*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for five
1814	minutes.
1815	*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to
1816	push back on what we have been hearing from my colleagues on
1817	the other side of the aisle, and I would like to just start
1818	with a reality check here.
1819	In the past couple of months we have been fortunate in
1820	this committee to have several secretaries, administrators
	89

1821 from the EPA, senior-level officials from the EPA have all set right here in front of this committee. And we have 1822 1823 talked about the issue of electrification. And the fact is that not a single person that has come before this committee 1824 has been able to tell us that they have done the math, that 1825 the Administration has actually gone and looked at the 1826 electrons that are being produced in this country, and how 1827 1828 much we will need if we are to follow this electrification mandate. Not a single person. The Secretary of Energy 1829 didn't know it. The director of the EPA didn't know it. 1830 Other officials didn't know it. They have not done the math; 1831 we are, literally, beyond reality right now. 1832

1833 And this isn't about climate change, because if it was then I believe that my colleagues on the other side of the 1834 aisle would have made strides when they had the House, the 1835 Senate, and the White House to actually produce the critical 1836 minerals here in this country, and not export our dollars to 1837 1838 China, where the climate effects are much worse. We would have done the things and the hard work on permitting and 1839 other issues on critical minerals to actually mine those 1840 here. 1841

1842 So let's just talk about the reality of what EVs are costing Americans today. And this is from The New York 1843 1844 Times. The average price of an EV at the end of 2022 is about \$64,000. And that is compared to the Kelley Blue Book 1845 average for a non-EV internal combustion engine of about 1846 \$49,000. So \$64,000 for an average price of an EV, as 1847 reported by the New York Times, and \$49,000 for an internal 1848 1849 combustion engine.

The only way that Americans, and especially those who 1850 are paycheck-to-paycheck, and especially because of the 1851 inflation issues we see because of the all-out assault on 1852 American energy, the only way Americans can even come close 1853 to bridging that \$15,000 gap between 64,000 and 49,000 is a 1854 \$7,500 government investment, and The New York Times actually 1855 talks about that as one of the main levers that gets it even 1856 close to being marketable. 1857

There is a truck on the market right now, an F-150 Lightning. My father in law was a Ford dealer. This F-150 Lightning has a standard range of 240 miles. But when you put any sort of load on that -- and I am talking a small trailer -- or if the temperatures drop below a standard day,

or if you turn on the electric components like the radio, you
reduce that range by 40 percent, which gives you a whopping
range on an F-150 lightning of 144 miles, 144 miles.
Folks, this is about overreach. We have seen the
overreach. It is happening in the EV space. It certainly
was happening in the gas stove space. It is happening in the
home appliance space. It is happening in every space.

I am proud to join and support this bill because we are the ones that are standing in the gap against the unrealistic desires of this Administration that basically want to control everything.

I want to get back to something that works. If the car 1874 makers could have done this -- this is not a new idea -- they 1875 would have done it years ago. But instead, we are having to 1876 prop it up with government subsidies of \$7,500. We are 1877 having to prop it up with massive and billions and billions 1878 of dollars in the Inflation Reduction Act that they can't 1879 1880 even get out the door, that they have no mechanisms to get out the door. And it is just unrealistic, and it doesn't 1881 help this country continue to go forward. 1882

1883 I look forward to working with my colleagues on the

1884 other side of the aisle when it comes to critical minerals and extracting those here in the United States in places like 1885 1886 Minnesota and Wyoming and other places that have those, instead of outsourcing to slave labor camps in --1887 *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield? 1888 *Mr. Pfluger. -- Africa that are run by the Chinese 1889 Communist Party. 1890 1891 And I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina. 1892 *Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman. You know, CAFÉ standards were sort of forced on America 1893 because the California market was so large that the auto 1894 manufacturers wanted to sell their cars in California. 1895 So they complied with the CAFÉ standards. And all of a sudden 1896 it became sort of the law of the land through EPA. 1897 The reality is this. In California the government has 1898 told its citizens, "You have to make energy choices. You can 1899 only plug your vehicle in certain times of day, ' ' or "You 1900 1901 can't plug it in because of the draw on power.' People wanted to cool their homes or heat their homes or et cetera, 1902 so the reality is the grid doesn't support it. 1903 Power generation has been taken out of the generation 1904

1905 mix as generation has retired and not replaced by something that is dispatchable 24/7/365 baseload. And forcing electric 1906 1907 vehicles as the only choice -- which is, I think, the Democrat plan -- the only choice for Americans is not 1908 feasible in this country with our grid and et cetera. 1909 I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I yield back. 1910 *Mr. Pfluger. My time is expired. I yield back. 1911 1912 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there further discussion? 1913 The chair recognizes Ms. Matsui for five minutes. 1914 Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I move 1915 *Ms. Matsui. to strike the last word and speak in opposition to H.R. 1435. 1916 1917 *The Chair. Ms. Matsui is recognized for five minutes. *Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much. 1918 I am a proud Californian, and we work hard in California 1919 because we understand the effects of pollution. You know, we 1920 have been dealing with the impacts of air pollution for a 1921 1922 long time, and we have repeatedly led the nation in addressing air pollution, whether it is greenhouse gases, 1923 smoq, or other pollutants. California established the first 1924 tailpipe emission standard in the country in 1966. In 1971 1925

1926 and 1982 we adopted the first NOx standards and the first 1927 particulate matter standards for motor vehicles.

The Clean Air Act recognizes California's leadership, explicitly and intentionally affirming California's authority to set separate, more stringent emission standards. Thanks to that authority, California has made incredible progress in reducing air pollution.

However, we are now facing new challenges. Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles are making extreme weather more frequent and more deadly. Record-breaking heat and rainfall threaten to make our communities unlivable. Larger, more intense and more frequent wildfires have erased many of the air quality gains since the 1970s.

1939 Once again, California has developed cutting-edge emission standards that reduce greenhouse gas pollutants and 1940 lead the world in the fight against air pollution. But H.R. 1941 1435 would prevent California from reducing air pollutants 1942 1943 and addressing climate change by requiring California to keep dirty gas and diesel-powered vehicles on the roads forever. 1944 This Congress we have heard a lot about the need for a 1945 technology-neutral approach to reducing emissions, but this 1946

1947 bill does exactly the opposite.

This bill mandates the continued use of the internal combustion engine. This bill appears to be intended to prevent California from decarbonizing before rural areas have the infrastructure to support this transition. But this is unnecessary. The Clean Air Act already requires that California's emission standards be deemed feasible.

1954 Some of my colleagues have expressed concern that automakers are not ready for this transition. But many 1955 automakers have already committed to a zero-emission future. 1956 California recently announced a landmark deal with the 1957 world's largest truck manufacturers to meet California's 1958 1959 emission standards, even if California's authority under the Clean Air Act is challenged, rendering this bill meaningless. 1960 I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1435, and I 1961 yield back the balance of my time. Thank you. 1962

1963 *Mr. Johnson. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields back.
1964 For what purpose does Mr. Palmer seek recognition?
1965 *Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last
1966 word --

1967 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized.

1968 *Mr. Palmer. -- and to speak in support of the bill. I am always intrigued by my colleagues across the aisle, 1969 1970 particularly the ones from California, talking about how great things are in California. And I will admit and am 1971 thankful for a lot of the improvements that are -- we have 1972 enjoyed in terms of emissions control that came out of 1973 California. But they have reached a point where they have 1974 1975 gone to an extreme, that it is starting to impact people in California to the extent that California, rather than a state 1976 with a growing population, is now projected by 2060 to lose 1977 almost 5 percent of its population. People are getting out 1978 of California as fast as they can. 1979

1980 But I would also like to point out something else. And California is noted for a number of things, one of which, 1981 unfortunately, is smoq. And even though over the last couple 1982 of decades the United States has decreased its production of 1983 air pollution, by some measures -- the six criteria gases 1984 1985 tracked by the EPA -- by 86 percent, pollutants from China has caused a 65 percent increase in Western ozone, or smog. 1986 One study shows that 29 percent of the particulates in smog 1987 over San Francisco come directly from China's coal plants, 1988

1989 and I think another one showed about 25 percent of all of the 1990 particulate matter over the State of California comes from 1991 China coal plants.

China produces 27 percent of the world's greenhouse gases, more than any other country in the world. They are building 6 times more coal-fired plants than any other country, and they are planning more than 300 coal plants in places as widely spread as from Turkey, Vietnam, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Egypt, Philippines.

My point here is -- and I find this interesting -- that 1998 they want to abandon fossil fuel hydrocarbons as rapidly as 1999 they can, they want to get rid of the internal combustion 2000 2001 engine, but they -- to make themselves more reliant on China, which will build more coal-fired plants to build the 2002 components, the batteries, the other things that they need 2003 for electric vehicles, which will add more pollution in the 2004 air over California. I just find that interesting, in 2005 2006 addition to the fact that, as my friend and colleague from Texas pointed out, this is a direct assault on people's 2007 freedom. 2008

2009

As you pointed out, I drive a pickup truck, and I pull a

2010 trailer. I have some timberland that I enjoy working on. And there is no way an electric -- an EV pickup could pull my 2011 2012 trailer and my Kawasaki mule or the tractor that we use up there. I wouldn't make it 50 miles, probably. 2013 And I just -- if California wants to go all electric, as 2014 far as I am concerned they can knock themselves out, as long 2015 as the moving trucks are not EVs. Because I am afraid, if 2016 2017 they are all EVs, people couldn't get out. 2018 I yield back. *Mr. Pence. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. Palmer? 2019 *Mr. Johnson. Who --2020 *Mr. Pence. Will the gentleman yield? 2021 2022 *Mr. Palmer. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana. 2023 *Mr. Pence. Thank you. I want to go off something Mr. 2024 Pfluger said. 2025 I went out and bought -- went shopping for cars three 2026 2027 weeks ago, and we can talk about all the numbers we hear about and things like that. My wife looked at two different 2028 SUVs, okay? It was -- the EV was \$16,000 more than the ICE, 2029 but it was also the smaller version of that manufacturer. 2030

2031 There is a lot more going on out here. It is not just \$16,000 more, it is less of a vehicle. 2032 2033 And with that, I yield back. *Mr. Palmer. I would just like for the gentleman to 2034 clarify when he says ICE he is not talking about Arctic or 2035 Antarctic ice. You are -- Internal Combustion Engine? 2036 *Mr. Pence. Yes, sir. 2037 2038 *Mr. Palmer. I yield back. *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Do others --2039 the gentlelady from Michigan is recognized. 2040 *Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to 2041 2042 strike the last word. 2043 *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady is recognized for five 2044 minutes. *Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2045 This bill, along with the other bills we are 2046 considering, would collectively have harmful effects on the 2047 2048 future of the automotive industry and, guite frankly, would aim to undo the good progress we have made on reducing 2049 harmful vehicle emissions, and would stymie future automotive 2050 innovation in this country. 2051

The Clean Air Act was a landmark public health law, and this bill, H.R. 1435, would weaken public health protections and is a direct attack on over 50 years of Congress and EPA recognizing California's authority to set stronger protective vehicle emission standards. And quite frankly, 17 other states have adopted them, and the District of Columbia, so it is just not an attack on California.

2059 Revoking past, present, and future waivers would, I 2060 fear, throw grave and unnecessary uncertainty into the 2061 marketplace, and create confusion for both industry and 2062 consumers. One of the most important things is industry 2063 needs certainty.

2064 And when my colleagues talk about China, China is coming into this market with electric vehicles. We are competing in 2065 a global marketplace. The last quarter in Europe, more than 2066 42 percent of the sales were these kinds of vehicles. We are 2067 in a global marketplace. Every major automotive company in 2068 2069 the United States and around the globe is in a race to manufacture and ship greater and greater numbers of clean 2070 vehicle, including hybrids, battery electric vehicles, and 2071 hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. This transformational shift to 2072

2073 other forms -- electric vehicles is the major one right -now is well underway. 2074 2075 Thirty percent of U.S. carbon pollution stems from the transportation sector, and people are telling us all over the 2076 place they want to do something about it. 2077 So I love my colleagues on the other side. I am a car 2078 girl, and I love this industry, and I -- but I have to oppose 2079 2080 this bill, as well as the other environmental bills we are 2081 considering today. I do share it is legitimate, many of the concerns my 2082 Republicans have raised, particularly on affordability. We 2083 have got -- but we are going to address that by investing in 2084 2085 R&D, selling more of the vehicles, et cetera. And we must make sure that the foundation is strong for 2086 this transition, that we have built out the charging 2087 stations, that they are being maintained -- I know that that 2088 is important -- and that we are investing in the R&D here so 2089 2090 that we are creating what we need for the batteries in the United States, and not increasing our dependency. 2091 But if we are successfully going to make this needed 2092 transition to alternative technology, we need to do so in a 2093

2094 comprehensive way, and build on all the meaningful bills from 2095 last Congress, and we need to do it together. Democrats have 2096 already made major historic investments in our economic 2097 future through the Inflation Reduction Act, Bipartisan 2098 Infrastructure Law, CHIPS and Science Act, which will help 2099 keep the United States a global leader, create new jobs, 2100 protect public health, and cut costs for families.

2101 And as I conclude I am going to remind people I am not 2102 old, but I am seasoned. Remember what happened in this country when we weren't ready with smaller vehicles? Other 2103 countries were. We are competing in a global marketplace. 2104 2105 And if we don't make sure we are creating and building the technology of the future, we are seceding [sic] our 2106 leadership in mobility and transportation, and I will be 2107 damned if the United States of America will ever do that. 2108 *Mr. Walberg. Will the gentlelady yield? 2109

2110 *Mrs. Dingell. Oh, yes, because I love you, but I am 2111 not sure.

2112 [Laughter.]

2113 *Mr. Walberg. I love you, too. And we work together on 2114 so much. And I agree with some of the things you say, though

we lost to the Japanese influx because we had lesser quality vehicles at the time, and then we picked up our act and now we outdo them.

2118 *Mrs. Dingell. We didn't build small cars.

2119 *Mr. Walberg. Well, we didn't build good cars for a 2120 while. Now we got our act together.

The auto industry knows that we do not have the energy to do what you are saying we can do yet. They also know that only six percent of the people want to buy these things. They also know that we are pushing them to do this when, in fact, their dealers, their customers really don't want it yet.

Let's do it the normal way, through letting the customer win, putting out the quality, and then I can agree with you, we will have our act together.

2130 I yield back.

*Mrs. Dingell. Well, I am almost out of time, but I am going to say back to my colleague it is the companies that are pushing for us to make commitments. Everybody came to the table -- UAW, the environmentalists, and the companies -and said, "Let's set a goal of 50 percent by the year 2030.' `

2136 And with that, I yield back. *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady yields back. I guess we 2137 2138 will see how long these dealers continue to advocate this as these electric vehicles continue to stack up on their lots 2139 2140 across the country. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from 2141 Pennsylvania, the bill's sponsor, for five minutes. 2142 2143 *Mr. Joyce. I move to strike the last word and speak on behalf of H.R. 1435. 2144 First, I want to thank Chair Rodgers for holding this 2145 markup on these three bills dealing with the automotive 2146 industry and the Administration's attack on consumers' 2147 2148 choice. I ask unanimous consent to enter coalition letters from 2149 the many businesses represented, the American Fuel and 2150 Petrochemical Manufacturers, and the National Propane Gas 2151 Association into the record. These letters demonstrate the 2152 2153 support of H.R. 1435 from industries that are critical to my constituents for their everyday needs. 2154

Let's be honest. Mobility is essential for our American way of life. It is critical economically to move goods and

get people to their jobs. It is critical culturally to give Americans the freedom of movement. It is critical in health care to give people access to the doctors, the hospitals, and the specialists that they need.

Americans have built their lives around reliable and affordable transportation, and now government overreach is threatening to put the cars and trucks out of reach for the working-class Americans. California's new Advanced Clean Cars II regulations does just that. These regulations would require 35 percent of new cars to be EVs by 2026, and fully 100 percent of sales to be EVs by 2035.

The only thing standing in the way of these regulations 2168 2169 being implemented is a required EPA waiver. That is why I, along with Representatives Latta, Bilirakis, and Obernolte 2170 introduced H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicles 2171 Purchases Act, to prevent the EPA administrator from granting 2172 a waiver to any regulation that would directly or indirectly 2173 2174 limit the sale of use -- or the sale or use of new motor vehicles with internal combustion engines. 2175

Although starting in California, section 177 of the Clean Air Act will ensure that, once adopted, an internal

2178 combustion ban will spread across the nation, disrupting the 2179 entire American auto market, and ultimately limiting what my 2180 constituents are able to buy.

2181 Seventeen states, including my home state of 2182 Pennsylvania, have already adopted California's clean air 2183 regulations. These states represent over 40 percent of the 2184 American auto market, and any electric vehicle mandate on 2185 that large of a scale is a de facto mandate. It is a de 2186 facto mandate on the entire market, and represents a decisive 2187 shift in national policy.

Even the Biden Administration admits that -- the effects that this would have on the consumers nationally. Recently, on June 22, in front of the Environmental Subcommittee, Joseph Gottman, the principal deputy administrator for the EPA's Office of Air and Radiation, acknowledged this reality.

The problem is that in rural America EVs cannot fulfill the needs of hard-working Americans or their families. They can't drive the distance, they can't maintain their charge, whether it is in hot or cold weather. They can't recharge fast enough to keep people on the move. And for these reasons, Americans simply don't want to buy them.

2199 Last month we heard testimony, in fact, from Scott Lambert, the President of the Minnesota Auto Dealers 2200 2201 Association. His position was very clear. The auto dealers were not anti-electric, far from it. In places like Saint 2202 Paul and Minneapolis, where there is a market for EVs, they 2203 are happy to sell them. But the cold winters and the rugged 2204 terrains of states like Minnesota and my home state of 2205 2206 Pennsylvania require more, more than what the electric vehicles can offer. To strip constituents of that choice is 2207 government overreach at its worst. 2208

Again, Biden Administration officials appear to 2209 recognize that. On May 2, when asked if he supported banning 2210 2211 internal combustion engines, EPA Administrator Regan responded -- and I am quoting -- "No, not at all.' ' When 2212 asked if he supported consumer choice in vehicles, he 2213 responded, "I don't see' ' -- and I am quoting -- "I don't see 2214 a near future where we don't have a fuel supply that 2215 2216 complements electric vehicles and provides customers choice.'' 2217

Again, in Joseph Gottman's June 22 testimony he also reiterated the commitment not to support a ban on internal
2220 combustion engines.

As I have made clear before to this committee, H.R. 1435 is not anti-electric vehicle. Those who can afford it, those who want it, an electric vehicle, they should be able to buy it. But it does not help constituents in any of our districts to require them to buy an EV, regardless of their needs and regardless of their wants.

2227 This policy would harm working and middle-class families 2228 by making cars less capable and thousands of dollars more 2229 expensive for the people who can least afford it. Only by 2230 taking government's thumb off of the scale and letting the 2231 free market decide will Americans get the efficient and 2232 affordable transportation that they want and that they need. 2233 I urge my colleagues to support this important

2234 legislation.

Thanks again to Chair Rodgers for holding this important markup today, and I yield back.

2237 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back and, without 2238 objection, the document you referenced will be entered into 2239 the record.

2240 [The information follows:]

2244 *Mr. Johnson. Does anyone else wish to speak on the bill? 2245 2246 *Mr. Weber. Mr. Chairman? *Mr. Johnson. For what purpose does the gentleman from 2247 2248 Texas seek recognition? *Mr. Weber. To strike the last word. 2249 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 2250 2251 minutes. 2252 *Mr. Weber. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Simple facts. You look back at the U.S. Census Bureau's 2253 American population numbers in 2010, there was 308-plus 2254 million Americans. In 2020 there was 331 million Americans. 2255 2256 It is not quite a 10 percent increase; it is about 8 percent, or 23 million more Americans. 2257 Now, isn't it safe to assume that, with 23 million more 2258 Americans, there is going to be a need for apartments, 2259 schools, homes, cars, even furnaces, air conditioners? 2260 How 2261 about electric vehicle chargers? There is going to be more power needed for electric vehicle chargers and for the 2262 ladies' hair dryers. Maybe some of the guys -- I don't leave 2263 those out, if you want hair dryers. We are going to need 2264

2265 more power for lights. We are going to turn on lights. We 2266 are going to need more power for air conditioning and, yes, 2267 even dishwashers. And God forbid that I would throw gas 2268 stoves into that mix.

The government, the White House, is clearly out of touch with the power requirements needed for America. And I think the gentleman from South Carolina said this: the grid doesn't support -- it is not supportive of enough right now for the hard times that we have, certainly not strong enough for what the left is proposing.

We need more robust power, a stronger, larger grid, 2275 output of electricity. And what does that mean? That means 2276 2277 natural gas and nuclear are still the most reliable. We like green, renewable energy. Renewable energy is good. 2278 Renewable energy can play a supporting actor role in this 2279 play. It cannot play the leading actor role in this play. 2280 Natural gas and nuclear are the two best options and the two 2281 2282 most dependable. But, for Pete's sake, there seems to be a lot of opposition to that plan from the left. 2283

California should have learned a lesson when the governor said, "Don't charge your electric vehicles between

9:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m.' I am thinking that is when most people sleep, and they want to charge that vehicle to get up and go to work in the morning. And when they found out that they were having rolling blackouts and brownouts -- and I am told there is a sign at the California border that says, "Last one out of California, turn out the lights.''

So I love Californians, I love what they -- that they 2292 2293 are Americans, free Americans. But I don't see that their climate policy is all that adorable, quite frankly. 2294 What we need from our friends on the left is the cooperation to 2295 understand that, yes, we need more power; yes, it is going to 2296 be natural gas, it is more dependable; yes, it is going to be 2297 2298 nuclear, it is clean. We need to make the permitting safer, faster, quicker. What we need is cooperation so that, as 2299 some have said here, we can give Americans the right to make 2300 their own choices. 2301

And at the risk of sending out a pun at the end, why don't we empower Americans to do just that? Let's vote for this bill.

2305 *Mr. Allen. Will the gentleman yield?

2306 *Mr. Weber. The gentleman from Georgia I will yield to.

2307 *Mr. Allen. Just a quick, real-life story. In my district a three-generation Cadillac dealer was approached by 2308 2309 Cadillac saying they were going total electric. He is now out of business. Four hundred Cadillac dealers in this 2310 nation have shut down, based on that decision. Everybody in 2311 my district is driving a Lexus now, rather than a Cadillac. 2312 You don't think there are going to be economic 2313 2314 implications to a government, whether it be the State of 2315 California or the Federal Government making these kind of demands of the people of this country? 2316 We are going to destroy our economy. You know, this is 2317 a real -- this is a three-generation -- this guy and all of 2318 2319 his people now do not have a job or a business. Folks, let the economy, free market economy, determine our course 2320 forward, or we will and the people of this country will 2321

2322 suffer greatly.

2323 And I yield back.

2324 *Mr. Weber. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.2325 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

2326 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Do others 2327 wish to speak on the bill?

2328 The gentlelady from Florida, for what purpose do you seek recognition? 2329 2330 *Ms. Castor. To speak in opposition to the bill. *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady is recognized for five 2331 2332 minutes. *Ms. Castor. You know, I am going to reject the 2333 Republicans' can't-do spirit, because we live in the United 2334 States of America and we can do this. 2335 And in fact, we are not destroying the economy. 2336 Consumers now are voting with their pocketbook. Electric 2337 vehicle sales have risen about 40 percent since 2016 alone. 2338 And I have to tell you, I learned a lot when I chaired the 2339 Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. I went with 2340 Representative Dingell to Detroit and Dearborn, and listened 2341 to the engineers, the auto manufacturers who explained very 2342 clearly we are in a race with China, and right now they are 2343 producing more EVs than we are. And she is right, this is a 2344 2345 global marketplace.

2346 So what you are doing is you are -- this is a pro-China 2347 bill, a pro-China bill. It is an anti-innovation bill. It 2348 is a pro-pollution bill.

2349 The future is in cleaner, cheaper energy. And right now across America, in large part with the help of the 2350 2351 infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act, new factories and plants are being opened to create the new EVs, 2352 build them here in America, build the batteries, enhance the 2353 supply chains. Many of these announcements are in your 2354 districts, these batteries, all of the plants. The workers 2355 2356 are getting paid good wages. A lot of these are good, union jobs to help grow the middle class. 2357

This is great news for consumers, too. They don't have to stop at the gas station. And I think that is what this is all about. The fossil fuel companies still have a firm grip on the GOP. That is why I often refer to it as the Grand Oil Party. And they kind of see this slipping away with electric vehicles, as we electrify all kinds of vehicles.

In one visit to California I saw what was happening in building the electric busses that our kids are going to ride on, where they are -- the air will be cleaner, it will be more efficient, it is going to save them money. Innovation happening with large trucks, too. That is where a lot of capital is flowing out, because we want to win the future.

The United States of America has always been in the lead when we are talking about the transportation sector, and automobiles, and how we get around. I am not willing to give that up to China. And you shouldn't be, either. This is a critical race for the future.

And by the way, we are in a severe climate crisis. The cost and impacts of an overheating planet are with us. This summer is probably the best summer we are going to see as we look ahead, unless we move forward with urgency. Please don't turn it back.

Please don't think that just complaining, oh, the price 2380 point is -- it is too expensive now, because the price points 2381 2382 are going to come down as innovation ramps up. Already there are vehicles all across at different price points. And 2383 thanks to the Inflation Reduction Act, consumers get 2384 discounts and credits to make those purchases more 2385 affordable, and they are going to become more affordable over 2386 2387 time as we ramp up the supply chain.

2388 So I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for 2389 believing in America, believing in innovation, trusting 2390 American consumers, trusting our automobile workers and what

2391 is happening in America. We can't go backward. We have got to go forward, and I trust that we will do so, even in the 2392 2393 face of the naysayers, the pro-China party, apparently, the anti-innovation party, the pro-pollution party. We are not 2394 going backwards. This is the United States of America, and 2395 we are going to do this. 2396 Thank you, and I yield --2397 2398 *Mr. Soto. Will the gentlelady yield? *Ms. Castor. I yield to my colleague --2399 *Mr. Soto. Does the gentlelady know the state with the 2400 second most electric vehicles in the nation? 2401 *Ms. Castor. It is the Sunshine State. 2402 2403 Thank you, and I yield back. *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady yields back. Does anyone 2404 else wish to speak? 2405 For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina 2406 seek recognition? 2407 2408 *Mr. Duncan. I move to strike the last word. *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 2409 minutes. 2410 *Mr. Duncan. You know, it is interesting. 2411 The 118

2412 Republican Party is about innovation and unleashing and 2413 unbridling the innovative and entrepreneurial spirits of 2414 Americans.

There is no denial that electric vehicles will be a part of our transportation matrix, and I like it. My best friend drives a Tesla to work every day, 45 miles one way, works in a hospital. It works for him.

But it won't work for everybody. And this legislation ensures choices for Americans versus forcing a choice down the throats of the Americans, which is what it seems like the Democrats want to do with electric vehicles. This is a big country. The infrastructure isn't there to provide for the electric vehicles.

And I know we have this much-touted IRA and Inflation 2425 Reduction Act, or the infrastructure bill. That is a 2426 tremendous amount of government spending to try to build out 2427 an infrastructure when the generation isn't there to provide 2428 2429 the power, when governments are telling the consumers they have to make electrical choices in charging their vehicles in 2430 states like California. California is pushing electric 2431 trucks, or at least forcing the diesel-burning trucks out of 2432

2433 the market.

And if you really think about it holistically, the components for the renewable energies are -- resources, whether it is solar panels or wind turbines, a lot of that is made in China. China is building a new coal-fired power plant every month to power an industry that makes the solar panels that are so touted.

And I like renewables. I think they are a part of the energy matrix, as well, and they will be, and they should be. Eight percent of the power generated in my home state is from renewables every day, and we like it.

So if we really care about carbon emissions and the climate, it just does not make sense to continue supporting companies in China who need power produced by coal, which raises global carbon emissions. And a lot of the smog on the West Coast, according to my friend from Alabama, comes from China. It is the way the wind is blowing.

2450 Republicans and the purpose of this bill is to give 2451 Americans choices in the marketplace. And if they choose to 2452 spend their hard-earned money to buy an EV, that is their 2453 choice. But they ought to have a choice.

I drive a diesel truck, and I like mine because I don't have to make any power choices. If I am stuck in traffic during an emergency or during a winter storm, I don't have to make power choices.

But if you are sitting in an electric vehicle on the 2458 interstate in California in rush hour traffic, I will 2459 quarantee you you are having to make energy choices on 2460 2461 whether you play the radio or run the air conditioning because you are looking at that charge, wondering if you have 2462 enough to get to the next charging station, or home to your 2463 children at night, or pick them up from their school, or 2464 attend their ball game. You are having to make energy 2465 2466 choices. And the Government of California has made energy choices for you, because they told you you can't plug your EV 2467 in today because of the drain on the grid in that state. 2468

So it seems to me like there is a lack of common sense and pragmatism as we approach this. And look, if the manufacturers want to manufacture EVs, if they think there is a market for it, they will manufacture them. They will sell them at a price point that they think the consumers will pay so they can sell units because it is all about selling units

2475 and having a return on the investment at the end of the day.
2476 The market should determine that. Government shouldn't force
2477 this.

2478 We heard it that the DoE, they said they are trying to 2479 nudge America in a certain direction toward electrification. 2480 It is not a nudge, it is a shove. It is a shove by 2481 government policies that are forcing Americans to go more 2482 renewable power generation, more electrification, electric 2483 vehicles.

We ought to focus in this committee on power generation 2484 and dispatchable energy and what can work to provide that 2485 24/7/365 baseload energy that Americans need for their homes, 2486 2487 for their municipalities, and for manufacturing that provides the jobs that we tout so much, the jobs that need the 2488 electricity to turn the widgets that are created -- the 2489 machines that create the widgets and the manufacturing 2490 plants. So let's just inject some common sense and 2491 2492 pragmatism in this discussion as we move forward. And with that, I yield back. 2493

2494 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Are there 2495 others wishing to speak on the bill?

2496	Seeing none, are there bipartisan amendments?
2497	Seeing none, are there any amendments?
2498	For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek
2499	recognition?
2500	*Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk
2501	labeled SC01.
2502	*Mr. Johnson. The clerk will report.
2503	*The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1435, offered by Mr.
2504	Ruiz. Beginning on page 2, strike line 24 and all that
2505	follows through page 3, line 6.
2506	*Mr. Johnson. Without objection, the reading of the
2507	amendment is dispensed with.
2508	[The amendment of Mr. Ruiz follows:]
2509	
2510	********COMMITTEE INSERT*******
2511	

2512 *Mr. Johnson. And the gentleman is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment. 2513 2514 *Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. H.R. 1435, the Preserving Choice in Vehicles Purchases 2515 Act, would prevent the EPA administrator from granting a 2516 waiver of Federal preemption under the Clean Air Act. As we 2517 have heard, this bill would put harmful limitations on EPA's 2518 2519 authority to grant waivers of Federal preemption under the Clean Air Act for states like California, whose vehicle 2520 emission standards are more protective than those at the 2521 Federal level. 2522

I am strongly opposed to this bill in its entirety. 2523 Ιt is a direct attack on California and our nation's bedrock 2524 environmental laws by undermining efforts to decarbonize our 2525 transportation sector and promote technological innovation. 2526 This bill overlooks over 50 years of Congress and the EPA 2527 recognizing the unique air quality challenges faced by 2528 2529 communities like those in my state, and disregards the clean transportation leadership California has shown in response. 2530 To make matters worse, this short-sighted bill also goes 2531 after waivers previously granted by EPA. This bill requires 2532

2533 the EPA administrator to revoke existing waivers if they do 2534 not comply with the bill's vague requirement that California 2535 standards must not "directly or indirectly limit the sale or 2536 use of new motor vehicles with internal combustion engines.' `

Industries come to Congress asking for predictability, regulatory certainty, and long-term stability. In fact, the only witness representing the vehicle manufacturing industry testified at the subcommittee legislative hearing that this bill would create confusion and uncertainty because of its language about revoking existing waivers.

Furthermore, forcing the EPA's administrator to revoke existing California waivers is irresponsible, and would endanger years of incredible progress in decarbonizing our transportation sector. The implementation of this language would be chaos.

2548 My amendment would bring stability by striking the 2549 section of the bill that would require the EPA administrator 2550 to revoke existing California waivers.

2551 California has significant air pollution challenges. As 2552 a physician I have seen the public health impacts of air 2553 pollution firsthand. These consequences are serious and have

very real effects on the lives of my constituents. From having to skip work to deal with air pollution-associated health challenges to spending money on unexpected health care costs, my constituents are experiencing the negative impacts of air pollution every day.

California is making an effort to address these issues 2559 head on, and in the process has been a leader in reducing 2560 2561 dangerous air pollution from its transportation section [sic]. This has been critical to the health of my 2562 constituents and for communities across the country. 2563 Revoking already-granted California waivers is a nonsensical, 2564 destabilizing step backwards in dealing with climate 2565 pollution, supporting fossil fuels' interests at the expense 2566 of innovation and public health. 2567

I strongly support EPA's statutory authority to grant California waivers for more protective vehicle emission standards, and I support a stable regulatory regime that empowers manufacturers to make decisions based on these standards. And I vote for my -- a vote for my amendment is a vote for regulatory certainty and stability.

I also associate my comments -- or Ms. -- with Ms.

2575 Castor's comments and Mrs. Dingell's comments. You see, 2576 there is a free market at play here. The free market is that 2577 the United States want to be global competitors with China in 2578 the global market, and we want to make sure that they -- they 2579 want to make sure that there is constituent or consumer 2580 demand, as well as regulatory certainty, policy certainty, in 2581 the industry.

2582 The industry that is most afraid of this market, especially the U.S. aggressively competing with China, is the 2583 fossil fuel, big oil, big gas. You see, what we are doing is 2584 we are helping to foster that market to meet consumer demand 2585 by helping to increase supply, because increasing supply will 2586 2587 eventually reduce costs. By reducing costs we will take into consideration the real concerns about the affordability of 2588 electrical vehicles, and we will get to that market where 2589 costs will come down. 2590

The other thing we need is consumer demand. Consumers would want to do this, but all we have seen from the Republicans have been efforts to reduce supply of electrical vehicles and the messaging, no matter how they message it, to reduce demand. And so this is about -- what we are seeing is

2596 the saying we want free market, but at the same time there is 2597 market manipulation by manipulating the policies and the 2598 incentives to increase demand, to reduce costs, and then also 2599 to message that the American people don't want these 2600 electrical vehicles, which, in fact, there is a high demand 2601 and growing demand for electric vehicles.

So the protective effort that the Republicans are doing is to foster the fossil fuel market and gas and their needs. And so this is some -- very serious for our free market efforts and our ability to produce electric vehicles, to reduce costs, and clean our air, and have the can-do American spirit of leading this effort.

2608 So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and 2609 oppose the underlying bill, and I yield back.

2610 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Is there 2611 discussion on the amendment?

2612 The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Joyce, is

2613 recognized for five minutes.

2614 *Mr. Joyce. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the 2615 last word and speak in opposition to this amendment.

2616 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized.

2617 *Mr. Joyce. This amendment strikes subsection B of the underlying bill, which would revoke any waivers that 2618 2619 California has received under the Clean Air Act between January of 2022 and the date of enactment of the bill. 2620 The underlying bill would cover an array of problematic 2621 technology for state standards. California has submitted 2622 final waiver requests to the EPA for Advanced Clean Cars II, 2623 2624 Advanced Clean Cars I, advanced clean trucks, heavy duty vehicle engine emission warranty and maintenance provision, 2625 and non-road engine pollution control standards. 2626 Remember that the Advanced Clean Cars II would drive 2627 gas-powered cars off of the road by requiring new vehicle 2628 sales to be totally electric by 2035. We cannot let 2629 California dictate the fate of the national car market. 2630 I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I 2631 yield back. 2632 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Is there 2633 2634 further discussion? For what purpose does the gentleman from New York seek 2635 recognition? 2636

2637 *Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

2638 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 2639 minutes. 2640 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, sir. I speak in support of Congressman Ruiz's amendment. 2641 Mr. Chair, earlier today I mentioned my concerns that 2642 this bill would create uncertainty for the U.S. auto 2643 industry. This amendment strikes language that would force 2644 2645 EPA to go back and revoke previously issued waivers. We simply cannot have these wild swings in our approach to 2646 regulations. Going back and forth between approving and 2647 revoking waivers will have disastrous effects on the entire 2648 2649 vehicle market. 2650 At the legislative hearing for this bill, the only witness who represented any vehicle manufacturers testified 2651 that this bill would create substantial disruption in the 2652

U.S. vehicle market. And of course, this will not only affect California, but also disrupt states that adopt California's standards under section 177 of the Clean Air Act. These states, including my home state of New York State, represent more than 40 percent of new vehicle sales. The witness explained that members of the EV ecosystem,

2659 including vehicle manufacturers and their supply chains, make decisions and investments based on regulatory regimes. And 2660 2661 if we upend settled regulatory environment, we should expect that there will be consequences. Throwing a wrench into how 2662 EPA and states can regulate dangerous air pollution from 2663 vehicles would only weaken our domestic vehicle market and 2664 imperil ongoing investments. 2665 2666 I do urge members to support this amendment. And with that, Mr. Chair, I yield back. 2667 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Is there more 2668 discussion on the amendment? 2669 Seeing none, the vote now occurs on the amendment, and a 2670 2671 roll call vote has been requested. The clerk will call the 2672 roll. *The Clerk. Burgess? 2673 *Mr. Burgess. Burgess votes no. 2674 *The Clerk. Burgess votes no. 2675 2676 Latta? *Mr. Latta. 2677 No. *The Clerk. Latta votes no. 2678 Guthrie? 2679

2680	*Mr. Guthrie. No.
2681	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes no.
2682	Griffith?
2683	*Mr. Griffith. No.
2684	*The Clerk. Griffith votes no.
2685	Bilirakis?
2686	*Mr. Bilirakis. No.
2687	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes no.
2688	Johnson?
2689	*Mr. Johnson. Johnson votes no.
2690	*The Clerk. Johnson votes no.
2691	Bucshon?
2692	*Mr. Bucshon. No.
2693	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes no.
2694	Hudson?
2695	[No response.]
2696	*The Clerk. Walberg?
2697	*Mr. Walberg. No.
2698	*The Clerk. Walberg votes no.
2699	Carter?
2700	*Mr. Carter. No.

2701	*The Clerk. Carter votes no.
2702	Duncan?
2703	*Mr. Duncan. No.
2704	*The Clerk. Duncan votes no.
2705	Palmer?
2706	[No response.]
2707	*The Clerk. Dunn?
2708	*Mr. Dunn. No.
2709	*The Clerk. Dunn votes no.
2710	Curtis?
2711	[No response.]
2712	
2713	*The Clerk. Lesko?
2714	*Mrs. Lesko. No.
2715	*The Clerk. Lesko votes no.
2716	Pence?
2717	*Mr. Pence. No.
2718	*The Clerk. Pence votes no.
2719	Crenshaw?
2720	*Mr. Crenshaw. No.
2721	*The Clerk. Crenshaw votes no.
	133

2722	Joyce?
2723	*Mr. Joyce. No.
2724	*The Clerk. Joyce votes no.
2725	Armstrong?
2726	*Mr. Armstrong. No.
2727	*The Clerk. Armstrong votes no.
2728	Weber?
2729	*Mr. Weber. [Inaudible.]
2730	*The Clerk. Weber votes no.
2731	Allen?
2732	*Mr. Allen. No.
2733	*The Clerk. Allen votes no.
2734	Balderson?
2735	*Mr. Balderson. [Inaudible.]
2736	*The Clerk. Balderson votes no.
2737	Fulcher?
2738	*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher, no.
2739	*The Clerk. Fulcher votes no.
2740	Pfluger?
2741	*Mr. Pfluger. No.
2742	*The Clerk. Pfluger votes no.

2743	Harshbarger?
2744	*Mrs. Harshbarger. [Inaudible.]
2745	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes no.
2746	Miller-Meeks?
2747	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.
2748	*The Clerk. Miller-Meeks votes no.
2749	Cammack?
2750	*Mrs. Cammack. No.
2751	*The Clerk. Cammack votes no.
2752	Obernolte?
2753	[No response.]
2754	*The Clerk. Pallone?
2755	*Mr. Pallone. Yes.
2756	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
2757	Eshoo?
2758	[No response.]
2759	*The Clerk. DeGette?
2760	[No response.]
2761	*The Clerk. Schakowsky?
2762	*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.
2763	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes aye.
	105

2764	Matsui?
2765	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
2766	*The Clerk. Matsui votes aye.
2767	Castor?
2768	*Ms. Castor. Aye.
2769	*The Clerk. Castor votes aye.
2770	Sarbanes?
2771	[No response.]
2772	*The Clerk. Tonko?
2773	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
2774	*The Clerk. Tonko votes aye.
2775	Clarke?
2776	*Ms. Clarke. Aye.
2777	*The Clerk. Clarke votes aye.
2778	Cardenas?
2779	*Mr. Cardenas. Aye.
2780	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes aye.
2781	Ruiz?
2782	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
2783	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.
2784	Peters?

2785	[No response.]
2786	*The Clerk. Dingell?
2787	*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
2788	*The Clerk. Dingell votes aye.
2789	Veasey?
2790	*Mr. Veasey. Aye.
2791	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
2792	Kuster?
2793	[No response.]
2794	*The Clerk. Kelly?
2795	*Ms. Kelly. Aye.
2796	*The Clerk. Kelly votes aye.
2797	Barragan?
2798	*Ms. Barragan. Aye.
2799	*The Clerk. Barragan votes aye.
2800	Blunt Rochester?
2801	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
2802	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes aye.
2803	Soto?
2804	*Mr. Soto. Aye.
2805	*The Clerk. Soto votes aye.

2806	Craig?
2807	*Ms. Craig. Aye.
2808	*The Clerk. Craig votes aye.
2809	Schrier?
2810	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
2811	*The Clerk. Schrier votes aye.
2812	Trahan?
2813	*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.
2814	*The Clerk. Trahan votes aye.
2815	Fletcher?
2816	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
2817	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
2818	Chair Rodgers?
2819	*The Chair. No.
2820	*The Clerk. Rodgers votes no.
2821	*Mr. Johnson. Are there members not recorded?
2822	How is Mr. Curtis reported?
2823	*The Clerk. Mr. Curtis is not recorded.
2824	*Mr. Curtis. No.
2825	*The Clerk. Curtis votes no.
2826	*Mr. Hudson. Hudson?

2827		*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson is not recorded.
2828		*Mr. Hudson. Hudson votes no.
2829		*The Clerk. Hudson votes no.
2830		*Mr. Johnson. How is Ms. Eshoo recorded?
2831		*The Clerk. Ms. Eshoo is not recorded.
2832		*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
2833		*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.
2834		*Mr. Sarbanes. Sarbanes?
2835		*Mr. Johnson. Mr. Sarbanes, how is Mr. Sarbanes
2836	recor	ded?
2837		*The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes is not recorded.
2838		*Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
2839		*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes aye.
2840		*Mr. Johnson. Are there other members that need to be
2841	recor	ded?
2842		How is Ms. Castor recorded?
2843		*The Clerk. Ms. Castor is recorded as aye.
2844		*Mr. Johnson. How is Mr. Ruiz recorded?
2845		*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz is recorded as aye.
2846		*Mr. Johnson. Okay. The clerk will report.
2847		[Pause.]

2848	*The Clerk. Chair Johnson, on that vote we have 20 ayes
2849	and 27 nays.
2850	*Mr. Johnson. The amendment is not agreed to.
2851	Are there further amendments?
2852	*Ms. Barragan. I have an amendment at the desk.
2853	*Mr. Johnson. For what purpose does the gentlelady from
2854	California seek recognition?
2855	*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the
2856	desk, No. SC03.
2857	*Mr. Johnson. The clerk will report.
2858	*The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1435, offered by Ms.
2859	Barragan. At the end, the following at the end of the
2860	following. Effective date. This act and the amendments made
2861	by this act may not take effect until the administrator of
2862	the Environmental Protection Agency certifies that
2863	implementation of this act in such amendments will not
2864	cause
2865	*Mr. Johnson. Without objection, the reading of the
2866	amendment is dispensed with.
2867	[The amendment of Ms. Barragan follows:]
2868	
	1.4.0

2869 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

2871 *Mr. Johnson. And the gentlelady is recognized for five 2872 minutes in support of her amendment.

2873 *Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for 2874 reading a good part of that. I will repeat a little bit of 2875 it.

My amendment prevents this bill, H.R. 1435, from going into effect unless the director of the Environmental Protection Agency determines it will not harm the public health of environmental justice communities.

The Clean Air Act waiver allows California to adopt stronger vehicle emission standards than the Federal Government. California has taken action to do just that. Its latest clean truck rule will provide more than \$26 billion in public health benefits over the life of the Regulation.

2886 There are real people behind this number. My 2887 constituents in Wilmington, California, a Latino community, 2888 have urged elected officials to address truck pollution and 2889 air pollution in their neighborhoods. These residents have 2890 said that their doctor visits -- at their doctor visits they 2891 are being diagnosed with respiratory issues like asthma. And

we know that in my district doctor offices have asthma inhalers piled up. Higher air pollution causes heart disease, lung disease, and cancer.

This is an environmental justice issue for Latino 2895 communities and communities of color across our country. 2896 Now that clean vehicle technology has advanced, 2897 California and other states have stepped up to protect 2898 2899 residents from zero-emission car and truck standards that will lead to fewer early deaths, less trips to the hospital 2900 or the doctor's office, a decrease in lost workdays because 2901 of poor health caused by pollution. And this Republican bill 2902 attacks California's ability to protect its residents. It 2903 also will hurt the public health of residents in other states 2904 that have adopted California vehicle standards. 2905

I want to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to make sure this bill will not go into effect if it harms the health of environmental justice communities.

Also, I want to take a moment because we heard some inaccurate information. There is this misconception that nobody wants to buy electric vehicles. That is just not true. It is just not true. If there are electric vehicles

2913 piling up someplace, there is a waiting list in the State of 2914 California. Send your vehicles to California because there 2915 are buyers there.

As a matter of fact, there was a quote on how much 2916 electric vehicles cost. I think the number was, like, 2917 somewhere in the \$60,000 mark. Number one, there are 2918 electric vehicles that are cheaper than that. But costs are 2919 2920 going up for electric vehicles, at least in California. Why? Because there is a waiting list, because more people want 2921 And so I just wish we would stop repeating this 2922 them. falsehood, that there is no demand. There might be parts of 2923 the country where there might be some on a lot. I don't know 2924 where. But just to blanketly say there is not a demand, or 2925 cars are piling up across the country is inaccurate. And I 2926 just want us to have a fair and accurate debate. 2927

And with that, I want to urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back.

2930 *Mr. Burgess. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields back.
2931 Mr. Joyce, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
2932 *Mr. Joyce. I wish to strike the last word in

2933 opposition to the amendment.
2934 *Mr. Burgess. The gentleman is recognized for five 2935 minutes. *Mr. Joyce. I thank my colleague for bringing health 2936 care into this discussion. 2937 As a rural physician, someone who worked to serve 2938 patients for over 25 years, I know the challenges and the 2939 concerns and, most importantly, the barriers to care that 2940 2941 these patients can often face. In my practice in 2942 Pennsylvania I saw patients from across the entire commonwealth. Some had to drive more than 100 miles just to 2943 see a doctor. We cared for patients from Maryland and West 2944 Virginia, as well, many spending hours in their vehicles 2945 2946 across Appalachia to see a physician. These patients need reliable and affordable 2947 transportation to receive their medical care. I am gravely 2948 concerned about the effect of banning all internal combustion 2949 engines, and that effect on access to health care for 2950 2951 patients in rural America. In my part of the country, internal combustion engines are reliable and they are 2952 affordable, and that is how health care is accessed. 2953 In my own experience as a child, my parents had to drive 2954

2955 my younger brother over 200 miles to Philadelphia to see a cardiothoracic surgeon. There were none in our community. 2956 2957 The shortage of specialists in rural America means that more and more people are forced to drive to cities like Pittsburgh 2958 and Philadelphia to receive the care that they need. 2959 People 2960 in my community know how important transportation -affordable, accessible transportation -- is to health care. 2961 2962 We have heard expert testimony on this subject. Electric vehicles simply are not a workable solution for my 2963 constituents. Even EPA Administrator Regan said -- and I am 2964 quoting -- "I don't see a near-term future where we don't 2965 2966 have a fuel supply that complements electric vehicles and provides consumer choice.' ` 2967 I authored this bill specifically because I have the 2968

2969 interests of both my former patients and my constituents at 2970 heart.

2971 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

2972 *Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back.

2973 *Mr. Latta. Will the gentleman yield?

2974 *Mr. Joyce. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

2975 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much. I also would

2976 like to speak in opposition to this amendment.

My Democrat colleagues want to claim that if you don't 2977 2978 support the amendment you don't support the Clean Air Act, public health, or environmental justice communities. I think 2979 we can all say that we all support clean air and we want to -2980 - and public health for our communities. I do not support 2981 policies that, in the name of public health, undermine 2982 2983 health, welfare, and the people's ability to work and provide for their families for only one community. 2984

This amendment in the name of public health would harm 2985 people by enabling the EPA to continue its dangerous actions. 2986 Let's not forget that Congress designed the Clean Air Act 2987 with a holistic, realistic view of the needs of the American 2988 families and enacted the seminal law "to promote the public 2989 health and welfare and the productive capacity of its 2990 population.' ' The amendment not only ignores the realistic 2991 and appropriate approach to implementing emissions standards, 2992 2993 it also exposes Americans to numerous adverse effects --2994 impacts that are created by the mandated use of electric vehicles. 2995

```
2996
```

We have had ample testimony about this in committee. We

know today that the new cars, SUVs and pickup trucks, are 99 percent cleaner than they were in the 1970 models for common pollutants. However, in order to decrease emissions by the remaining one percent, EPA is on a path to limit America's --Americans' mobility at the expense of cost to working families. And I think a number of things have to be pointed out.

You know, costs are going up. It has been pointed out a little bit earlier that, just looking at the differences in prices, you know, what the costs of a car would be for an average American, you are looking at up to \$64,000, according to some of the articles that have been quoted.

And the other thing you have to think about in this 3009 whole question is this. We have a situation that we only 3010 produce one percent of the world's lithium in the United 3011 States. I was at that lithium mine last year. And again, we 3012 are trying to get more in production. The problem is, again, 3013 3014 it is taking us 7 to 10 years, from our hearings, to get anything done in this country to get a permit done. So that 3015 puts us on reliance of who? Well, communist China, because 3016 communist China produces -- not only produces, but it is the 3017

3018 ones that are out there processing between 80 to 85 percent of the world's lithium. 3019 3020 So it is important that we remember the sources out there. Because what happens if we get cut off, and all of a 3021 sudden we are totally reliant on a single source of 3022 transportation when our adversary is the one having it? 3023 So this is going to hit the bottom line for American 3024 3025 families. And so, you know, if you are saving for college or your groceries or, you know, anything that you are going to 3026 be doing out there, it is going to cost us more. So that is 3027 why, you know, I have -- I think the American people should 3028 be the judges of what they want to drive. You want to drive 3029 3030 electric or you want to drive a combustion, that is up to you, but not should be for the Federal Government. 3031 And with that, I yield back to my friend from 3032 Pennsylvania. 3033 *Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields back. 3034 3035 *Mr. Johnson. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back. Is there more discussion? 3036 For what purpose does Ms. Clarke seek recognition? 3037 *Ms. Clarke. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last 3038

3039 word.

3040 *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady is recognized for five 3041 minutes.

3042 *Ms. Clarke. Thank you.

Reducing dangerous pollution from our nation's vehicles is an urgent issue for the over 120 million people in the United States who live in the areas with unhealthy levels of air pollution.

3047 Studies have time and time again shown that communities 3048 of color and economically disadvantaged neighborhoods are 3049 disproportionately exposed to air pollution from vehicles. 3050 For instance, light-duty gas vehicles have been shown to be 3051 one of the most significant emission sources driving the 3052 disparity between communities of color and exposure to 3053 particulate matter.

I have said this before, and I will say it again: for environmental justice communities where pollution from "peaker'' power plants, chemical facilities, dirty diesel trucks are compounded, pollution is a matter of life and death.

3059 Cutting greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation

3060	sector is one of the most significant steps we must take to
3061	both meet our climate goals and protect our most vulnerable
3062	populations.
3063	I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I
3064	yield back.
3065	*Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady yields back. Is there
3066	further discussion on the amendment?
3067	Seeing none, the vote now occurs. The roll call has
3068	been requested. The clerk will call the roll.
3069	*The Clerk. Burgess?
3070	*Mr. Burgess. Burgess votes no.
3071	*The Clerk. Burgess votes no.
3072	Latta?
3073	*Mr. Latta. No.
3074	*The Clerk. Latta votes no.
3075	Guthrie?
3076	[No response.]
3077	*The Clerk. Griffith?
3078	[No response.]
3079	*The Clerk. Bilirakis?
3080	*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

3081	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes no.
3082	Johnson?
3083	*Mr. Johnson. No.
3084	*The Clerk. Johnson votes no.
3085	Bucshon?
3086	*Mr. Bucshon. No.
3087	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes no.
3088	Hudson?
3089	[No response.]
3090	*The Clerk. Walberg?
3091	[No response.]
3092	*The Clerk. Carter?
3093	[No response.]
3094	*The Clerk. Duncan?
3095	[No response.]
3096	*The Clerk. Palmer?
3097	[No response.]
3098	*The Clerk. Dunn?
3099	[No response.]
3100	*The Clerk. Dunn?
3101	[No response.]

3102	*The	Clerk.	Curtis?
3103	*Mr.	Curtis.	No.
3104	*The	Clerk.	Curtis votes no.
3105	Lesko	?	
3106	*Mrs.	Lesko.	No.
3107	*The	Clerk.	Lesko votes no.
3108	Pence	?	
3109	*Mr.	Pence.	No.
3110	*The	Clerk.	Pence votes no.
3111	Crens	shaw?	
3112	*Mr.	Crenshaw	v. No.
3113	*The	Clerk.	Crenshaw votes no.
3114	Joyce	e?	
3115	*Mr.	Joyce.	No.
3116	*The	Clerk.	Joyce votes no.
3117	Armst	rong?	
3118	*Mr.	Armstror	ng. No.
3119	*The	Clerk.	Armstrong votes no.
3120	Weber	?	
3121	[No r	response	.]
3122	*The	Clerk.	Weber?

3123	*Mr.	Weber.	No.	
3124	*The	Clerk.	Weber votes no	•
3125	Aller	1?		
3126	*Mr.	Allen.	No.	
3127	*The	Clerk.	Allen votes no	
3128	Balde	erson?		
3129	*Mr.	Balderso	on. No.	
3130	*The	Clerk.	Balderson vote	s no.
3131	Fulch	ner?		
3132	*Mr.	Fulcher.	Fulcher, no.	
3133	*The	Clerk.	Fulcher votes	no.
3134	Pfluc	ger?		
3135	*Mr.	Pfluger.	[Inaudible.]	
3136	*The	Clerk.	Pfluger votes	no.
3137	Harsh	nbarger?		
3138	*Mrs.	. Harshba	rger. [Inaudi]	ble.]
3139	*The	Clerk.	Harshbarger vo	tes no.
3140	Mille	er-Meeks?		
3141	*Mrs.	. Miller-	Meeks. No.	
3142	*The	Clerk.	Miller-Meeks v	otes no.
3143	Camma	ack?		

3144	*Mrs. Cammack. No.
3145	*The Clerk. Cammack votes no.
3146	Obernolte?
3147	[No response.]
3148	*The Clerk. Pallone?
3149	*Mr. Pallone. Yes.
3150	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
3151	Eshoo?
3152	*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
3153	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.
3154	DeGette?
3155	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
3156	*The Clerk. DeGette votes aye.
3157	Schakowsky?
3158	*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.
3159	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes aye.
3160	Matsui?
3161	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
3162	*The Clerk. Matsui votes aye.
3163	Castor?
3164	*Ms. Castor. Aye.

3165	*The Clerk. Castor votes aye.
3166	Sarbanes?
3167	*Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
3168	*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes aye.
3169	Tonko?
3170	[No response.]
3171	*The Clerk. Clarke?
3172	*Ms. Clarke. Aye.
3173	*The Clerk. Clarke votes aye.
3174	Cardenas?
3175	*Mr. Cardenas. Aye.
3176	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes aye.
3177	Ruiz?
3178	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
3179	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.
3180	Peters?
3181	*Mr. Peters. Aye.
3182	*The Clerk. Peters votes aye.
3183	Dingell?
3184	*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
3185	*The Clerk. Dingell votes aye.

3186	Veasey?
3187	*Mr. Veasey. Aye.
3188	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
3189	Kuster?
3190	[No response.]
3191	*The Clerk. Kelly?
3192	*Ms. Kelly. Aye.
3193	*The Clerk. Kelly votes aye.
3194	Barragan?
3195	*Ms. Barragan. Aye.
3196	*The Clerk. Barragan votes aye.
3197	Blunt Rochester?
3198	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
3199	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes aye.
3200	Soto?
3201	[No response.]
3202	*The Clerk. Craig?
3203	[No response.]
3204	*The Clerk. Schrier?
3205	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
3206	*The Clerk. Schrier votes aye.

3207	Trahan?
3208	*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.
3209	*The Clerk. Trahan votes aye.
3210	Fletcher?
3211	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
3212	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
3213	Chair Rodgers?
3214	*The Chair. No.
3215	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes no.
3216	*Mr. Johnson. Can the clerk call the members that have
3217 not 1	been recorded, please?
3218	*The Clerk. Guthrie?
3219	*Mr. Guthrie. No.
3220	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes no.
3221	Griffith?
3222	*Mr. Griffith. No.
3223	*The Clerk. Griffith votes no.
3224	Hudson?
3225	*Mr. Hudson. No.
3226	*The Clerk. Hudson votes no.
3227	Walberg?

3228	*Mr. Walberg	. No.
3229	*The Clerk.	Walberg votes no.
3230	Carter?	
3231	*Mr. Carter.	No.
3232	*The Clerk.	Carter votes no.
3233	Duncan?	
3234	*Mr. Duncan.	No.
3235	*The Clerk.	Duncan votes no.
3236	Palmer?	
3237	[No response	.]
3238	*The Clerk.	Dunn?
3239	*Mr. Dunn.	No.
3240	*The Clerk.	Dunn votes no.
3241	Tonko?	
3242	*Mr. Tonko.	Aye.
3243	*The Clerk.	Tonko votes aye.
3244	Kuster?	
3245	[No response	.]
3246	*The Clerk.	Soto?
3247	*Voice. Did	Rodgers vote?
3248	*The Clerk.	Craig?

3249	*Mr. Johnson. Do any other members seek to be recorded?
3250	[Pause.]
3251	*Mr. Johnson. The clerk will report.
3252	[Pause.]
3253	*The Clerk. Chair Johnson, on that vote we have 20 ayes
3254	and 28 nays I mean 27 nays, I am sorry.
3255	*Mr. Johnson. The amendment is not agreed to.
3256	Are there further amendments?
3257	Seeing none, the question now occurs on approving H.R.
3258	1435. Those in favor will say aye; those opposed will say
3259	no.
3260	Those in favor, say aye.
3261	Those opposed?
3262	A roll call has been requested. The clerk will report.
3263	*The Clerk. Burgess?
3264	[No response.]
3265	*The Clerk. Latta?
3266	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
3267	*The Clerk. Can Mr. Latta repeat his vote?
3268	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
3269	*The Clerk. Latta votes aye.
	1.00

3270	Guthrie?
3271	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
3272	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes aye.
3273	Griffith?
3274	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
3275	*The Clerk. Griffith votes aye.
3276	Bilirakis?
3277	*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.
3278	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes aye.
3279	Johnson?
3280	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
3281	*The Clerk. Johnson votes aye.
3282	Bucshon?
3283	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
3284	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes aye.
3285	Hudson?
3286	[No response.]
3287	*The Clerk. Walberg?
3288	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
3289	*The Clerk. Walberg votes aye.
3290	Carter?

3291	*Mr. Carter. Aye.
3292	*The Clerk. Carter votes aye.
3293	Duncan?
3294	*Mr. Duncan. [Inaudible.]
3295	*The Clerk. Duncan votes aye.
3296	Palmer?
3297	[No response.]
3298	*The Clerk. Dunn?
3299	*Mr. Dunn. Aye.
3300	*The Clerk. Dunn votes aye.
3301	Curtis?
3302	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
3303	*The Clerk. Curtis votes aye.
3304	Lesko?
3305	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
3306	*The Clerk. Lesko votes aye.
3307	Pence?
3308	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
3309	*The Clerk. Pence votes aye.
3310	Crenshaw?
3311	*Mr. Crenshaw. Aye.

3312	*The C	Clerk.	Crenshaw votes aye.
3313	Joyce?	?	
3314	*Mr. J	Joyce.	Aye.
3315	*The C	Clerk.	Joyce votes aye.
3316	Armstr	rong?	
3317	*Mr. A	Armstror	ng. Yes.
3318	*The C	Clerk.	Armstrong votes aye.
3319	Weber?	?	
3320	*Mr. W	Weber.	[Inaudible.]
3321	*The C	Clerk.	Weber votes aye.
3322	Allen?	?	
3323	[No re	esponse.]
3324	*The C	Clerk.	Balderson?
3325	*Mr. E	Baldersc	on. Aye.
3326	*The C	Clerk.	Balderson votes aye.
3327	Fulche	er?	
3328	*Mr. B	Fulcher.	Fulcher is aye.
3329	*The C	Clerk.	Fulcher votes aye.
3330	Pfluge	er?	
3331	*Mr. E	Pfluger.	[Inaudible.]
3332	*The C	Clerk.	Pfluger votes aye.

3333	Harshbarger?
3334	*Mrs. Harshbarger. [Inaudible.]
3335	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes aye.
3336	Miller-Meeks?
3337	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. [Inaudible.]
3338	*The Clerk. Miller-Meeks votes aye.
3339	Cammack?
3340	*Mrs. Cammack. Aye.
3341	*The Clerk. Cammack votes aye.
3342	Obernolte?
3343	[No response.]
3344	*The Clerk. Pallone?
3345	*Mr. Pallone. No.
3346	*The Clerk. Pallone votes no.
3347	Eshoo?
3348	*Ms. Eshoo. No.
3349	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes no.
3350	DeGette?
3351	*Ms. DeGette. No.
3352	*The Clerk. DeGette votes no.
3353	Schakowsky?

3354	*Ms.	Schakows	sky.	No.	
3355	*The	Clerk.	Schal	kowsky	votes no.
3356	Matsı	ıi?			
3357	*Ms.	Matsui.	No.		
3358	*The	Clerk.	Matsu	i vote	es no.
3359	Casto	or?			
3360	*Ms.	Castor.	No.		
3361	*The	Clerk.	Casto	or vote	s no.
3362	Sarba	anes?			
3363	*Mr.	Sarbanes	5. No	Ο.	
3364	*The	Clerk.	Sarba	anes vo	tes no.
3365	Tonko	>?			
3366	*Mr.	Tonko.	No.		
3367	*The	Clerk.	Tonko	votes	no.
3368	Clar	ke?			
3369	*Ms.	Clarke.	No.		
3370	*The	Clerk.	Clar	ke vote	s no.
3371	Carde	enas?			
3372	*Mr.	Cardenas	5. No	Ο.	
3373	*The	Clerk.	Carde	enas vo	tes no.
3374	Ruizî	?			

3375	*Mr. Ruiz. No.
3376	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes no.
3377	Peters?
3378	*Mr. Peters. [Inaudible.]
3379	*The Clerk. Peters votes no.
3380	Dingell?
3381	*Mrs. Dingell. No.
3382	*The Clerk. Dingell votes no.
3383	Veasey?
3384	*Mr. Veasey. No.
3385	*The Clerk. Veasey votes no.
3386	Kuster?
3387	[No response.]
3388	*The Clerk. Kelly?
3389	*Ms. Kelly. No.
3390	*The Clerk. Kelly votes no.
3391	Barragan?
3392	*Ms. Barragan. No.
3393	*The Clerk. Barragan votes no.
3394	Blunt Rochester?
3395	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. No.

3396	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes no.
3397	Soto?
3398	*Mr. Soto. No.
3399	*The Clerk. Soto votes no.
3400	Craig?
3401	[No response.]
3402	*The Clerk. Schrier?
3403	*Ms. Schrier. No.
3404	*The Clerk. Schrier votes no.
3405	Trahan?
3406	*Mrs. Trahan. No.
3407	*The Clerk. Trahan votes no.
3408	Fletcher?
3409	*Mrs. Fletcher. No.
3410	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes no.
3411	Rodgers?
3412	*Mr. Johnson. How is Allen recorded?
3413	*The Clerk. Mr. Allen is not recorded.
3414	*Mr. Allen. Allen votes yes.
3415	*The Clerk. Allen votes aye.
3416	*Mr. Johnson. Would the clerk call the roll for
	1.67

those

3417	not recorded, please?
3418	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers?
3419	[No response.]
3420	*The Clerk. Burgess?
3421	[No response.]
3422	*The Clerk. Hudson?
3423	*Mr. Hudson. Aye.
3424	*The Clerk. Hudson votes aye.
3425	Palmer?
3426	[No response.]
3427	*The Clerk. Obernolte?
3428	[No response.]
3429	*The Clerk. Kuster?
3430	[No response.]
3431	*The Clerk. Craig?
3432	*Ms. Craig. Ms. Craig votes no.
3433	*The Clerk. Craig votes no.
3434	*Mr. Johnson. How is Chair Rodgers recorded?
3435	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers is not recorded.
3436	*The Chair. Chair Rodgers votes aye.
3437	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes aye.

3438 *Mr. Johnson. The clerk will report. [Pause.] 3439 3440 *The Clerk. Chair Johnson, on that vote we have 26 ayes and 22 nays. 3441 3442 [Pause.] *Mr. Johnson. The ayes have it, and the bill is 3443 adopted. 3444 3445 The chair now calls up H.R. 4468, and asks the clerk to 3446 report. 3447 *The Clerk. H.R. 4468, a bill to prohibit the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from 3448 finalizing, implementing, or enforcing a proposed rule with 3449 respect to emissions from vehicles, and further --3450 *Mr. Johnson. Without objection, the first reading of 3451 the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for 3452 amendment at any point. 3453 So ordered. 3454 3455 [The bill follows:] 3456 3457 3458

3459 *Mr. Johnson. Does anyone seek to be recognized --*Mr. Allen. Mr. Chair? 3460 *Mr. Johnson. For what purpose does the gentleman from 3461 Georgia seek recognition? 3462 *Mr. Allen. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last 3463 word to speak in favor of the CARS Act. 3464 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 3465 3466 minutes. 3467 *Mr. Allen. The American people have a right to decide which car to buy that best fits their needs, not unelected 3468 bureaucrats. However, the Environmental Protection Agency, 3469 EPA, has proposed a rule, the multi-pollutant emission 3470 standards for model years 2027 and later light-duty and 3471 medium-duty vehicles, which is a backdoor policy towards 3472 taking gas-powered engines off the market. 3473 There is also consensus in the automobile industry that 3474 the EPA's tailpipe emissions rule is nothing more than a 3475 3476 mandate for electric vehicles. According to the Congressional Budget Office, projections that electric 3477 vehicles will not -- will only account for 30 to 56 percent 3478

170

of new car sales by 2032. Even with the massive incentives

3480 for electric vehicles included in Biden's so-called Inflation Reduction Act, this falls well short of EPA's goal of two-3481 3482 thirds of new car sales being electric vehicles. In looking at the current electric vehicle market, 3483 electric vehicles only account for 4.5 percent of new vehicle 3484 I would also like to note that during the 3485 sales. environmental subcommittee markup two weeks ago, I mentioned 3486 3487 that electric vehicles are not a new phenomenon, but have been around for nearly 200 years. So again, why is there 3488 this rush now to incentivize and speed up the production of 3489 vehicles that are not popular among consumers? 3490 According to a recent Gallup poll, 41 percent of 3491 3492 Americans unequivocally would not buy an electric vehicle. EPA's de facto EV mandate would take options away from the 3493 more than 84 percent of Americans that are likely to choose 3494 or would strongly prefer a gas-powered or hybrid vehicle. 3495 No matter how much government floods the market with 3496

3497 requirements that squeezes out internal combustion engines 3498 and require electric vehicles, if consumers aren't buying 3499 those cars, nobody is going to win.

3500 That is why I am supporting the CARS Act, authored by my

3501 colleague, Congressman Walberg. This bill stops EPA's current light and medium-duty vehicle regulation, and instead 3502 3503 allows consumers and the market to determine the cars and engine technology they want available, not the Federal 3504 3505 Government. I urge my colleagues to support the CARS Act, and I 3506 yield back. 3507 3508 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey seek --3509 *Mr. Pallone. I move to strike the last word and speak 3510 in opposition to the bill. 3511 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 3512 3513 minutes. *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I strongly 3514 oppose H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act 3515 of 2023. 3516 This bill is a direct attack on the current and expected 3517 3518 future success of our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry. In addition to cutting industry stakeholders out 3519 of the rulemaking process by barring EPA from finalizing its 3520 light and medium-duty vehicle proposal for model years 2027 3521 172

and later, this bill would put in place far-reaching and illdefined requirements for any future vehicle emission standards.

The way I read it, this bill would block EPA from ever regulating tailpipe emissions from the transportation sector. And it is disappointing that my Republican colleagues are reverting to their playbook of dismantling common-sense protections, even when it is against the best interests of public health, the environment, and our economy.

When announcing this markup, Chair Rodgers said, and I 3531 quote, that "America's global leadership and ability to win 3532 the future depends on our capacity to harness the 3533 3534 technologies that will shape our nation and the world in the coming decades, ' ' and that "we must make certain that 3535 America, not China, is capturing the innovations in these 3536 industries,' ' and I agree with her statement, which is why I 3537 am baffled that my majority colleagues included H.R. 4468 on 3538 3539 today's agenda, because this bill would hurt our global leadership and our ability to harness new technologies, and 3540 would only weaken our ability to compete with China. 3541 EVs are not science fiction. This innovative technology 3542

has been around for decades, and is becoming a more popular vehicle choice for consumers around the country. We know that China currently controls a significant portion of EV market share and of the global EV supply chain, and that is why we must continue to leverage the power of the Federal Government to drive innovation, secure supply chains, and expand our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry.

3550 So H.R. 4468, in my opinion, is a step in the wrong 3551 direction. We must ensure the United States is the global 3552 leader on clean transportation, and not cede that role to 3553 China, and that is why I will be voting no on H.R. 4468 and 3554 urge my colleagues to do the same.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

3556 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. The chair now 3557 recognizes the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Walberg, for five 3558 minutes.

3559 *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to 3560 strike the last word and speak proudly in favor of my 3561 legislation, H.R. 4468.

3562 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 3563 minutes.

3564 *Mr. Walberg. H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales, or CARS Act. Americans need reliable, 3565 3566 affordable, and functional modes of transportation. I asked Mr. Goffman, the EPA official who testified at 3567 the subcommittee legislative hearing, if each of these 3568 aspects are important. He agreed that all Americans should 3569 have access to reliable, available, functional, and 3570 3571 affordable cars and trucks. He did not believe that Federal rules should make cars and trucks less available, less 3572 affordable, and less functional for consumers and their 3573 3574 needs.

He also admitted the multi-pollutant tailpipe emissions rule didn't really factor those things into its calculation, even though the facts are that prices are rising. When pressed, we would -- he would not commit as to whether this rule would raise vehicle purchase prices for consumers or make small trucks and SUVs less available.

Finally, he dodged giving an answer when I asked him if he would insert a regulatory off-ramp into the light and medium-duty rule if new vehicles become more expensive or unreliable, auto choice or functionality is limited, or those

cars and trucks are unavailable to American consumers.
This is unacceptable, forcing a major change in how
Americans live, particularly in rural districts like mine,
without taking care to prevent harmful outcomes. EPA may
have the luxury of avoiding the need to examine life outside
the Beltway, and it certainly does not stand for election to
understand -- to answer for its choices, but we do.

I introduced the CARS Act to help prevent the dreams Mr. Goffman expressed from becoming a nightmare for Americans.

First, it stops EPA's proposal to require that twothirds of all new cars sold by 2032 be an electric vehicle. This is the same rule that the trade group representing car manufacturers in the U.S., the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, said was "neither reasonable or achievable' in the proposed regulation's 10-year timeframe.

Even the UAW is on record claiming the rule insufficiently addresses charging infrastructure or accounting for the role of cars with internal combustion engines, as well as calling for substantial changes to this proposed rule that recalibrate its standards to reflect more feasible emissions levels that reflect technology that can be

feasibility [sic] complied with over a longer window.
In Michigan, when the automakers and the unions are both
raising red flags that something is really wrong, people
listen, and so should we.

Second, the CARS Act tries to step in and prevent a 3610 similar problem in the future with the regulations issued 3611 under this section of the Clean Air Act. Section 3 of H.R. 3612 3613 4468 prevents EPA from mandating a specific technology, which I believe includes drafting a standard in which a way that --3614 in such a way that it knows only one technology can meet it. 3615 It also prevents EPA from issuing regulations that limit 3616 the availability of a particular vehicle engine for the 3617 ultimate consumer. 3618

My colleagues, EPA's job is to identify emissions and -that endanger health or welfare. If EPA intends to set emission standards that are economically and technically feasible, this provision should not be a problem. However, if EPA decides to tune up greenhouse gas and criteria pollution standards to create a de facto technology or engine mandate, this bill will prevent it.

3626 It is not EPA's job to decide what is best for Americans

3627 and assume it got it right. On that note I ask for unanimous 3628 consent in order to enter three letters of support into the 3629 record from the Consumers Energy Alliance, the National Tank 3630 Truck Carriers, API, and AFPM.

In advancing the CARS Act, customers and their needs, 3631 not the government and its political biases, will drive auto 3632 innovation, secure functionality, and promote affordability. 3633 3634 And affordability is especially important, considering that the Inflation Reduction Act's subsidies disappear as soon as 3635 the EPA rule becomes fully implemented. Leaving many 3636 consumers without mobility options yet making these subsidies 3637 permanent defies fiscal sanity. 3638

I appreciate the subcommittee forwarding this bill to the full committee for consideration, and I urge all members to support the safety valve that is H.R. 4468. It is good for preserving Americans' affordable and reliable mobility, promoting Americans domestic automobile economy, and

3644 protecting Americans national security.

3645 And I yield back.

3646 *The Chair. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back.

And without objection, the letters will be entered into

3648	the record.
3649	So ordered.
3650	[The information follows:]
3651	
3652	**************************************
3653	

3654 *The Chair. Any further discussion? The chair recognizes Mr. Tonko. 3655 3656 For what purpose do you seek recognition? *Mr. Tonko. Yes, Madam Chair. I move to strike the 3657 last word. 3658 *The Chair. You have five minutes. 3659 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Madam Chair. I strongly oppose 3660 3661 the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. EPA has an important mission to protect human health and 3662 the environment, and this bill seeks to prevent EPA from 3663 fulfilling its responsibilities. It does not seem to matter 3664 that the proposed rule from EPA will save lives, or that it 3665 3666 is expected to result in up to an estimated \$1.6 trillion -that is trillion, with a T -- in benefits. 3667 EPA has an obligation under the Clean Air Act to protect 3668 public health by addressing air pollution, including from 3669 mobile sources. And we know that vehicles covered by this 3670 3671 proposed rule will account for a large amount of greenhouse gas pollution, as well as other dangerous pollutants. 3672 But putting aside those health and environmental 3673

benefits, we should see this rule as an opportunity to
further drive technological innovation. Over the last several years -- or over the coming several years, the vehicle model years covered by EPA's proposed rule, we expect the cost of EVs to come down significantly, the performance and range of EVs to improve, and consumer demand for EVs to continue to grow.

Let's stop looking backwards and stop trying to deny 3681 3682 Americans the health and the economic benefits of EVs. And that includes significant job benefits. Because if we do 3683 this right, these vehicles will be built here, with U.S.-made 3684 components and U.S.-made batteries. That is the vision 3685 imagined by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, and 3686 3687 by the Inflation Reduction Act. And by all public reports, that is exactly what is beginning to happen with the litany 3688 of private sector commitments and investments to build new 3689 manufacturing facilities all across our country. 3690

Rather than prejudge the outcome of a not-yet-finalized EPA rulemaking process, we should be working together to help overcome any barriers, real or just perceived, that may slow down EV adoption. In the meantime, we should not block proposed public health protections that will provide more

3696 than \$1 trillion of benefits to the American people.

With that I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and, Madam Chair, I yield back.

3699 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. I would like to 3700 recognize myself to strike the last word and speak in support 3701 of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

At the Detroit Auto Show, President Biden said he believes the U.S. can own the future of the automobile market. Unfortunately, by using the EPA to institute government mandates and restrictions, he is handing the keys of America's auto future to China.

We are offering a different approach with the Cars Act, one that encourages free enterprise and innovation. We want Americans to continue to have the ability to choose the best transportation options for their lives. Opening up mobility options has revolutionized people's lives. It is helped lift so many out of poverty.

3713 EPA's tailpipe emission standards for light and medium-3714 duty vehicles force the auto market toward 100 percent 3715 battery electric vehicles only. The fact is these cars are 3716 expensive, and unreliable in many parts of the country where

3717 infrastructure like charging stations are unavailable. And 3718 the EVs is a market that China controls, the biggest polluter 3719 in the world.

We win, the United States of America will win, by 3720 innovating building here at home and letting people choose 3721 the cars they want to drive, whether they are the more and 3722 more fuel-efficient internal combustion engines, hybrids, 3723 3724 plug-in hybrids, hybrid hydrogen, electric vehicles, or maybe something else still to be created. We do not win by 3725 dictating to people and businesses that there will only be 3726 one option. 3727

The American way, and why the CARS Act revokes EPA's dangerous tailpipe emission standards and ensures that any future rulemaking do not mandate the use of specific vehicle technology [sic]. We should be proud. I am so proud of our auto leadership over the past century, and working to make sure that the United States continues to lead for the next 100 years. We shouldn't be ceding that to China.

After all, we know China isn't focused on reducing carbon emissions. Since 2007 their emissions are skyrocketing. Again, China is the biggest polluter in the

3738 world. Today China is building, on average every week, two coal-fired plants to meet their goal of electrification. 3739 3740 China dominates access to critical minerals, controlling 76 percent of global battery cell production capacity for 3741 electric vehicles, 75 percent of lithium ion batteries, the 3742 majority of the processing, the refining capacity for over 3743 half of the world's lithium, cobalt, graphite. Last guarter 3744 3745 it was China -- China, ladies and gentleman -- that became the largest exporter of new motor vehicles, EVs, in the 3746 world, surpassing Japan. Forcing Americans to switch to EVs 3747 is playing into China's scheme. 3748

3749 Chinese electric EV companies are developing a foothold 3750 in Europe, and are expanding manufacturing now in countries 3751 like Mexico, right in our backyard.

Now, you all know I have heard some of my Democratic colleagues and our current Secretary of Energy state that we need to follow China's lead. I don't agree. President Biden is implementing top-down government mandates that are going to drive up costs, stifle innovation, limit our choices, and benefit China.

3758 This bill and others before us offer a better approach,

3759 one that ensures people have access to affordable, reliable, 3760 functional means of transportation, and that should be a 3761 bipartisan goal.

We cannot win the future with China making our cars. 3762 We cannot win the future with the Federal Government dictating 3763 our lives or sending our U.S. auto jobs overseas. We need to 3764 stay focused on the real goal, which is continued American 3765 3766 leadership in the auto sector, while being good stewards of the environment. We have been doing this for decades, and 3767 the results have been that the United States of America that 3768 is leading in bringing down lowering carbon emissions while 3769 also providing more affordable, clean transportation options 3770 3771 for people.

The CARS Act and other bills ensure we continue to build, build on that important legacy. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our solutions today, and I yield back.

3776 Is there further discussion?

All right, the gentlelady from Florida. For what purpose do you seek recognition?

3779 *Ms. Castor. To speak in opposition to this pro-China

3780 bill. *The Chair. Ms. Castor is recognized for five minutes. 3781 3782 *Ms. Castor. Thank you, Madam Chair. On the CARS Act, if you want to compete with China in 3783 automaking, you would not do this. You would not support 3784 this legislation or any of the bills being offered by my GOP 3785 colleagues today. And it is very disappointing to see 3786 3787 another Republican pro-China bill. It would be better policy, a more pro-America, more 3788 patriotic policy, to strengthen American industry and 3789 American ingenuity to compete with China, rather than what 3790 their approach is, just to throw up their hands and say, 3791 okay, we can't do anything, we will cede it all to China. 3792 The global demand for electric vehicles is rising. And 3793 if we don't compete, who will benefit? China. 3794 If we step back, who ends up controlling all the supply 3795 chains? China. 3796 3797 You cannot ignore the fact that China now controls a lot of the existing supply chains for electric vehicles. Thev 3798 want to put our autoworkers and our automobile companies out 3799 of business. But rather than ceding more ground, the answer 3800

is to invest in America, to invest in our competitiveness.
In fact, that is the aim of the Inflation Reduction Act.
That is what is going on across America right now. We are
investing in domestic battery manufacturing, creating jobs
here, and reducing our dependance on foreign supplies.

Republicans are in a defensive crouch. They are stepping away through these bills today. They are stepping away from electric vehicle technology, and they are willing to cede the dominance to China in this space. Republicans -and let's just kind of peel back the curtain into why that is happening, because it doesn't make sense, does it?

But they are going down this road of scare tactics to --3812 3813 kind of deliberately misleading the American people about electric vehicles in order to prop up big oil corporations. 3814 See, electric vehicles are cheaper to own. They are more 3815 environmentally sustainable. They deliver significant cost 3816 savings to American families. They decrease fueling costs by 3817 3818 50 percent or more. And overall, they are about 25 percent less expensive than regular cars. 3819

Additionally, EV prices have declined by more than \$5,600 over the past year, and they are going to go down,

3822 down, down as we ramp up production. Thanks to incentives in the Inflation Reduction Act, electric passenger cars and 3823 3824 light-duty trucks are expected to reach cost parity with gasoline-powered vehicles in the next two years. 3825 That is years sooner than anyone predicted. The technology is going 3826 to get better and better, just like what happened with gas-3827 powered vehicles over time. But that is because we 3828 3829 incentivize that. We incentivized fuel economy. We invested in innovation and research and development, and that paid 3830 dividends for families across this country. 3831

I know that electric vehicles are a threat to the profits of oil and gas companies. But the upside to American families, to workers, to businesses is simply too great to ignore. The benefits to their pocketbooks, to our industrial base, to our health, and to a livable future for our kids and grandkids cannot be ignored.

3838 This bill hurts American progress. It hurts job 3839 creation in America. It hurts workers. It hurts our 3840 industrial base. It hurts small business owners. So I urge 3841 my colleagues for all of those reasons to oppose this bill 3842 today and join us in standing up for America and the can-do

spirit of innovation and competitiveness. 3843 Thank you, I yield back. 3844 3845 *The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Does anyone seek recognition? 3846 The chair recognizes Mr. Carter for five minutes on the 3847 CARS Act. 3848 *Mr. Carter. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last 3849 word in support of this bill. 3850 3851 *The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes. 3852 *Mr. Carter. Madam Chair, I am not opposed to electric 3853 vehicles. The single largest economic development project in 3854 3855 the history of the State of Georgia is underway right now in my district that I have the honor and privilege of 3856 representing. It is by Hyundai, Hyundai Motor Company. 3857 They are building electric vehicles. We are excited to have them, 3858 a \$5.5 billion investment. It is going to employ over 8,100 3859 3860 people, and probably that many more people in ancillary businesses. We are excited about it. They are incredible 3861 machines. Lots of cool features and advantages. 3862 However, I am opposed to the idea that we should be more 3863

3864 or less forcing Americans into these vehicles only. What is 3865 more, I am also against the notion that electric vehicles 3866 will somehow save our emission problems.

The truth is that we don't know the true picture of 3867 carbon dioxide emissions associated with EVs. All the claims 3868 are either estimates or guesses. The processes behind mining 3869 and processing the materials required to produce these 3870 3871 vehicles are very energy intensive and for -- certainly not emission free at the moment. A recent Manhattan Institute 3872 report examined just this, and emphasized that we have no 3873 real idea of these emissions, especially if we expand EV 3874 production dramatically. In that report they point out that 3875 the global mining industry today already accounts for about 3876 40 percent of all industrial energy use before a significant 3877 expansion. That will have to happen as high-quality deposits 3878 become rarer to find. 3879

By the way, those processes are largely not happening here in the U.S., where I am confident we could do a decent job, despite my colleagues' pleas to actually do that.

3883 Not only do you have to factor in these emissions that, 3884 again, we don't have a full picture of, but you also have to

factor in the emissions involved in transporting materials all across the globe. I fear that accounting for these either eliminates those benefits or may even add more emissions.

What we are hearing from the other side is that, as long 3889 as it isn't here, it doesn't count. We are simply going to 3890 shift this burden to other countries. They can deal with air 3891 3892 quality issues which are already worse than the U.S. In 3893 fact, the mining and processing power by coal in China is putting particulates in the air that travel all the way to 3894 the U.S. Shutting down -- shutting that down in the U.S. 3895 will not end that pollution, and will hurt us. Is that what 3896 3897 they call environmental justice?

3898 The research firm ICF found that if crude oil from the 3899 Gulf of Mexico were to displace crude oil production outside 3900 of the U.S. and Canada, global emissions could drop by 50 3901 percent. That seems like a reasonable path to pursue, but 3902 the Administration is decidedly not doing that.

Further, the EPA has said that U.S. air quality and emissions continue to improve as we drive more miles, consume more energy, and grow our economy. My colleagues will say

that this will improve public health because of their narrow idea that the only health issues associated with this is air quality. That is misguided.

As we discussed in the subcommittee markup, health care 3909 access is a significant factor. Portions of my district are 3910 incredibly rural and simply not practical for EVs. 3911 Mv constituents deserve access to affordable vehicles that they 3912 3913 can depend on. I understand that my colleagues across the aisle are big fans of EVs, as am I. I get it. They are very 3914 high tech, and they can be incredibly convenient in the right 3915 circumstances, but not for everyone, and especially if you 3916 make less than six figures. And a lot of people in my 3917 district do make less than six figures. 3918

3919 If people want an EV, they can make that choice. In fact, they already have a number of incentives pushing them 3920 that way as it is today. There are Federal tax credits to 3921 incentivize purchasing an EV, and many states have other 3922 3923 incentives on top of that, and they are working. Otherwise, I don't think you see what is happening in Georgia. 3924 My home state of Georgia is positioning itself to be the electric 3925 mobility capital of the U.S., yet Georgia has not and will 3926

3927	not propose tailpipe rules like California, or similar
3928	policies to more or less mandate EVs.
3929	We don't need any more market-distorting policies that
3930	cost taxpayers money and opportunity. I urge all my
3931	colleagues to support these bills that allow for consumer
3932	choice, consumer choice.
3933	Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back.
3934	*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone
3935	seek to be recognized on the bill?
3936	You are done?
3937	*Mr. Pallone. No, we have amendments.
3938	*The Chair. Okay. The chair recognizes the gentleman
3939	from Mr. Duncan for five minutes to speak on the
3940	underlying
3941	*Mr. Duncan. South Carolina.
3942	*The Chair. South Carolina.
3943	*Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Madam Chair.
3944	*The Chair. I am sorry.
3945	*Mr. Duncan. China, China, China. Republicans on this
3946	committee since January have done more to push back against
3947	China on so many topics that the gentlelady from Florida is

3948 just so misguided when she is talking about Republicans and 3949 China.

I support Made in America and Buy American Made. We have a robust automotive sector in this country, and it will include EVs if the market is there.

I align myself with comments from Mr. Carter. 3953 I have a rural district. I have a Ford dealership that is forced to 3954 3955 put in charging stations at his dealership. He has EVs on the lot he can't sell because they just don't work in rural 3956 America. Dealers need to sell units. They were forced by 3957 the manufacturer to put in charging stations after they were 3958 forced by the manufacturer to improve their facade and do a 3959 3960 lot of work on their showrooms. There has got to be a return 3961 on investment. And when the EVs are sitting there unsold, there is none. 3962

You talked about pushing incentives to incentivize the industry. The government spends so much money now we are, what, \$34 trillion in debt today? I mean, when is enough spending enough to incentivize people to purchase something or a manufacturing company to manufacturing something when the market isn't there?

3969 You want to talk about China? China controls most of the rare earths in the world. They own the mining rights, 3970 3971 and they do it in such an environmentally insensitive way. If you believe in the environment, you should also believe in 3972 the environmental practices that American mining companies do 3973 in a much more environmentally sensitive and cleaner way, and 3974 we don't do it with child labor because we have labor 3975 3976 standards. China doesn't, and they are using child labor in Africa to mine this lithium that is so toxic. 3977

And guess what? They are not using EV articulating loaders. They are using diesel-powered loaders to move that earth.

3981 So China. They are going to provide a lot of electric vehicles in this country. But the technology that exists 3982 today -- and I have read many articles on this -- gives the 3983 Chinese companies and the Chinese Communist Party the ability 3984 to spy on Americans, even if it is sitting in your driveway. 3985 3986 We push back against China's spying with TikTok. We see where Chinese companies are heavily involved in the 3987 automotive industry and battery production in places like 3988 Michigan. The Chinese Communist Party seems to be the one 3989

3990 that is pushing us toward electrification. We know Russia 3991 gave money to environmental groups to go after the fossil 3992 fuel industry. Why? Because they don't want us to be energy 3993 dominant and energy independent. They want to weaken 3994 America. I believe that is the same goal of the Chinese 3995 Communist Party through this push.

3996 So I am not going to sit here, and sit idly by, and not 3997 respond when we have pushed against the Chinese influence in 3998 America, against Chinese mining practices that are 3999 environmentally unsound, against this push toward 4000 electrification where the grid can't support it, where 4001 generation isn't there. Made in America, Buy American.

4002 The American automotive sector needs to be strong because they also produce a lot of vital components for our 4003 United States military, and they did during World War II. 4004 And if we have a circumstance in the future, they will step 4005 up and build the tanks and the trucks and the airplanes and 4006 4007 the other things we need, just like Henry Ford did during World War II. But if they don't exist anymore because we 4008 have moved toward electric vehicles, there is not going to be 4009 an industry to help us defend this country. 4010

4011 A robust, strong American manufacturing sector is necessary. And another thing that is necessary in my 38 4012 4013 seconds is a robust and strong American energy sector, where we use the resources that we are given in this country. We 4014 are blessed with natural gas and oil, but we are also blessed 4015 with the technology and the brainpower to do the renewables, 4016 It is all inclusive. And Republicans on this side 4017 as well. 4018 of the aisle believe in renewables, and we believe in generation from all sources to meet the power demands that 4019 are necessary to fuel your electric vehicles, which we 4020 acknowledge are a part and will be a part of the fleet. But 4021 let the market do that. Let the consumer do that. And that 4022 4023 is what these bills do.

- 4024 And I yield back.
- 4025 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there

4026 further discussion?

4027 *Mr. Pallone. I think we are tired.

4028 *The Chair. The chair recognizes the lady from Arizona, 4029 Mrs. Lesko, for five minutes.

4030 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am adamantly in 4031 support of this bill, H.R. 4468.

The bill stops the Biden Administration from implementing its radical rule that will force two-thirds of all new passenger vehicles to be electric by 2032. That is insane. My constituents do not want to be forced by the government to purchase an electric vehicle. My constituents want freedom of choice. That is America. We don't live in a communist country yet, do we?

```
4039 *Voice. Not yet.
```

*Mrs. Lesko. My constituents will purchase an electric
vehicle if they want to, if it works for them, not because
President Biden tells them they have to.

I was just in a Natural Resources field hearing in Phoenix, and there we had testimony about critical minerals, and how electric vehicles need four times as much copper as a traditional car, how there is so much lithium that is needed for the electric vehicle batteries. And guess where this stuff is processed? China. China.

And you know what President Biden is doing when we need all these new critical minerals? He is shutting down U.S. mines. In Arizona we have Resolution Copper mine. It could produce 25 percent of all the copper demand in the United

4053 States. And what did he do? Two to three months into his 4054 presidency, he pulled back an environmental permit review, 4055 and now the mine is just sitting there when it could be 4056 helping the United States. He did the same thing in 4057 Minnesota.

In addition, when we are adding new electric vehicles onto the grid, and we are mandating and enforcing it by a certain time, the grid is not going to be able to keep up with the demand. And so I don't want Arizona to be like California, where they are mandating electric vehicles, and then the government texts them, said, "Oh, don't charge your electric vehicle today.'' That is insane.

4065 I support this bill because I support consumer choice. I am opposed to Biden forcing my constituents to buy an 4066 electric car against their will. I support this bill because 4067 I want reliable, affordable electricity. I want to keep the 4068 lights on. I don't want the government telling them that 4069 4070 they can't charge their electric vehicle after they forced them to buy it. I don't want the U.S. to be more reliant on 4071 China. I support Americans, not China. I support this bill 4072 and I yield back. 4073

4074 *The Chair. I am just waiting, just waiting for some people to get done. 4075 4076 The gentlelady yields back. The chair recognizes for five minutes Mr. Veasey. 4077 *Mr. Veasev. Thank you, Madam Chair. It has been 4078 interesting, listening to this discussion, and it is good 4079 that we are having this discussion. 4080 4081 Obviously, as the world continues to look for alternatives -- and not just the U.S. and -- the world. And 4082 I think that, when we have this discussion, that we shouldn't 4083 be looking so inward. And that was one of the things that 4084 4085 worries me. 4086 We have heard China mentioned a lot in this discussion -- and we should be mentioning China a lot in this discussion 4087 -- about, as electric vehicles sales surged worldwide last 4088 year, about a 55 percent increase, it was China that led the 4089 way. And I know that these vehicles are certainly more 4090 4091 popular in some parts of our country than they are in certain parts of other country [sic], and there are good reasons why 4092 people may -- an electric vehicle may not be right for them 4093 at this time. 4094

4095 But I think that, regardless of where one may fall on this discussion, that we really need to look for a way how we 4096 4097 can move this discussion away from the sort of black-andwhite issue and the black-and-white way that we discuss it, 4098 and really look at it as the very complex matter that it is, 4099 because I can tell you that England, France, the rest of 4100 Europe, India -- which is a huge, huge growing market -- we 4101 4102 do not want them looking 100 percent towards China for this product that is going to roll more and more, not just on 4103 American roads, but roads around the world. We want to make 4104 sure that the rest of the world can look towards the United 4105 States of America, as they have for so many other 4106 4107 technologies, whether it is defense or whether it is just for everyday common use, like a vehicle. 4108

And we really do need to figure out some sort of way how we can get the discussion to move into that territory, because if not they will supply the rest of the world and it doesn't matter. You can scare them with all the Chinese are going to put devices in your cars to be able to monitor you, and be able to gather biometrics, and things like that about you in these vehicles that they sell, and the Chinese -- and

4116 the Communist Chinese Party definitely would do things like 4117 that. But I can tell you that people in Europe aren't going 4118 to care. People in India aren't going to care. And the Big 4119 Three will no longer be the leaders when it comes to 4120 supplying cars for the world. It will be -- the Chinese will 4121 have whatever the version of the Big Three look like if we 4122 don't take this seriously.

And so we need to figure out, Madam Chair, how we can have -- start having some real serious discussions about this. And again, when it comes to this particular product, instead of being so inward, we really do need to look out. Thank you very much.

4128 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The chair -4129 for what purpose does Mr. Crenshaw seek recognition?
4130 *Mr. Crenshaw. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the
4131 last word.

4132 *The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes.

4133 *Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Thank you 4134 for holding this markup.

4135 So we look at these bills, we look at all these 4136 amendments, and we are all addressing the same question:

4137 Should we force a rapid transition away from traditional 4138 combustion engines and toward electric vehicles? That is the 4139 question.

Okay, so it seems that the mature and responsible way to answer that question would be to collect the relevant facts, and then apply a reasonable cost benefit analysis to the question. So let's actually do that.

The claim from my Democrat colleagues in the EPA is that a rapid transition to EVs will be nothing but rainbows and sunshine, with all the benefits and no downside whatsoever. I encourage my colleagues to write a fiction fantasy novel about that scenario, because that is exactly where it belongs.

4150 In reality, the data shows that they are pretty much wrong on every account. The facts demonstrate that there are 4151 massive costs and very little benefits. Vehicles will be 4152 less affordable and less capable. That is a fact. Our 4153 4154 reliance on China would increase, not decrease. That is a fact. And actually, here is the kicker. Global carbon 4155 emissions would increase, too, especially in the short term. 4156 Here is why. 4157

So the claim is that this radical rule from EPA is necessary to reduce the twin crises of global climate change and air pollution. Is that true? The fact is there is little evidence that the mass adoption of electric vehicles will result in significantly less global greenhouse gas emissions. In fact, the opposite is probably true, and here is why.

4165 Every single battery for an electric vehicle requires the mining and processing of roughly 500,000 pounds of 4166 materials. It requires significantly more energy-intensive 4167 metals like aluminum than traditional combustion engine 4168 vehicles do. And according to the manufacturers themselves, 4169 the manufacturing of these vehicles generate 70 percent more 4170 emissions than traditional internal combustion engine 4171 vehicles. That means they need to drive about 70,000 miles 4172 or more just to break even on the emissions side. 4173

So this means, at least in the short term -- and it is not that short, because 70,000 miles is a really long way to go, especially when you pretty much only use these things in urban environments -- that means that, just according to the math and the facts, mass adoption of EVs will increase global

4179 carbon emissions. Full stop. It is a fact. You can't argue 4180 with it. It is just the math.

It is also worth noting that internal combustion engines are continuing to increase in their fuel efficiency over time. And you don't have to take my word for that, just take the IEA's word for that because, according to the International Energy Agency, increases in automobile fuel efficiency will displace at least 300 percent more petroleum than the addition of 300 million EVs by 2040.

It was said earlier that EVs are a threat to oil and gas profits. Well, this fact disproves that. Facts matter. We aren't worried about the oil and gas industry here, we are worried about our constituents.

4192 If you want to be serious about addressing global emissions, you have got to focus on real solutions: 4193 streamline nuclear permitting; encourage more export of 4194 clean, U.S. LNG, which displaces foreign, dirty coal; take 4195 4196 steps to claw back global mineral mining and processing industries from China, bring it here, where we actually do 4197 care about the environment. You don't deepen our dependance 4198 on importing more critical minerals and products from them by 4199

4200 subsidizing the very products they specialize in.

Now, there was this bizarre argument made earlier that 4201 4202 this new restrictive rule will make it easier to compete with 4203 That has never been true for any regulation, it won't China. be true for this one. This claim that demand is wildly 4204 increasing for electric vehicles, not true. One percent of 4205 cars are EVs; four-and-a-half percent of new vehicle sales 4206 4207 are EVs. There is no demand boom. Let's just stop it. And if there was, then why did you need to propose all these 4208 rules to make people buy them? 4209

So the other argument that is used to justify this 4210 radical new rule is that we need to be protected from air 4211 pollution, there is an air pollution crisis. I will tell you 4212 what, there is really good news. We already have laws to 4213 address that. And here is some more good news. According to 4214 the EPA's own website and their own data, air pollution has 4215 decreased nearly 80 percent in the last 50 years. There is 4216 4217 no crisis in air quality in America. And even with the problems we have, it doesn't even come close to justifying 4218 these radical changes and the immense costs to our voters. 4219 And these costs are real. EVs have significantly less 4220

4221 range than a normal car. They are significantly more expensive, on average \$20,000. The price has actually only 4222 4223 gone up over the last 10 years, even with scaling them out. 4224 And I just don't understand why we want to rush to be dependent on China, who is -- actually has 85 percent of the 4225 processing capacity for the critical minerals needed for 4226 these vehicles. And don't even -- that doesn't even get to 4227 4228 the human rights abuses associated with how they mine and 4229 process those materials.

So this is about cost and benefits, folks. This isn't about emotions, or supporting one industry over another. This might surprise you, but we don't really care about that. We care about the livelihood of our constituents, and we care about proper decision-making and proper thinking when addressing a problem.

4236 And I yield back. Thank you.

4237 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there

4238 further discussion?

4239 *Mr. Pallone. Darren.

4240 *The Chair. I am sorry, who?

4241 *Mr. Pallone. Darren Soto.

4242 *The Chair. Oh, the chair recognizes Mr. Soto. For what purpose do you seek recognition? 4243 4244 *Mr. Soto. To strike the last word. *The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for five 4245 4246 minutes. *Mr. Soto. Thank you, Madam Chair. 4247 You know, we are seeing one of the hottest summers on 4248 4249 record. It has particularly been troubling in Florida, where the ocean is over 100 degrees down near the Florida Keys, and 4250 hurting the great Florida reef, among many other issues that 4251 we have worked on in a bipartisan way. 4252 It is important to recognize that, after the Inflation 4253

4253 It is important to recognize that, after the inflation 4254 Reduction Act passed, America is now in the position to lead 4255 the way for an electric vehicle revolution, and it is about 4256 time because of the effects of climate change.

4257 We also still are the top energy producer in the world. 4258 We produce so much energy here in the United States that we 4259 actually export it.

But I want to talk more about the long-term effects of what we are seeing. There is a tripling of new factory construction in the nation right now, as we speak. President

Biden has helped us triple the number of factories that are being built. We heard a little bit about it. There is a couple in my district. We heard Mr. Carter talk about the new factory in his district for electric vehicles. We are making clean energy products in my district. We are seeing both in blue and, yes, a lot of red districts new manufacturing happening at a triple rate.

4270 And just so we are clear, it is the Inflation Reduction 4271 Act, the CHIPS Act, the infrastructure law that did that. Some of those were bipartisan, and we appreciate that help, 4272 and it is making sure that private capital is coming in at an 4273 amazing rate. And so as we look at Bidenomics and what it is 4274 doing to power, record-low employment -- unemployment, 4275 inflation dropping to three percent, and this biggest surge 4276 in new construction, many jobs that don't require a college 4277 degree so that families can put food on the table, it is a 4278 really amazing story that we are seeing over these quarters. 4279 4280 And I hear a lot of debates here today, and I know this stuff gets us all emotional, but I do see some common ground 4281 that we can work on, particularly in the area of critical 4282 minerals, rare earth minerals. 4283

I got to travel to Japan with Representative Ruiz and heard more than one time about the lithium deposits in his district in the Salton Sea, among many other things that we worked on together. But that is just one example, and I am sure there is others in your districts, as well, of the rare earth minerals that are around the nation.

Obviously, it starts with a lot of dirt and raw materials, and we have to process it down. But I really think the committee should be focusing some of its effort on a bipartisan way to help really address the issues we both recognize in order for the Inflation Reduction Act to meet its full potential. We are going to have to work on these rare earth mineral issues.

So while I don't want us to see us pull back from an increasing number of electric cars, since I know it is important to our dominance in the auto industry, it is important for us to be able to be dominant in the 21st century economy and to help combat climate change, I do think there are some things we agree on that we could do together.

And with that I yield back.

4304 *Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

4305 *Mr. Soto. Yes.

*Ms. Barragan. I just wanted to take a moment to correct the record, because it is really hard to sit here and just to keep hearing the false information, and to just let it go totally -- so there is just one fact I am going to get on the record. I am not going to go through all of them, because there is a lot of things that were said that were inaccurate.

One of the things that is said was that EVs are not 4313 cleaner, it takes 70,000 miles, and there was no way that 4314 there was anything out there that said otherwise. So let me 4315 just make sure on the record -- the Argonne National 4316 4317 Laboratory analysis has shown that an EV is cleaner than gas after the first 13,000 miles of driving. It is even less on 4318 100 percent clean energy grid, as low as 8,000 miles. It is 4319 important to note that also -- and California's electric grid 4320 is cleaner than most, and that the state has 90 percent clean 4321 4322 energy target by 2035.

And just so we know where this is coming from, since it doesn't exist out there, it is a Reuters July 7, 2021 -- has an article about this.

4326 So I understand there could be differences of opinion. But again, let's have a debate honestly. Let's not come with 4327 4328 inaccurate information that we are telling people as though it is the truth. That is the most frustrating part of these 4329 hearings. Let's just talk about facts, okay? 4330 And I don't want to hear anybody lecturing me about 4331 freedom of choice. 4332 4333 And with that I yield back. *Mr. Johnson. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields back. 4334 Are there other members wishing to speak on the bill? 4335 I have got -- the chair recognizes Mr. Pfluger from 4336 4337 Texas. *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move to strike 4338 4339 the last word and speak in support of this. *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 4340 minutes. 4341 *Mr. Pfluger. It was earlier said that -- it was 4342 4343 accused from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that Republicans are deliberately misleading the American 4344 public. I think that is kind of rich, given the news events 4345 in the last 24 hours. 4346

4347 Republicans are standing in the gap of reality. Military doctrine has a couple of criteria for decision-4348 4349 making, and that criteria for a course of action looks at whether a plan is feasible, is it suitable, is it acceptable, 4350 does it complete, just to name a couple of the criteria. 4351 This rapid, unrealistic, mandated transition to electric 4352 vehicles is none of those. It doesn't check off a single one 4353 4354 of those.

What is the problem we are trying to solve? Why haven't 4355 the Administration officials come to this body that is 4356 responsible for oversight in Article I of the Constitution, 4357 and provided any justification according to those criteria or 4358 any other criteria that they would like to show us? 4359 Instead, when the EPA and other agencies come, they appear to be the 4360 ones misleading the American public because they don't have a 4361 plan. 4362

And what we just heard about facts, I would join my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to hear the facts. Unfortunately, the Administration is not bringing those facts to the table.

4367 I proudly support Representative Walberg's legislation

4368 to prohibit the EPA from continuing their weaponization, 4369 regulatory weaponization, and in this case from finalizing, 4370 implementing, or enforcing the proposal for light and medium-4371 duty vehicles.

During a recent hearing with Mr. Goffman from the EPA, 4372 when he testified, it was clear that the EPA had abused its 4373 authority while not seriously considering the impacts of the 4374 4375 rule. The ability for automakers and manufacturers to seriously consider the impacts of the rule and -- as well as 4376 not considering where the necessary energy generation will 4377 That is the biggest question that we have here. 4378 come from. So when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say 4379 that Republicans are deliberately misleading the American 4380 public, give me a break. We are the only ones asking the 4381 questions that every single normal American is going, "Where 4382

4383 is the electricity going to come from?' `

In fact, let me just state -- I know we are all sitting here tired of this debate and, you know, we want to move on, but you know what? This is important. My constituents sent me up here to stand in this very gap. And when they hear the Secretary of Energy say that she would like to electrify the

4389 military and the fleet vehicles in the military, they have some serious concerns about our national security. 4390 4391 Secretary Granholm doubled down on that. I would invite her to a flight line in Anchorage, Alaska. I would invite 4392 her to go to a deployed location like Al Dhafra in the Middle 4393 East to see a missile truck, to go out on that flight line 4394 and see the impacts of her statement saying that she wants to 4395 4396 electrify military vehicles, not to mention the fact that we are talking about 150,000 -- 150 million excuse me --4397 vehicles in this country that she is suggesting and other 4398 agencies are suggesting that we should mandate. No, we are 4399 going to continue to stand in the gap. 4400

Show us the facts. The Administration has failed to do 4401 that. We are almost eight months in to this Congress, and 4402 not a single official has come over here and showed us any 4403 math, science, or data to suggest that anything in their plan 4404 is feasible, suitable, acceptable, and -- much less complete. 4405 4406 Mr. Chairman, I proudly support this legislation. It is exceedingly important for all the reasons that our colleagues 4407 on this side of the aisle have said, and I urge us to vote 4408 with a reality-based mindset. While we can innovate, let's 4409

be realistic. 4410 I yield back. 4411 4412 *Mr. Crenshaw. Will the gentleman yield? *Mr. Pfluger. I would gladly yield. 4413 *Mr. Crenshaw. Over here, Crenshaw, Texas. The quy 4414 from Texas. 4415 *Mr. Pfluger. My colleague from Crenshaw -- from Texas. 4416 4417 *Mr. Crenshaw. I thank the gentleman, and I want to respond. 4418 I like debating actual studies. That is exactly what we 4419 should be doing, so I appreciate my colleague on the other 4420 side doing it. But the problem with that study that was 4421 mentioned is it does not take into account supply chains. 4422 That is the problem. It only looks at the vehicle itself. 4423 It looks at like-sized vehicles, and it looks at different 4424 scenarios based on what kind of power there is to the grid. 4425 It does not look at the supply chain. 4426 4427 I like the manufacturers' studies because the manufacturers want to sell those EVs, so their incentives are 4428 aligned there. They came up with more accurate studies based 4429 on the entire supply chain. 4430
And I yield back. 4431 *Mr. Pfluger. I yield back, Chairman. 4432 The gentleman yields back. Do others 4433 *Mr. Johnson. wish to speak on the bill? 4434 The chair now recognizes Mr. Hudson for five minutes. 4435 [Pause.] 4436 *Mr. Johnson. Okay. The chair recognizes that votes 4437 4438 have been called. We are going to recess and come back after 4439 votes. The subcommittee will -- or the committee will stand in 4440 4441 recess. 4442 [Recess.] *The Chair. [Presiding] The committee comes to order. 4443 We are considering H.R. 4468. We will continue 4444 discussion on the underlying bill. Who seeks recognition? 4445 Mr. Fulcher, for what purpose? 4446 *Mr. Fulcher. To speak on behalf of the bill, Madam 4447 4448 Chair. *The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes. 4449 *Mr. Fulcher. Thank you, Madam Chair. It is late, and 4450 we have been going through this for some time now. 4451

4452 But it is not okay for the Environmental Protection Agency to implement a rule -- that is a rule, and that is an 4453 4454 agency implementing a rule -- that essentially mandates certain types of technologies. Non-elected agency directly 4455 via rule having a major economic impact decision. I support 4456 H.R. 4468, the CARS Act, because it gets rid of that rule. 4457 Now we are painfully aware that this Administration is 4458 pushing electronic vehicles. It doesn't matter that -- if 4459 they are not practical. It doesn't matter if it makes us 4460 more dependent on our enemies. It doesn't matter if it is 4461 more expensive. It doesn't matter if there is drastically 4462 negative environmental impacts as a function of that. We are 4463 painfully aware where this Administration is trying to go. 4464 And as has been explained by my colleagues in very good 4465 terms, American people don't want it. From a functionality 4466 standpoint, it simply is not practical in many parts of the 4467 country for many purposes. It undercuts a very incredible, 4468 4469 necessary industry: the fossil fuel industry, combustion engines. And it is not okay for an agency, via rule, to 4470 mandate certain types of technology. 4471

4472 The right answer is the market. The right answer is

choice, functionality, allowing the American people to choose 4473 what they want. Any time that the government has to come in 4474 4475 and prop up an industry, which is exactly what is happening with this, and override market conditions, override people's 4476 desires, this is going to wind up going the wrong way. 4477 Madam Chair, I support H.R. 4468, the CARS Act, and I 4478 yield the balance of my time. Thank you, Madam Chair. 4479 4480 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there further discussion? 4481 Are there any amendments? 4482 *Mr. Pallone. Clarke has an amendment. 4483 *The Chair. The chair recognizes Ms. Clarke for the 4484 purposes of offering an amendment. 4485 4486 *Ms. Clarke. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk labeled SCD03. 4487 *The Chair. The clerk will report. 4488 *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4468, offered by Ms. 4489 4490 Clarke. Page 3, after line 12, insert the following. Section 4, Certification. This act and the amendments made 4491 by this act may not take effect until the date on which the 4492 administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency 4493 219

4494 certifies that the implementation of this act --*The Chair. Without objection, the first reading of the 4495 4496 bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for amendment at any point. 4497 I am sorry. Without objection, we are -- the reading of 4498 the amendment is dispensed with. 4499 [The amendment of Ms. Clarke follows:] 4500 4501 4502 4503

4504 *The Chair. And Ms. Clarke is recognized for five minutes in support of her amendment. 4505 4506 *Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Madam Chair. My amendment would simply delay implementation of this bill until the EPA 4507 administrator certifies that it will not harm public health. 4508 As a reminder to my colleagues, the EPA is required 4509 under the Clean Air Act to address air pollution that 4510 4511 endangers public health. Setting tailpipe emission standards is one of the clearest and most effective ways to reduce 4512 harmful pollutants in the transportation sector. Passenger 4513 vehicles alone produce more than 1 million tons of nitrogen 4514 oxide emissions and over 33,000 tons of particulate matter 4515 pollution every year. These pollutants are linked with tens 4516 of thousands of preventable deaths, millions of asthma 4517 attacks, and countless cases of heart disease, stroke, and 4518 There is great urgency in reducing these harmful 4519 diabetes. emissions. Reducing these emissions can be life and death in 4520 4521 communities disproportionately burdened by environmental pollution. 4522

This bill represents -- unfortunately, this bill represents a reckless attempt at kneecapping efforts to save

lives and move progress toward a healthy future. And many of my colleagues support the EPA's efforts to finalize strong vehicle emission standards. In fact, two weeks ago I sent a letter with Representative Matsui and 91 of our colleagues calling on the EPA to finalize the strongest feasible standard proposed under its light-duty vehicle emission standards.

4532 I am disappointed that the majority seems intent on attempting to roll back the clock on the progress our nation 4533 has made in reducing air pollution and the serious health 4534 effects associated with it. A letter sent to the chair and 4535 ranking member of this committee from environmental health 4536 4537 groups ahead of this markup said this bill would set a dangerous precedent by "injecting politics into rulemakings' ' 4538 instead of basing decisions on the "best available science 4539 and the need to protect public health.' ' 4540

4541 My amendment simply ensures that the EPA's 4542 congressionally mandated mission to protect Americans and our 4543 environment from harmful pollution is not undermined by this 4544 bill.

```
4545 So I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense
```

4546 amendment and, Madam Chair, I yield back. Oh, I am going to yield my time to the gentleman from 4547 4548 California. *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you for yielding. I just want to 4549 thank you for introducing this common-sense amendment. I am 4550 going to be voting for this amendment because I am for 4551 choice, and I am for policies based on science and people's 4552 4553 health, and I am also definitely for the freedom to breathe. 4554 Thank you. *Ms. Clarke. Madam Chair, I yield back. 4555 *The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there 4556 4557 further discussion? *Mr. Walberg. Madam Chair? 4558 4559 *The Chair. The chair recognizes Mr. Walberg for five minutes to --4560 *Mr. Walberg. Madam Chair, I would like to strike the 4561 last word to speak in opposition to the amendment. 4562 4563 *The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes. 4564 *Mr. Walberg. My Democrat colleagues want to claim that if you don't support their amendment you don't support the 4565 Clean Air Act, public health, or breathing fresh air. I 4566 223

4567 support clean air and public health for all communities. I 4568 don't support policies that, in the name of public health, 4569 undermine health, welfare, and people's ability to work and 4570 provide for their families.

This amendment, in the name of public health, would harm people by enabling the EPA to continue its dangerous actions. Let's not forget that Congress designed the Clean Air Act with a holistic, realistic view of the needs of American families. It enacted this seminal law, and I quote, "to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population.'

4578 The amendment not only ignores this realistic and appropriate approach to implementing emission standards, it 4579 also would expose Americans to a suite of adverse impacts 4580 that are created by the mandated use of electric vehicles. 4581 We have had ample testimony about this in committee. 4582 We know today that the new cars, SUVs, and pickup trucks are 99 4583 4584 percent cleaner than the 1970 models for common pollutants. However, in order to decrease emissions by remaining one 4585 percent, EPA is on a path to limit American's mobility at an 4586

224

excessive cost to working families. It would hinder access

4588 to the doctor and to the hospital, for example, both of which would undermine the very public health, both emotional and 4589 4590 physical, which I would hope Democrats would want to protect. I understand also that my Democrat colleagues had some 4591 critiques about the scope of this legislation at 4592 subcommittee. Let me be clear. We don't want to reach back 4593 to the start of the Clean Air Act and repeal catalytic 4594 4595 converters, on-board diagnostic systems. I don't want to 4596 remove those improvements from cars or create compliance uncertainty for auto manufacturers. We will continue to work 4597 on this issue to ensure that the legislation only applies to 4598 the type of rules that limit Americans' ability to choose 4599 what is right for them and their families. 4600 4601 And so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back. 4602 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there 4603 further discussion on the amendment? 4604 4605 *Mr. Pallone. We want a roll call. *The Chair. Seeing none, there has been a request for a 4606 roll call vote. The clerk will call the roll. 4607 *The Clerk. Burgess? 4608

4609	[No response.]
4610	*The Clerk. Latta?
4611	[No response.]
4612	*The Clerk. Guthrie?
4613	[No response.]
4614	*The Clerk. Griffith?
4615	[No response.]
4616	*The Clerk. Bilirakis?
4617	*Mr. Bilirakis. No.
4618	*The Clerk. Bilirakis?
4619	*Mr. Bilirakis. Votes no.
4620	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes no.
4621	Johnson?
4622	*Mr. Johnson. No.
4623	*The Clerk. Johnson votes no.
4624	Bucshon?
4625	*Mr. Bucshon. No.
4626	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes no.
4627	Hudson?
4628	[No response.]
4629	

4630	*The Clerk. Walberg?
4631	*Mr. Walberg. No.
4632	*The Clerk. Walberg votes no.
4633	Carter?
4634	[No response.]
4635	*The Clerk. Duncan?
4636	[No response.]
4637	*The Clerk. Palmer?
4638	*Mr. Palmer. No.
4639	*The Clerk. Palmer votes no.
4640	Dunn?
4641	*Mr. Dunn. No.
4642	*The Clerk. Dunn votes no.
4643	Curtis?
4644	*Mr. Curtis. No.
4645	*The Clerk. Curtis votes no.
4646	Lesko?
4647	*Mrs. Lesko. No.
4648	*The Clerk. Lesko votes no.
4649	Pence?
4650	*Mr. Pence. No.

4651	*The Clerk. Pence votes no.
4652	Crenshaw?
4653	*Mr. Crenshaw. No.
4654	*The Clerk. Crenshaw votes no.
4655	Joyce?
4656	*Mr. Joyce. No.
4657	*The Clerk. Joyce votes no.
4658	Armstrong?
4659	*Mr. Armstrong. No.
4660	*The Clerk. Armstrong votes no.
4661	Weber?
4662	[No response.]
4663	*The Clerk. Allen?
4664	*Mr. Allen. No.
4665	*The Clerk. Allen votes no.
4666	Balderson?
4667	*Mr. Balderson. No.
4668	*The Clerk. Balderson votes no.
4669	Fulcher?
4670	*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.
4671	*The Clerk. Fulcher votes no.

4672	Pfluger?
4673	*Mr. Pfluger. No.
4674	*The Clerk. Pfluger votes no.
4675	Harshbarger?
4676	*Mrs. Harshbarger. [Inaudible.]
4677	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes no.
4678	Miller-Meeks?
4679	[No response.]
4680	
4681	*The Clerk. Cammack?
4682	*Mrs. Cammack. No.
4683	*The Clerk. Cammack votes no.
4684	Obernolte?
4685	[No response.]
4686	*The Clerk. Pallone?
4687	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
4688	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
4689	Eshoo?
4690	*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
4691	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.
4692	DeGette?

4693	*Ms.	DeGette.	Aye.
4694	*The	Clerk.	DeGette votes aye.
4695	Schak	owsky?	
4696	*Ms.	Schakows	sky. Aye.
4697	*The	Clerk.	Schakowsky votes aye.
4698	Matsu	ii?	
4699	*Ms.	Matsui.	Aye.
4700	*The	Clerk.	Matsui votes aye.
4701	Casto	or?	
4702	[No r	esponse.	.]
4703	*The	Clerk.	Sarbanes?
4704	*Mr.	Sarbanes	s. Aye.
4705	*The	Clerk.	Sarbanes votes aye.
4706	Tonko	?	
4707	[No r	esponse.	.]
4708	*The	Clerk.	Clarke?
4709	*Ms.	Clarke.	Aye.
4710	*The	Clerk.	Clarke votes aye.
4711	Carde	enas?	
4712	*Mr.	Cardenas	s. Aye.
4713	*The	Clerk.	Cardenas votes aye.
			220

4714	Ruiz?
4715	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
4716	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.
4717	Peters?
4718	[No response.]
4719	*The Clerk. Dingell?
4720	*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
4721	*The Clerk. Dingell votes aye.
4722	Veasey?
4723	*Mr. Veasey. Aye.
4724	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
4725	Kuster?
4726	*Ms. Kuster. Aye.
4727	*The Clerk. Kuster votes aye.
4728	Kelly?
4729	[No response.]
4730	*The Clerk. Barragan?
4731	[No response.]
4732	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester?
4733	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
4734	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes aye.

4735	Soto?
4736	*Mr. Soto. Aye.
4737	*The Clerk. Soto votes aye.
4738	Craig?
4739	*Ms. Craig. Aye.
4740	*The Clerk. Craig votes aye.
4741	Schrier?
4742	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
4743	*The Clerk. Schrier votes aye.
4744	Trahan?
4745	*Mrs. Trahan. [Inaudible.]
4746	*The Clerk. Trahan votes aye.
4747	Fletcher?
4748	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
4749	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
4750	Chair Rodgers?
4751	*The Chair. No.
4752	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes no.
4753	*Ms. Castor. Madam Chair?
4754	*The Chair. Yes. Madam Clerk, how is Ms. Castor
4755	recorded?

4756	*The Cl	lerk.	Ms. Castor is not recorded.
4757	*Ms. Ca	astor.	Votes aye.
4758	*The Cł	nair.	How is Ms oh.
4759	*The Cl	lerk.	Castor votes aye.
4760	*The Cł	nair.	How is Ms. Kelly recorded?
4761	*The Cl	lerk.	Ms. Kelly is not recorded.
4762	*Ms. Ke	elly.	Kelly votes aye.
4763	*The Cl	lerk.	Kelly votes aye.
4764	*The Cł	nair.	How is Mr. Peters recorded?
4765	*The Cl	lerk.	Mr. Peters is not recorded.
4766	*Mr. Pe	eters.	Peters votes aye.
4767	*The Cl	lerk.	Peters votes aye.
4768	*The Ch	nair.	How is Ms. Barragan recorded?
4769	*The Cl	lerk.	Barragan is not recorded.
4770	*Ms. Ba	arragar	n. Barragan votes aye.
4771	*The Cl	lerk.	Barragan votes aye.
4772	*The Ch	nair.	How is Mr. Burgess recorded?
4773	*The Cl	lerk.	Mr. Burgess is not recorded.
4774	*Mr. Bu	irgess.	Votes no.
4775	*The Cl	lerk.	Burgess votes no.
4776	*The Cł	nair.	How is Mr. Latta recorded?

4777	*The Clerk.	Mr. Latta is not recorded.
4778	*Mr. Latta.	Latta votes no.
4779	*The Clerk.	Latta votes no.
4780	*The Chair.	How is Mr. Duncan recorded?
4781	*The Clerk.	Mr. Guthrie is not recorded.
4782	*Mr. Guthrie	. No.
4783	*Mr. Duncan.	[Inaudible.]
4784	*The Clerk.	Guthrie votes no.
4785	*The Chair.	That was Duncan.
4786	*Mr. Duncan.	That was Duncan.
4787	*The Clerk.	I mean Duncan.
4788	*Mr. Guthrie	. And Guthrie votes no, as well.
4789	*The Clerk.	Guthrie votes no.
4790	Duncan votes	no.
4791	*The Chair.	How is Mr. Weber recorded?
4792	*The Clerk.	Mr. Weber is not recorded.
4793	*Mr. Weber.	Weber votes no.
4794	*The Clerk.	Weber votes no.
4795	*The Chair.	How is Mr. Tonko recorded?
4796	*The Clerk.	Mr. Tonko is not recorded.
4797	*Mr. Tonko.	Tonko votes aye.

4798	*The Clerk.	Tonko votes aye.
4799	*The Chair.	Madam Clerk, would you call the members who
4800	are not recorded,	the names of the members that are
4801	*The Clerk.	Mr. Griffith?
4802	*Mr. Griffit]	n. No.
4803	*The Clerk.	Mr. Griffith votes no.
4804	Mr. Hudson?	
4805	[No response	.]
4806	*The Clerk.	Mrs. Miller-Meeks?
4807	[No response	.]
4808	*The Clerk.	Mr. Obernolte?
4809	[No response	.]
4810	[Pause.]	
4811	*The Chair.	The clerk will report.
4812	*The Clerk.	Chair Rodgers, on that vote we have 23 ayes
4813	and 25 noes.	
4814	*The Chair.	The amendment is not agreed to. Are there
4815	further amendments	s?
4816	The chair red	cognizes Mrs. Dingell for the purposes of
4817	offering an amend	ment.
4818	*Mrs. Dingel	l. Thank you, Chairman Rodgers. I have an
		235

4819 amendment at the desk labeled SCD01. *The Chair. Clerk, report the amendment. 4820 *The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4468, offered by Mrs. 4821 Dingell. Page 3, strike lines 3 through 5, and make such 4822 conforming changes as may be necessary. 4823 4824 [The amendment of Mrs. Dingell follows:] 4825 4826 4827

4828 *Mrs. Dingell. Madam Chair, I oppose H.R. 4468, the bill we are calling Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act of 4829 4830 2023, which I believe does nothing to improve consumer choice. With all due respect and great respect for my 4831 colleague from Michigan, H.R. -- as far as I can tell, as I 4832 read H.R. 4468 -- and have consulted with the autos and 4833 lawyers and others -- it would stifle innovation in our 4834 4835 domestic vehicle industry.

Everybody knows I keep saying I am a car girl, but I 4836 really pay attention to this industry. I pay a lot of --4837 spend a lot of time with them, and I want to protect the 4838 industry, my state, my workers, and this country. And I can 4839 confidently say that the American auto industry is constantly 4840 innovating to provide the best products for consumers. But 4841 innovation like that driven by my sponsors and my -- the 4842 sponsor of this bill and my home state does not happen 4843 overnight or in a vacuum. 4844

Vehicle emission standards play an important role in supporting this innovation. These standards serve as a catalyst for the OEM companies, and help drive this incredible progress and advancement to create new, better,

4849 more affordable products for our constituents and for car 4850 owners and enthusiasts across the world.

4851 H.R. 4468 would require that EPA vehicle emission standards do not "result in limited availability of new motor 4852 vehicles based on the type of motor vehicle engine in such 4853 new motor vehicles.' ' This language is broad, and ill-4854 defined that -- it could stop the incredible innovation 4855 4856 happening right now in the vehicle industry. This section just puzzles people. Why would we want to put limits on the 4857 types of cars vehicle manufacturers can produce? My 4858 amendment would simply strike this limited availability 4859 language. 4860

The Federal Government is an important partner of our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry. Forward-looking vehicle emission standards that improve year over year have pushed the industry to innovate and advance its technology for decades. We should not be jeopardizing future technological breakthroughs just because some of us don't like electric vehicles.

And let me also say the United States Government has not mandated that we cannot produce ICE vehicles, nor, if you

read the notice of proposed rulemaking, does it say you must produce electric vehicles. I say to my staff every day: hydrogen, hydrogen, hydrogen. There are many different technologies that we need to be looking at. And by the way, Thomas Edison and Henry Ford looked at a nickel iron battery in the early 1900s. There are many other biodiesel fuels, others that we can look at.

Look, my colleague isn't here. I am the person in this 4877 room that knows better than anybody that this is not rainbows 4878 and sunshine. It is tough. We got a lot of difficult 4879 choices to make. And rather than making all of these 4880 statements and being here and there, we got to work together 4881 to get to the right place that we are cleaning the air, and 4882 building vehicles that people can afford, and we are not 4883 endangering the workers, and the industry don't want to be 4884 caught in a political fight between the two sides. They want 4885 our support to keep this industry competitive in a global 4886 4887 marketplace.

4888 So I don't want to support -- I am sorry I have to 4889 oppose my Republican colleagues' approach here, but I believe 4890 this bill would stop innovation. It is just something I

4891 cannot support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment just dropping limited availability. 4892 4893 Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back. The gentlelady yields back. Is there *The Chair. 4894 further discussion? 4895 The gentleman, Mr. Walberg, is recognized for five 4896 minutes on the amendment. 4897 4898 *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Madam Chair. I oppose this amendment and urge other members to do so, as well. 4899 I appreciate my colleague from Michigan's positions on 4900 this, but the underlying bill is intended to prevent the EPA, 4901 through regulation, government, bureaucratic, hard-fisted 4902 regulation, from deciding which types of cars people should 4903 buy or not have available to them. 4904 I will never forget -- and saying this in the positive, 4905 good, strong memory of the scion, the lion of this committee, 4906 Chairman John Dingell, who I had the privilege of sitting in 4907 4908 a room with when he was talking with Sergio Marchionne, the late chairman of Chrysler Daimler, and they were talking 4909 about the newer -- the new CAFÉ standards that were coming 4910 out. I will never forget the discussion. It was a good 4911

4912 discussion.

And after the chairman had given the basics for the CAFÉ 4913 4914 standards, I will never forget Sergio Marchionne saying, "Mr. Chairman, thank you. As long as the standards are reasonable 4915 -- they may make us stretch a bit, but as long as they are 4916 reasonable and rational, we can make them. But then get out 4917 of the way. Don't tell us what engine, what motor, what 4918 4919 transmission to achieve this. Between our engineers, our 4920 designers, and our consumers we will come up with the best deal.' ' I have always remembered that. 4921

And I appreciate the fact that we all say we believe in innovation, a free market approach, competition. This amendment, in fact, would take away from that. My bill will expand that opportunity.

And with that I encourage opposition to this amendment, and I yield back.

4928 *The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there 4929 further discussion?

4930 The chair recognizes Ms. Schakowsky to strike the last 4931 word.

4932 *Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. Yes, I seek to like -- to

4933 strike the last word.

So despite its name, the name of this legislation, 4934 4935 Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, despite the name of this resolution, this bill would limit consumer choice. 4936 Ιt would it would lock in place the status quo for vehicle 4937 technology as they exist today, preventing pro-consumer, pro-4938 innovation, and the American people. American innovation has 4939 4940 actually reduced prices for consumers and benefits millions 4941 of Americans, and we must not block future savings for American drivers. 4942

I just want to say that Mrs. Dingell's amendment strikes the language that will have serious negative consequences for consumers across the country. And we need to be encouraging innovation, not stagnation. And I certainly urge my colleagues to vote no.

4948 And now I yield to Congresswoman DeGette.

4949 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much.

I rise in support of Congresswoman Dingell's amendment because it addresses a proposed policy that would perpetuate the status quo when it comes to pollution, while actually kneecapping innovation in the automotive industry.

4954 Historically, as the gentlelady from Michigan said, the Clean Air Act's vehicle emissions standards actually drive 4955 4956 innovation. And that is what EPA's proposed rule does without -- and this is key -- without mandating a specific 4957 type of technology. However, the wide-reaching, vague 4958 "limited availability' ' language in H.R. 4468 would lock us 4959 into today's technology across all engine types. It would 4960 4961 bring automotive innovation to a standstill because it is simply too broad. 4962

And in addition, given how this language is drafted, I fear that it would be impossible for the EPA to determine the impact of a regulation on availability across all engine types.

So here is the thing. All of us want cars that emit fewer harmful emissions and contribute less pollution. All of us want cleaner air and water. In my town of Denver we regularly have high ozone days that are in part driven by automobile traffic. And frankly, I don't think Congress should dictate that we should be frozen in time and have to live with this indefinitely.

4974 So, yes, we all want to see the continued innovation

```
4975
      that lowers pollution from the automotive industry.
                                                             And
      because of that I urge adoption of this amendment.
4976
4977
           I yield back to Ms. Schakowsky.
            *Ms. Schakowsky. And I certainly would encourage
4978
      everyone who wants to move forward to vote in favor of the
4979
      amendment that has been offered by Congresswoman Dingell.
4980
           And with that, I yield back.
4981
4982
            *The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there
      further discussion on the amendment?
4983
           Seeing none, all -- a vote occurs on the amendment, the
4984
      Dingell amendment. A roll call has been requested.
4985
                                                             The
      clerk will call the roll.
4986
4987
           *The Clerk. Burgess?
4988
           *Mr. Burgess. Burgess votes no.
           *The Clerk. Burgess votes no.
4989
           Latta?
4990
           [No response.]
4991
           *The Clerk. Guthrie?
4992
4993
           [No response.]
           *The Clerk. Griffith?
4994
           *Mr. Griffith. No.
4995
```

4996	*The Clerk. Griffith votes no.
4997	Bilirakis?
4998	*Mr. Bilirakis. No.
4999	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes no.
5000	Johnson?
5001	*Mr. Johnson. No.
5002	*The Clerk. Johnson votes no.
5003	Bucshon?
5004	*Mr. Bucshon. No.
5005	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes no.
5006	Hudson?
5007	[No response.]
5008	*The Clerk. Walberg?
5009	*Mr. Walberg. No.
5010	*The Clerk. Walberg votes no.
5011	Carter?
5012	[No response.]
5013	*The Clerk. Duncan?
5014	[No response.]
5015	*The Clerk. Palmer?
5016	*Mr. Palmer. No.

5017	*The Clerk. Palmer votes no.
5018	Dunn?
5019	*Mr. Dunn. No.
5020	*The Clerk. Dunn votes no.
5021	Curtis?
5022	*Mr. Curtis. No.
5023	*The Clerk. Curtis votes no.
5024	Lesko?
5025	*Mrs. Lesko. No.
5026	*The Clerk. Lesko votes no.
5027	Pence?
5028	*Mr. Pence. No.
5029	*The Clerk. Pence votes no.
5030	Crenshaw?
5031	*Mr. Crenshaw. No.
5032	*The Clerk. Crenshaw votes no.
5033	Joyce?
5034	*Mr. Joyce. No.
5035	*The Clerk. Joyce votes no.
5036	Armstrong?
5037	*Mr. Armstrong. No.

5038	*The Clerk.	Armstrong votes no.
5039	Weber?	
5040	*Mr. Weber.	No.
5041	*The Clerk.	Weber votes no.
5042	Allen?	
5043	*Mr. Allen.	No.
5044	*The Clerk.	Allen votes no.
5045	Balderson?	
5046	*Mr. Balderso	on. [Inaudible.]
5047	*The Clerk.	Balderson votes no.
5048	Fulcher?	
5049	*Mr. Fulcher.	. Fulcher, no.
5050	*The Clerk.	Fulcher votes no.
5051	Pfluger?	
5052	*Mr. Pfluger.	[Inaudible.]
5053	*The Clerk.	Pfluger votes no.
5054	Harshbarger?	
5055	*Mrs. Harshba	arger. [Inaudible.]
5056	*The Clerk.	Harshbarger votes no.
5057	Miller-Meeks?	?
5058	[No response.	.]

5059	*The Clerk. Cammack?
5060	*Mrs. Cammack. No.
5061	*The Clerk. Cammack votes no.
5062	Obernolte?
5063	*Mr. Obernolte. No.
5064	*The Clerk. Obernolte votes no.
5065	Pallone?
5066	*Mr. Pallone. Aye.
5067	*The Clerk. Pallone votes aye.
5068	Eshoo?
5069	*Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
5070	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes aye.
5071	DeGette?
5072	*Ms. DeGette. Aye.
5073	*The Clerk. DeGette votes aye.
5074	Schakowsky?
5075	*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.
5076	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes aye.
5077	Matsui?
5078	*Ms. Matsui. Aye.
5079	*The Clerk. Matsui votes aye.

5080	Castor?
5081	*Ms. Castor. Aye.
5082	*The Clerk. Castor votes aye.
5083	Sarbanes?
5084	*Mr. Sarbanes. Aye.
5085	*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes aye.
5086	Tonko?
5087	*Mr. Tonko. Aye.
5088	*The Clerk. Tonko votes aye.
5089	Clarke?
5090	*Ms. Clarke. Aye.
5091	*The Clerk. Clarke votes aye.
5092	Cardenas?
5093	*Mr. Tonko. How is Joyce doing?
5094	*Mr. Cardenas. [Inaudible.]
5095	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes aye.
5096	Ruiz?
5097	*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
5098	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes aye.
5099	Peters?
5100	*Mr. Peters. Aye.

5101	*The Clerk. Peters votes aye.
5102	Dingell?
5103	*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
5104	*The Clerk. Dingell votes aye.
5105	Veasey?
5106	*Mr. Veasey. Aye.
5107	*The Clerk. Veasey votes aye.
5108	Kuster?
5109	*Ms. Kuster. Aye.
5110	*The Clerk. Kuster votes aye.
5111	Kelly?
5112	*Ms. Kelly. Aye.
5113	*The Clerk. Kelly votes aye.
5114	Barragan?
5115	*Ms. Barragan. Aye.
5116	*The Clerk. Barragan votes aye.
5117	Blunt Rochester?
5118	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Aye.
5119	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes aye.
5120	Soto?
5121	*Mr. Soto. Aye.

5122	*The Clerk. Soto votes aye.
5123	Craig?
5124	*Ms. Craig. Aye.
5125	*The Clerk. Craig votes aye.
5126	Schrier?
5127	[No response.]
5128	*The Clerk. Trahan?
5129	*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.
5130	*The Clerk. Trahan votes aye.
5131	Fletcher?
5132	*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.
5133	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes aye.
5134	Chair Rodgers?
5135	*The Chair. No.
5136	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes no.
5137	*Mr. Carter. Carter?
5138	*The Clerk. Mr. Carter is not recorded.
5139	*Mr. Carter. Carter votes no.
5140	*The Chair. Would you just
5141	*The Clerk. Carter votes no.
5142	*The Chair. Madam Clerk, would you call the roll of

5143	those who didn't vote?
5144	*The Clerk. Latta?
5145	*Mr. Latta. No.
5146	*The Clerk. Latta votes no.
5147	Guthrie?
5148	*Mr. Guthrie. No.
5149	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes no.
5150	Hudson?
5151	[No response.]
5152	*The Clerk. Duncan?
5153	*Mr. Duncan. No.
5154	*The Clerk. Duncan votes no.
5155	Miller-Meeks?
5156	[No response.]
5157	*The Clerk. Schrier?
5158	*Ms. Schrier. Aye.
5159	*The Clerk. Schrier votes aye.
5160	[Pause.]
5161	*The Chair. The clerk will report.
5162	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers, on that vote we have 23 ayes
5163	and 27 noes.
5164	*The Chair. The nays have it. The amendment is not
------	--
5165	agreed to.
5166	Are there further amendments?
5167	Seeing none, the question now occurs on approving H.R.
5168	4468, and a roll call vote has been requested. The clerk
5169	will call the roll.
5170	*The Clerk. Burgess?
5171	*Mr. Burgess. Votes aye.
5172	*The Clerk. Burgess votes aye.
5173	Latta?
5174	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
5175	*The Clerk. Latta votes aye.
5176	Guthrie?
5177	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
5178	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes aye.
5179	Griffith?
5180	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
5181	*The Clerk. Griffith votes aye.
5182	Bilirakis?
5183	*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.
5184	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes aye.
	253

5185	Johnson?
5186	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
5187	*The Clerk. Johnson votes aye.
5188	Bucshon?
5189	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
5190	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes aye.
5191	Hudson?
5192	[No response.]
5193	*The Clerk. Walberg?
5194	*Mr. Walberg. Aye.
5195	*The Clerk. Walberg votes aye.
5196	Carter?
5197	*Mr. Carter. Aye.
5198	*The Clerk. Carter votes aye.
5199	Duncan?
5200	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
5201	*The Clerk. Duncan votes aye.
5202	Palmer?
5203	[No response.]
5204	*The Clerk. Dunn?
5205	*Mr. Dunn. Aye.

5206	*The Clerk.	Dunn votes aye.
5207	Curtis?	
5208	*Mr. Curtis.	Aye.
5209	*The Clerk.	Curtis votes aye.
5210	Lesko?	
5211	*Mrs. Lesko.	Aye.
5212	*The Clerk.	Lesko votes aye.
5213	Pence?	
5214	*Mr. Pence.	Aye.
5215	*The Clerk.	Pence votes aye.
5216	Crenshaw?	
5217	[No response	.]
5218	*The Clerk.	Joyce?
5219	*Mr. Joyce.	Aye.
5220	*The Clerk.	Joyce votes aye.
5221	Armstrong?	
5222	*Mr. Armstron	ng. Yes.
5223	*The Clerk.	Armstrong votes aye.
5224	Weber?	
5225	*Mr. Weber.	Aye.
5226	*The Clerk.	Weber votes aye.

5227	Allen?
5228	*Mr. Allen. Aye.
5229	*The Clerk. Allen votes aye.
5230	Balderson?
5231	*Mr. Balderson. Aye.
5232	*The Clerk. Balderson votes aye.
5233	Fulcher?
5234	*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is aye.
5235	*The Clerk. Fulcher votes aye.
5236	Pfluger?
5237	*Mr. Pfluger. Aye.
5238	*The Clerk. Pfluger votes aye.
5239	Harshbarger?
5240	*Mrs. Harshbarger. Aye.
5241	*The Clerk. Harshbarger votes aye.
5242	Miller-Meeks?
5243	[No response.]
5244	*The Clerk. Cammack?
5245	*Mrs. Cammack. Aye.
5246	*The Clerk. Cammack votes aye.
5247	Obernolte?

5248	*Mr. Obernolte. Aye.
5249	*The Clerk. Obernolte votes aye.
5250	Pallone?
5251	*Mr. Pallone. No.
5252	*The Clerk. Pallone votes no.
5253	Eshoo?
5254	*Ms. Eshoo. No.
5255	*The Clerk. Eshoo votes no.
5256	DeGette?
5257	*Ms. DeGette. No.
5258	*The Clerk. DeGette votes no.
5259	Schakowsky?
5260	*Ms. Schakowsky. No.
5261	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes no.
5262	Matsui?
5263	*Ms. Matsui. No.
5264	*The Clerk. Matsui votes no.
5265	Castor?
5266	*Ms. Castor. [Inaudible.]
5267	*The Clerk. Castor votes no.
5268	Sarbanes?

5269	*Mr.	Sarbanes	5.	No.
5270	*The	Clerk.	Sai	cbanes votes no.
5271	Tonko	>?		
5272	*Mr.	Tonko.	No	
5273	*The	Clerk.	Tor	nko votes no.
5274	Clar	ke?		
5275	*Ms.	Clarke.	Nc	Ο.
5276	*The	Clerk.	Cla	arke votes no.
5277	Carde	enas?		
5278	*Mr.	Cardenas	5.	No.
5279	*The	Clerk.	Cai	denas votes no.
5280	Ruiz	?		
5281	*Mr.	Ruiz. N	No.	
5282	*The	Clerk.	Ru	iz votes no.
5283	Peter	rs?		
5284	*Mr.	Peters.	[]	[naudible.]
5285	*The	Clerk.	Pet	ters votes no.
5286	Dinge	ell?		
5287	*Mrs.	. Dingel	l.	No.
5288	*The	Clerk.	Dir	ngell votes no.
5289	Vease	≥Y?		

5290	*Mr. Veasey. No.
5291	*The Clerk. Veasey votes no.
5292	Kuster?
5293	*Ms. Kuster. No.
5294	*The Clerk. Kuster votes no.
5295	Kelly?
5296	*Ms. Kelly. No.
5297	*The Clerk. Kelly votes no.
5298	Barragan?
5299	*Ms. Barragan. No.
5300	*The Clerk. Barragan votes no.
5301	Blunt Rochester?
5302	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. No.
5303	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes no.
5304	Soto?
5305	*Mr. Soto. Nay.
5306	*The Clerk. Soto votes no.
5307	Craig?
5308	*Ms. Craig. No.
5309	*The Clerk. Craig votes no.
5310	Schrier?

5311	*Ms. Schrier. No.
5312	*The Clerk. Schrier votes no.
5313	Trahan?
5314	*Mrs. Trahan. No.
5315	*The Clerk. Trahan votes no.
5316	Fletcher?
5317	*Mrs. Fletcher. No.
5318	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes no.
5319	Chair Rodgers?
5320	*The Chair. Aye.
5321	*The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes aye.
5322	*The Chair. Madam Clerk, how is Mr. Palmer recorded?
5323	*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.
5324	*Mr. Palmer. Yes.
5325	*The Clerk. Palmer votes aye.
5326	*The Chair. How is Mr. Crenshaw recorded?
5327	*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw is not recorded.
5328	*Mr. Crenshaw. Crenshaw votes aye.
5329	*The Clerk. Crenshaw votes aye.
5330	*Mr. Pallone. I think we have got everybody.
5331	*The Chair. Good job.

5332 [Pause.] *The Chair. The clerk will report. 5333 *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers, on that vote we have 27 ayes 5334 and 23 noes. 5335 *The Chair. The ayes have it, and the bill is adopted. 5336 The chair calls up H.R. 4469, and asks the clerk to 5337 5338 report. 5339 *The Clerk. H.R. 4469, a bill to clarify that eRINs are not authorized for purposes of satisfying the volume of 5340 renewable fuel that needs to be contained in transportation 5341 fuel for purposes of the renewable fuel program, and for 5342 5343 other purposes. 5344 *Mr. Johnson. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for 5345 amendment at any point. 5346 So ordered. 5347 [The bill follows:] 5348 5349 5350 5351

5352 *Mr. Johnson. Does anyone --

5353 *Mr. Pence. Mr. Chair, I would like to strike the last 5354 word to speak in favor of the bill.

5355 *Mr. Johnson. The chair recognizes Mr. Pence from 5356 Indiana.

5357 *Mr. Pence. I urge my colleagues to join me in 5358 supporting my legislation, the No Fuel Credits for Battery 5359 Act.

5360 This legislation is simple. It protects the integrity 5361 of liquid fuels by clarifying that eRINs are not authorized 5362 to satisfy renewable fuel volume obligations. Efforts by the 5363 EPA to stand up this program could devalue or possibly 5364 eradicate the existing RIN market, which could be or would be 5365 replaced by the new category of eRINs.

As we know, Congress never affirmatively gave authority to the EPA to allow the generation of eRINs for purposes of satisfying volume requirements under the RFS. All that was done was to direct the EPA to conduct a study and report to Congress on the feasibility of eRINs, which was never fully completed.

5372 This proposal extends far beyond the intent of the RFS,

and would come at the expense of liquid fuels. The RFS was designed to bring integrity to liquid fuels and biofuel refiners, and is critical to the farmers in southern Indiana and across the United States. Fifty percent of the corn product in Indiana goes to ethanol.

As the original statute clearly states, RIN generation 5378 was to be awarded to entities that "refine, blend, or import 5379 5380 liquid fuels.' The RFS was never intended for a convoluted 5381 and complicated process that awards RINs to auto manufacturers. This effort to subsidize the entire EV 5382 charging value chain, from renewable energy developers to 5383 charging stations, could be rife with fraud and double 5384 5385 counting, like in the original RIN years ago.

During our hearings with EPA this year, both the 5386 administrator and the deputy administrator acknowledged 5387 concerns that their proposal could add even more expenses to 5388 refiners, penalize liquid fuels, and make them less 5389 5390 competitive, which could be the purpose of eRINs. This eRIN proposal seems to be nothing more than an additional funding 5391 stream to recover investments due to underwhelming EV sales, 5392 as we have discussed earlier. 5393

5394 And while the EPA removed this provision from their RFS rule earlier this summer, I remain concerned that the 5395 5396 Administration will bypass legitimate concerns from stakeholders, and finalize an eRINs proposal without any more 5397 public comment. Our nation's existing energy production and 5398 distribution chain should not be haphazardly shut down before 5399 we have a clear understanding of the viability of the 5400 5401 electrification of our transportation industry. 5402 I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I yield back. 5403 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone -5404 - Mr. -- for what purpose does the gentleman from New York 5405 5406 seek recognition? *Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word. 5407 *Mr. Johnson. The gentleman is recognized for five 5408 minutes. 5409 Thank you, Mr. Chair. *Mr. Tonko. 5410 5411 In the previous two bills we heard Republican members suggest that EPA and California are picking winners and 5412 losers amongst vehicle engine technologies, that these 5413 regulators have an agenda to promote zero-emission vehicles, 5414

and that should not be allowed to happen at the expense of internal combustion engines. So I have a hard time understanding how to square that argument with this bill, because, let's be clear, this bill is seeking to limit the availability of certain types of fuels, specifically fuels produced from biogas captured by landfills, wastewater treatment plants, farms, and other waste digesters.

5422 Currently, the RFS rewards biogas that is turned into 5423 renewable natural gas to fuel a natural gas-powered vehicle. 5424 But it does not offer any support for biogas that would power 5425 an electric vehicle. Why shouldn't fuels be able to benefit 5426 on an even playing field, provided that they meet the RFS 5427 definition of an eligible feedstock, regardless of the type 5428 of vehicle that they power?

5429 Over the course of the legislative hearing and 5430 subcommittee markup, we have gone back and forth about the 5431 history of eRINs. We are not going to be able to reach 5432 agreement on whether eRINs were originally intended under the 5433 RFS, or whether Congress has done anything to suggest 5434 otherwise since 2010. But what we should be able to agree 5435 upon is that the RFS was intended to support rural

5436	communities, reduce dependance on foreign oil, and lower
5437	emissions. There is no doubt that eRINs will help accomplish
5438	that goal.
5439	So in an effort to avoid blocking certain otherwise
5440	eligible fuels from benefiting from the program simply
5441	because the type of engine technology they are used to power,
5442	I encourage members to oppose this bill.
5443	With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.
5444	*Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone
5445	else seek recognition?
5446	For what purpose does the gentlelady from Iowa seek
5447	recognition?
5448	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. I move to strike the last word in
5449	support of this bill.
5450	*Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady is recognized for five
5451	minutes.
5452	*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am a proud
5453	cosponsor of H.R. 4469, the No Fuels Credit for Batteries
5454	Act.
5455	As Iowa has some of the highest production of biofuels,
5456	ethanol, biodiesel, compressed natural gas, and 50 percent of
	266

5457 our energy in the state is from renewables, I strongly 5458 support this legislation. The No Fuels Credit for Batteries 5459 Act retains current incentives for cleaner biofuels and 5460 eliminates participation in the Renewable Fuel Standard 5461 program by electric vehicle manufacturers.

The Biden Administration continues to thrust its support 5462 behind a complete shift to electric vehicles, employing every 5463 5464 available policy lever without consideration for consumer choice or feasibility for rural Americans. And I represent a 5465 rural district. This is all while forcing our country's 5466 baseload energy sources offline. This idea that has been put 5467 forth by the Biden Administration of allowing electric 5468 5469 vehicle manufacturers to participate in generating renewable fuel standard credits is unprecedented, and another example 5470 of bureaucratic overreach, if implemented. 5471

The RFS was not meant for electricity generated from an electric vehicle, even if that electric vehicle is charged using biogas that creates electricity. In fact, current law clearly states that the four renewable fuel categories under the RFS are biomass-based diesel, cellulosic biofuel, advanced biofuel, total renewable fuel.

5478 Absent this bill, EPA and others would be illegally acting as a legislator by allowing electric vehicles to 5479 5480 supplant a marketplace that is large, and is growing, and is needed, especially as we look at future markets with 5481 sustainable aviation fuel and marine fuel. 5482 This bill is vital, and I strongly support its passage 5483 through this committee, and I urge my colleagues to vote in 5484 5485 support. Thank you, and I yield back. 5486 *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady yields back. Does anyone 5487 else wish to speak? 5488 For what purpose does the gentlelady seek --5489 *Ms. Schakowsky. I move to strike the last word. 5490 *Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady is recognized for five 5491 minutes. 5492 *Ms. Schakowsky. So according to Brookings, United 5493 States fossil fuels are subsidized to the tune of \$20 billion 5494 5495 every year. And subsidies for fossil fuels really go back about 100 years. And so it seems to me that it is the height 5496 of hypocrisy for the -- for over billions of dollars to be 5497 spent on fossil fuels, and to say that we won't -- don't want 5498

5499 to fund renewables.

5500	And really, the Republicans are always saying to us that
5501	what they really want is all of the above. But when it comes
5502	to reality, no, not all of the above that they want to
5503	take this moment to make it impossible for us to really
5504	expand opportunities not only to address the climate, but to
5505	make sure that all of the technologies that are there, that
5506	are the innovation that is going on be able to go forth.
5507	And so I think this is an obstructionist proposal, and I
5508	would urge my colleagues to vote no.
5509	And with that, I yield back.
5510	*Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady yields back. Do any
5511	others wish to speak on the bill?
5512	Any bipartisan amendments?
5513	Any amendments?
5514	Seeing none, the question is on passing the bill. The
5515	clerk will report.
5516	*The Clerk. Burgess?
5517	*Mr. Burgess. Burgess votes aye.
5518	*The Clerk. Burgess votes aye.
5519	Latta?

5520	*Mr. Latta. Aye.
5521	*The Clerk. Latta votes aye.
5522	Guthrie?
5523	*Mr. Guthrie. Aye.
5524	*The Clerk. Guthrie votes aye.
5525	Griffith?
5526	*Mr. Griffith. Aye.
5527	*The Clerk. Griffith votes aye.
5528	Bilirakis?
5529	*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.
5530	*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes aye.
5531	Johnson?
5532	*Mr. Johnson. Aye.
5533	*The Clerk. Johnson votes aye.
5534	Bucshon?
5535	*Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
5536	*The Clerk. Bucshon votes aye.
5537	Hudson?
5538	[No response.]
5539	*The Clerk. Walberg?
5540	[No response.]

5541	*The Clerk. Carter?
5542	*Mr. Carter. Aye.
5543	*The Clerk. Carter votes aye.
5544	Duncan?
5545	*Mr. Duncan. Aye.
5546	*The Clerk. Duncan votes aye.
5547	Palmer?
5548	[No response.]
5549	*The Clerk. Dunn?
5550	*Mr. Dunn. Aye.
5551	*The Clerk. Dunn votes aye.
5552	Curtis?
5553	*Mr. Curtis. Aye.
5554	*The Clerk. Curtis votes aye.
5555	Lesko?
5556	*Mrs. Lesko. Aye.
5557	*The Clerk. Lesko votes aye.
5558	Pence?
5559	*Mr. Pence. Aye.
5560	*The Clerk. Pence votes aye.
5561	Crenshaw?

5562	*Mr. Crensha	w. Aye.
5563	*The Clerk.	Crenshaw votes aye.
5564	Joyce?	
5565	*Mr. Joyce.	Aye.
5566	*The Clerk.	Joyce votes aye.
5567	Armstrong?	
5568	*Mr. Armstro	ng. Yes.
5569	*The Clerk.	Armstrong votes aye.
5570	Weber?	
5571	[No response	.]
5572	*The Clerk.	Weber?
5573	*Mr. Weber.	Aye.
5574	*The Clerk.	Weber votes aye.
5575	Allen?	
5576	*Mr. Allen.	[Inaudible.]
5577	*The Clerk.	Allen votes aye.
5578	Balderson?	
5579	*Mr. Balders	on. Aye.
5580	*The Clerk.	Balderson votes aye.
5581	Fulcher?	
5582	*Mr. Fulcher	. Fulcher, aye.
		272

5583	*The Clerk.	Fulcher votes aye.
5584	Pfluger?	
5585	*Mr. Pfluger.	Aye.
5586	*The Clerk.	Pfluger votes aye.
5587	Harshbarger?	
5588	*Mrs. Harshba	arger. Aye.
5589	*The Clerk.	Harshbarger votes aye.
5590	Miller-Meeks?	2
5591	[No response.	.]
5592	*The Clerk.	Cammack?
5593	*Mrs. Cammack	k. Aye.
5594	*The Clerk.	Cammack votes aye.
5595	Obernolte?	
5596	*Mr. Obernolt	ce. Aye.
5597	*The Clerk.	Obernolte votes aye.
5598	Pallone?	
5599	*Mr. Pallone.	. Votes no.
5600	*The Clerk.	Pallone votes no.
5601	Eshoo?	
5602	*Ms. Eshoo.	No.
5603	*The Clerk.	Eshoo votes no.

5604	DeGette?	
5605	*Ms. DeGette. No.	
5606	*The Clerk. DeGette votes no.	
5607	Schakowsky?	
5608	*Ms. Schakowsky. No.	
5609	*The Clerk. Schakowsky votes no.	
5610	Matsui?	
5611	*Ms. Matsui. No.	
5612	*The Clerk. Matsui votes no.	
5613	Castor?	
5614	*Ms. Castor. No.	
5615	*The Clerk. Castor votes no.	
5616	Sarbanes?	
5617	*Mr. Sarbanes. No.	
5618	*The Clerk. Sarbanes votes no.	
5619	Tonko?	
5620	*Mr. Tonko. No.	
5621	*The Clerk. Tonko votes no.	
5622	Clarke?	
5623	*Ms. Clarke. No.	
5624	*The Clerk. Clarke votes no.	

5625	Cardenas?
5626	*Mr. Cardenas. No.
5627	*The Clerk. Cardenas votes no.
5628	Ruiz?
5629	*Mr. Ruiz. No.
5630	*The Clerk. Ruiz votes no.
5631	Peters?
5632	*Mr. Peters. No.
5633	*The Clerk. Peters votes no.
5634	Dingell?
5635	*Mrs. Dingell. No.
5636	*The Clerk. Dingell votes no.
5637	Veasey?
5638	[No response.]
5639	*The Clerk. Kuster?
5640	*Ms. Kuster. No.
5641	*The Clerk. Kuster votes no.
5642	Kelly?
5643	*Ms. Kelly. No.
5644	*The Clerk. Kelly votes no.
5645	Barragan?

5646	*Ms. Barragan. No.
5647	*The Clerk. Barragan votes no.
5648	Blunt Rochester?
5649	*Ms. Blunt Rochester. No.
5650	*The Clerk. Blunt Rochester votes no.
5651	Soto?
5652	*Mr. Soto. No.
5653	*The Clerk. Soto votes no.
5654	Craig?
5655	*Ms. Craig. No.
5656	*The Clerk. Craig votes no.
5657	Schrier?
5658	*Ms. Schrier. No.
5659	*The Clerk. Schrier votes no.
5660	Trahan?
5661	*Mrs. Trahan. No.
5662	*The Clerk. Trahan votes no.
5663	Fletcher?
5664	*Mrs. Fletcher. No.
5665	*The Clerk. Fletcher votes no.
5666	Chair Rodgers?

5667 *The Chair. [Presiding] Aye. *The Clerk. Chair Rodgers votes aye. 5668 5669 *Mr. Johnson. How is Mr. Palmer? *The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded. 5670 *Mr. Palmer. [Inaudible.] 5671 *The Clerk. Can Mr. Palmer repeat his vote? 5672 *Mr. Palmer. Yes. 5673 *The Clerk. Palmer votes aye. 5674 The clerk will report. 5675 *Mr. Johnson. *The Clerk. Chair Johnson, on that vote we have 26 ayes 5676 and 22 noes. 5677 *Mr. Johnson. The ayes have it, and the bill is 5678 5679 adopted. Without objection, staff is authorized to make technical 5680 and conforming changes to the legislation approved by the 5681 committee today. 5682 So ordered. 5683 5684 Without objection, the committee stands adjourned. [Whereupon, at 3:12 p.m., the committee was adjourned.] 5685