



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 2023

No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 23, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JERRY L. CARL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BANKING AND FINANCIAL SECTOR CHALLENGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight major challenges plaguing our banking and financial sector to the detriment of everyday Americans. Specifically, I refer to banking deregulation, lax oversight, and major consolidation.

Albert Einstein said that insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.

Well, the most recent financial market tremors follow the collapse of Silicon Valley Bank in California and Signature Bank in New York. These events remind us that our economy is still digging out of the 2008 massive market collapse.

The key question is: Do U.S. banking laws still allow too much speculative financial activity and excessive risk-taking?

Just three trillion-dollar megabanks now control one-third of U.S. banking assets. This chart tells the story. That is too much power by too few.

The financial crash of 2008 was a harsh reminder that, throughout U.S. history, speculators have squeezed through every regulatory keyhole to bring their much higher-risk, reckless, speculative ventures inside the confines of what should be prudent banking.

Regulators must provide firm separation between speculation and prudent banking. Regulators must provide firm separation. Do they hear me?

SVB was investing in speculative Chinese tech startups. How about that? Signature was intertwined with Swiss Bank's operations and cryptocurrency. Well, both banks collapsed.

History has taught us that speculation, derivatives, and venture capital are not normal banking activities. They are much higher risk, and their complexity and uncertainty can threaten the assets of other depositors like me and my constituents who choose not to highly leverage their assets. We should protect American depositors from rampant speculation.

The Biden administration is working to stem the bleeding. Management of both failed banks was shown the door, and the Federal Reserve, for the moment, put in place programs for banks or credit unions to meet their depositors' withdrawal requests.

After these collapses of SVB and Signature, both high-risk mega coastal

banks, I might add, where all of our major financial problems have started over my term of service, which is long, we are all enduring a truly troubling trend of massive bank consolidation that has been happening since the 1980s.

The pandemic pushed even more consolidation into overdrive. Another 9 percent of all branch locations in the U.S. closed between 2017 and 2021, a loss of 7,500 more brick-and-mortar locations in places where the American people live and work.

The empty buildings pockmark every community across our country. The branch closure rate doubled again during the pandemic, and more than 4,000 more branches have closed since March 2020.

People, pay attention. The money is walking away from your community to the very institutions that are causing the problem.

The rate doubled for bank closures from 99 per month during the 10 years prior to the pandemic to now 201 closings per month. The big fish are eating the smaller fish.

Those of us who have fought against the megabank culture that squashes prudent banking need look no further than the severe diminishment of market share held by local and regional banks over the last 40 years.

Step one is to reinstate Glass-Steagall's separation of prudent banking and speculation. The second is to develop a decoupled financial system that strengthens regional banks to manage an increasing share of local housing finance and commercial loans.

Soon, I will reintroduce in this Congress the Return to Prudent Banking Act, and I invite all of my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to join me. This bill would put America back on a path to fixing reckless speculation inside our banking and financial sector. As a result, no single company could be both an investment and a commercial bank.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1331

This structure worked for decades. It proved to be a sound way of creating local economic growth and limiting the systemic risks posed by hiding reckless speculation and venture capital inside our financial institutions.

They have a right to exist but put them elsewhere in the system. Depositors' safety, not speculation, must be our objective.

We must strengthen regional and community banks. In the wake of SVB and Signature Bank, the time is now. Congress must implement real reforms to protect depositors and the American economy.

Congress must demonstrate we stand with the American people and their communities, not just for the coastal scions of massive wealth who use the safety of our deposits for their reckless, speculative gambles. Prudent banking should be rewarded, not reckless behavior.

SUPPORTING THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as Congress works to reauthorize the farm bill, I rise today to deliver the 17th installment of my farm bill impact series, where I am highlighting various aspects of the legislation that deserve Congress' awareness and support.

The farm bill won't ever be effective, though, if the stepped-up basis is eliminated and if producers get saddled with unjust capital gains taxes.

Sadly, that is exactly what President Biden's budget proposal does. It works to eliminate the stepped-up basis and impose capital gains taxes on assets that have been held in family trust or ownership for over 90 years. This is the farm killer tax.

Here is why the stepped-up basis is so important. Let's say you are a young person working on your family farm, and you are slowly taking on responsibility and risk. You work for your parents until the time comes for you to take over the land, equipment, and livestock. When that happens, the Federal Government should not jump in and impose taxes on the unrealized gains of these inherited assets.

This principle is called the stepped-up basis and has a long precedent in the tax code with tons of bipartisan support.

The President's budget, however, works to eliminate this, which would destroy family farms overnight. The day-to-day trials of operating a successful farm, ranch, or small business are challenging enough without worrying about paying devastating capital gains taxes, and now the Biden administration wants to impose new taxes on these people.

Unbelievably, it gets even worse when dismantling the stepped-up basis. President Biden's budget proposal also includes the farm killer tax. In President Biden's budget proposal, there is a

plan to impose capital gains taxes on farms that have been in the family for over 90 years.

Think about that. In 1940, the average cost of Kansas farmland was \$50 an acre. Now, irrigated land is as much as \$4,000 per acre.

Imagine the capital gains tax implications on that history of ownership. This proposal would propose hundreds of thousands of dollars in new capital gains taxes on agriculture producers, destroying their livelihoods.

Mr. Speaker, 98 percent of all American farms and 90 percent of all American small businesses are family owned and operated. A budget proposal that eliminates the stepped-up basis and imposes the farm killer tax is not a game changer for American family businesses. It is a game ender.

Agriculture is a multigenerational calling. This is National Ag Week when we celebrate the tireless efforts of farmers, ranchers, and producers who have earned our support. President Biden's budget proposal is the opposite of support. It is a gut punch to the people who feed, fuel, and clothe us all.

This week, I introduced a bipartisan resolution with more than 60 of my colleagues who support the preservation of the stepped-up basis, oppose any efforts to impose new taxes on family farms and small businesses, and recognize the importance of generational transfers of farm and small business operations. I encourage all of my colleagues in this body to support it.

If we want to invest in the future of our country, we need to invest in the future leaders of American agriculture. Congress must preserve the stepped-up basis and oppose the farm killer tax.

I will be back on the floor soon to deliver another installment of my farm bill impact series and highlight more programs and titles within the bill that I believe Congress must understand and support to ensure that agriculture thrives in America. The people who feed, fuel, and clothe us all deserve our unwavering support.

BUILDING ON LIFE-CHANGING SUCCESS OF ACA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act, he told those gathered at the White House: "I am signing this reform bill into law on behalf of my mother, who argued with insurance companies even as she battled cancer in her final days."

In the 13 years since, the ACA has transformed healthcare in America, safeguarding the dignity of the sick, the security of families, and the health of us all.

Perhaps nobody has benefited more from the ACA than women. Before the ACA, being a woman was a preexisting condition. Insurance companies were

free to deny coverage for no reason other than being pregnant. Today, that kind of discrimination is a relic of the past. Today, women no longer have to pay more than men for insurance.

Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, 90 percent of market plans offered no maternity benefits. Today, they are offered by every single market plan in this country.

Thanks to the ACA, every insurance plan empowers women to take control of their health: birth control, annual well-women exams, breast and cervical cancer screenings, breastfeeding support, maternal depression, and much more.

What did Republicans have to say about this victory? One called it "the most dangerous piece of legislation ever passed in Congress." Another called it "downright evil."

They voted more than 50 times to repeal the ACA. They did everything in their power to put politics over the health of the American people. Thankfully, they failed every single time.

For 13 years, Democrats have proudly defended the ACA. Under President Biden, we haven't just held our ground. We have expanded access to quality, affordable health coverage.

With our American Rescue Plan and with our Inflation Reduction Act, we built on the life-changing, lifesaving success of the ACA. Now, a record 16.3 million Americans are using the ACA marketplace to gain the security and peace of mind that comes with quality health insurance.

As we celebrate all that has been achieved, I am grateful to those who made it possible. I am thankful for the leadership of President Obama and President Biden. I am thankful for the strength and unity of the House Democratic Caucus. I am thankful for the millions of Americans who have made their voices heard—voting, writing, calling, and marching to defend the Affordable Care Act.

Our job is to lift up those voices, to put people over politics. I invite our Republican colleagues to reflect on the progress of the last 13 years and to work with us to defend that progress and strengthen and secure it for the next generation.

SUPPORTING HIGHEST QUALITY EDUCATION EVERYWHERE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, MAGA Republicans continue to use political stunts to try to distract the American people with unnecessary legislation.

This week, House Republicans are advancing the Politics Over Parents Act. This legislation is part of a harmful and nationwide extreme MAGA Republican crusade toward censorship and book bans.

It would deprive our students of an accurate and fact-based education. Extreme Republicans are bringing culture wars into our classrooms.

I want to be clear, Mr. Speaker. I support a parent's right to be involved in their child's education. That is why, together with President Biden, Democrats are delivering the support and resources our schools need. House Democrats are working together to provide our American children with the highest quality level of education everywhere in America. That is what parents want for their children.

Parents want their children to feel safe in their schools. Moms worry every day, everywhere, about whether or not they are going to get that text or that call about a shooter at their child's school.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I spoke at a seniors' event, and afterwards visited with the seniors for Q&A. This question came up from a grandmom. She is worried about her grandbaby. When will we do something about guns? Will her grandbaby be safe?

Sadly, today, the leading cause of death in children is firearms, but House Republicans have not held a single hearing on gun safety. Instead, they have found the time to ban and censor books in school libraries.

House Republicans continue to waste time on political stunts.

House Democrats, on the other hand, are focused on improving public education and making our schools safer.

Americans want Congress to work together to solve real problems. House Republicans need to stop wasting time on circus-style hearings and divisive legislation that, frankly, will go nowhere.

The real problem in our schools isn't books or critical race theory; it is keeping guns out of schools, addressing teacher shortages, and keeping students and staff safe.

House Democrats will always continue to put children over guns, books over bullets because every child deserves to go to school without fear of losing their life.

□ 1015

CORPORATE GREED IS A VIRUS THAT INFECTS EVERY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, our residents are saying: Enough. Enough with giving billionaires and corporations taxpayer dollars that should be going to improve the quality of life of our residents, especially in a city that is still struggling with water shutoffs and foreclosures.

In the city of Detroit, billionaire developers are now lining up for \$800 million in tax giveaways after decades of broken promises. They even have the nerve to say the money isn't enough or coming fast enough.

Billionaires are asking a recently bankrupt city, the city of Detroit, for 800 million in public dollars, from a city still grappling with poverty, with the lack of affordable housing, and so much more. I just cannot believe how easily we give this money away to people with a track record of failure.

In Detroit, the Ilitch Holdings took \$400 million for what they called "District Detroit" just a few years ago. They showed us these beautiful images and renderings, and said this is what they were going to do with the public dollars.

Do you know what we got? We got parking lots, just parking lots. We got just asphalt—even though they got much of the property on top of the tax dollars—for just \$1.

Many of these parking lots sit empty while we struggle for affordable housing and so many other things. Again, because of these broken promises, we are stuck grappling with poverty.

They took the money from the people. They didn't deliver on those promises, and we are just going to go ahead and give them double the amount with little assurance that they actually would do their jobs this time? I ask my colleagues: really? Really?

For those that are in Michigan, we are going to go ahead and trust a company that continues to tell us they are going to do this and give us this?

Corporate greed is a virus that infects every level of government. Campaign contributions from those corporations are killing our democracy. Our residents deserve better. Our neighbors pay taxes so our government can provide much-needed resources and services to our communities, not billionaires seeking profits, no matter that they are now functioning, literally, a few blocks from a school, a public school which doesn't have clean drinking water.

We say: Enough. We need community benefits protections to ensure that we all are able to thrive.

CELEBRATING RAMADAN

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say Ramadan Mubarak to our Muslim neighbors around the world and wish all who celebrate and observe a peaceful Ramadan full of family, faith, and community.

As a Muslim myself, I know how critically important it is that we celebrate, again, our neighbors and help those that are most vulnerable among us during the month of Ramadan.

Ramadan is observed by more than a billion Muslims around the world. It involves deep prayer, reflection, robust charity and giving, as well as fasting from sunrise until sunset, and, yes, that includes water.

Ramadan is observed during the ninth month of the lunar calendar and is also meant to bring consciousness in the heart and mind to be closer to Allah.

I invite my colleagues and those watching to learn more about Ramadan, its meaning, and to even break

fast with us. Join our iftars that are near you in your communities. We welcome you.

Again, Ramadan Mubarak to all of our Muslim neighbors across the country and the world.

KEEP MEDICAL DEBT OFF CREDIT REPORTS

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, nearly one in five adults have medical debt collections listed on their credit report. That means one in five Americans may be denied housing, be forced to pay more in rent, struggle to purchase a vehicle, or other necessities because of a sudden health crisis or visit to an emergency room.

That hits particularly hard in communities like mine where residents already face challenges with access to credit.

This week, I am reintroducing the Consumer Protection for Medical Debt Collections Act to prohibit the collection of medical debt for 2 years and prohibit debt from medically necessary procedures from even being included in a credit report.

We passed this legislation in the House last year, and it will be a major step in fixing our broken credit system.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would also provide protections and safeguards for people who, through no fault of their own, got sick and could not afford the medical care due to our broken healthcare system.

In the wealthiest country in the history of our world, medical emergencies should not send a family into financial ruin. Collectively, Americans owe more than \$195 billion in medical debt, and this is immoral. We need to stop punishing people for being poor and getting sick.

Medical debt is the leading cause of personal bankruptcy in our country, and the pandemic has only made the crisis worse. No one, again, chooses to get sick. This is commonsense legislation, and we must get it signed into law.

CELEBRATING JILL DESTEFANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a true conservation leader who has dedicated years of her life to ensuring the Tule Springs Fossil Beds in Las Vegas would be declared a permanent national monument.

Jill DeStefano was one of the five founders of the Protectors of Tule Springs, and she worked tirelessly until the beds were officially designated the 405th unit of the National Park Service by President Barack Obama in 2014.

She has served as the board president of the Protectors of Tule Springs as they protect, preserve, support, and promote responsible stewardship of the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument and the Ice Age Fossils State Park.

Jill's passionate advocacy for Tule Springs has ensured they will always be safe and that our children and grandchildren can enjoy them for years to come.

These protected lands tell a story and teach the next generation about our American values for conservation and preservation of our most precious remnants of our national history.

I thank Jill for all of her hard work to protect Southern Nevada's beautiful outdoors. The people of Nevada's Third District are eternally grateful for Jill and all that she has done. I am wishing Jill the best of luck in her next chapter.

AZERBAIJAN'S BLOCKADE

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud Representative of a large Armenian-American community in southern Nevada as we mark 100 days since Azerbaijan began a devastating, heartless blockade of Artsakh, cutting off 120,000 Armenians from a critical humanitarian lifeline and their main artery to the outside world.

For 100 days, Azerbaijan has denied the citizens of Artsakh basic human rights and access to food, fuel, and medicine in freezing conditions on what is on its way to becoming a humanitarian catastrophe.

As if that wasn't enough, we have seen increasingly escalatory and troubling rhetoric from Azerbaijani officials in just the last few days.

It is long overdue that our government acts to hold Azerbaijan accountable for its heartless treatment of the innocent Armenian civilians in Artsakh.

That is why I was proud to join my colleagues as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 108 in February condemning Azerbaijan's brutal blockade and calling for an end to this manmade humanitarian crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to urge the administration to take action here and to respond to Azerbaijan's aggression by cutting off U.S. military assistance in line with section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act. Particularly, as we enter the thick of the appropriations process, I will also continue to work to ensure that vital humanitarian assistance is delivered to civilians who continue to suffer from the blockade and ongoing fighting.

During these difficult times, I share the serious concerns of my constituents in southern Nevada's Armenian-American community. I will continue to be an advocate for solutions to this manmade crisis.

I will always stand with the Armenian people and to work to secure much-needed relief as they face down continued threats and unjustified aggression from Azerbaijan.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 26 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, we need Your presence with us this day. As a deer longs for streams of water, so our souls long for You. Our very beings thirst for You, the living God.

Be with those who intentionally fast in this season of Lent and Ramadan. Even as they wash their hands, purify their hearts, and draw near to You, draw near to them. Call us each to come closer to You and fast from all that tempts and distracts us from a right relationship with You.

Deliver us from our dependence on our physical strength and uphold us with the power You alone bestow on us. Save us from our inclination to fill our minds with disparaging thoughts and our mouths with sarcasm and gossip. Release us from anything that deters us from the good and righteous life You call us to lead.

Then may we in our deprivation be privileged to receive Your revelation of truth. May we, in our weakness, learn to draw our strength from You.

Break into our lives this season and remind us once again that who we are, what we enjoy, and all that we receive are grace gifts from You. We humble ourselves before You in the hope that You will restore us to the fullness which is found only in You.

In Your most holy name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROSS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN FLOOD COALITION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the American Flood Coalition for 5 years of driving proactive solutions to combat flooding.

During this time, the American Flood Coalition has brought together political, military, business, and local civic leaders to build resilience against stronger storms and more frequent flooding.

In North Carolina's Fifth District, recent tropical storms have brought inches of rain in only a matter of hours, triggering destructive floods and landslides. These storms can leave behind millions of dollars in damages that burden communities for years.

The American Flood Coalition works across all levels of government, supporting process improvements and projects that directly protect against such impacts while lifting the experiences and needs of members to drive transformational adaptation policy at the Federal level.

Congratulations, American Flood Coalition, on 5 years of protecting our Nation's residents, economy, and military installations from flooding.

HONORING JULIE STIVERS 2023 SCHOOL LIBRARIAN OF THE YEAR

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2023 School Librarian of the Year, Wake County's own Julie Stivers.

At the Mount Vernon Middle School, she is the librarian and has worked to create an environment where students not only learn and thrive, but also where they can express their creativity and see their identities and interests represented in literature.

Outside her library, a sign boldly reads: "In This Library, We Don't Shush, We Roar."

Children's socioeconomic status should not determine their opportunities to learn, which is exactly why the library holds two book fairs a year where students can choose new books at no cost.

As others have worked to ban books from schools across the country, Julie has fought against harmful proposals that will ban LGBTQ+ books in Wake County.

Julie cultivates a welcoming space to ensure her students feel at home.

Congratulations on this well-deserved achievement.

BIDEN WILL BE JUDGED

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, The Washington Post lead editorial on March 10 confirmed the murderous invasion of Ukraine by war criminal Putin demands Western support of Ukraine as “. . . President Biden will be tested and judged by his own success in making a similar case for this country to step up by applying its military and industrial might.”

Sadly, there “is a gap between the West’s supportive rhetoric on equipping Ukraine . . . and the pace of actual deliveries of arms and ammunition.”

“It’s critical that the administration perceive those interests clearly and explain them compellingly. . . .

“. . . for our European allies’ security but also to maintain a basic principle of civilized international relations: that one state cannot invade and subjugate another. . . . It is also crucial to transmit the message to China, North Korea and other would-be aggressors that the United States will stand fast in defense. . . .”

In conclusion, it is clear “President Biden will be tested and judged” by his decisions to support the courageous people of Ukraine.

Thank you, Prince William, heir to the British throne, for visiting the British troops in Poland training Ukrainians for freedom. President Andrzej Duda is the courageous President of Poland.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, any mom or dad knows that being a parent is a lifetime job. It doesn’t end when your kids are 18 and it certainly doesn’t end when they are 7.

That is why I was horrified when a Republican colleague of mine on the Agriculture Committee introduced a bill last week to kick parents with kids over the age of 7 and older adults, ages 50-65, off SNAP by imposing harsh new work requirements.

Let’s be clear about who this would penalize: grandparents raising grandchildren, folks who can’t work full-time because childcare is too expensive, and single moms and dads struggling to make ends meet.

Over 10 million people—1 in 4 SNAP recipients—live in households that would be at risk of losing food assistance under this bill, including 4 million children.

When we kick parents off SNAP, we make it harder for them to feed their children. It is as simple as that.

We have a chance to increase access to healthy and locally grown food by funding SNAP and passing a farm bill with a robust nutrition title.

Let’s focus on helping families put food on the table instead of trying to figure out ways to make life harder for working parents.

Let’s all commit to ending hunger now.

NATIONAL AG WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Agriculture Week, which kicked off March 21, also known as National Ag Day.

For 50 years, this week has marked a time to honor American farm families and the essential and often unsung role that agriculture plays in all our lives.

The safe and abundant food and fiber supply that Americans rely on on a daily basis comes from hardworking farming communities across this country.

With rising input costs, market uncertainty, increasing regulations, and global supply chain disruptions, producers are facing increased hardship.

Only 2 percent of Americans are employed in the agriculture sector, yet they successfully feed our entire Nation and the world, despite the odds being stacked against them.

During this week of education and appreciation, I want to emphasize rural America, or what I like to call essential America, as the backbone of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this year, we are reauthorizing the farm bill.

This farm bill will put producers first and aims to revitalize rural America by restoring the farm safety net, expanding market access, and much more.

National Agriculture Week is the perfect opportunity to highlight the hardworking Americans who have dedicated their lives to providing a safe and abundant food supply.

I honor their contributions to society and commend farmers and ranchers who add so much to our national culture.

Mr. Speaker, this is a week where I call on everyone to celebrate National Agriculture Week.

CULTURE WARS IN OUR CLASSROOMS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, when my Lord, my savior, Jesus Christ, was on this Earth, He said: Suffer the children to come to me and do not deny them.

Unfortunately, this week, my Republican colleagues are bringing forward a bill, H.R. 5, the so-called Parents Bill of Rights, which will not teach our children to love, not teach them tolerance, not teach them the plethora of issues and ideas that extend to all Americans.

It will bring culture wars into our classrooms. It will deprive our students

of accurate and fact-based education. It will not teach them tolerance and love.

Americans everywhere overwhelmingly agree that Congress should focus on tangible assistance that will improve student outcomes, not polarizing culture wars. The pandemic has already erased years of learning from our children, and nothing in this legislation will address that issue.

We have not had one hearing on gun violence in our classrooms. Instead, we are prioritizing MAGA talking points over improving student outcomes.

Let’s get back to the people’s business. Let’s teach tolerance and love to our children. Let parents open their hearts and their children’s hearts to what needs to be done.

FIGHTING DANGEROUS FENTANYL ADDITIVES

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for my colleagues’ support on my new bill, the TRANQ Research Act.

This bill directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology to analyze and advance research on dangerous fentanyl additives that are putting public safety officers’ lives at risk, including those guarding our borders.

Fentanyl has been entering our country at record levels over the past 2 years. Now, we are witnessing dangerous cartels adding even more harmful chemicals, like tranq, to an already deadly substance.

Tranq is a dangerous substance containing a veterinary tranquilizer, which when combined with fentanyl becomes even more deadly than fentanyl itself.

The Drug Enforcement Agency reports that between 2020 and 2021, detections of tranq in fentanyl increased 198 percent in the southern United States. From 2020 to 2022, Georgia alone saw a 1,120 percent increase in overdose deaths involving this deadly concoction.

Mr. Speaker, this issue may be even more widespread than we know. This bill is another step in fighting dangerous fentanyl additives. By understanding what these additives are, how to test for them, and how to safely handle them, we can better protect our first responders.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense bill, and I ask for my colleagues’ support on this bill.

ADVOCATING FOR FREE AND COMPETITIVE MARKETS

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a quick show of hands: How many of us in this room have ever had someone

come into our office and ask to make the world safer for their competitors? Me neither.

The RECORD will show that no hands were raised.

This is because there is no lonelier position in Washington than being an advocate for free and competitive markets.

Competition is hard. Free markets are scary. That is why when markets allocated capital to clean energy, cheaper energy, and it displaced fossil fuel energy and \$20 trillion flowed into ESG funds, the losers came to Washington and got the majority of the people in this body, the majority of people in this House to block that free flow of capital.

I thank the minority of my colleagues, and President Biden, who blocked that from happening, who stood up for markets in spite of how hard it was.

To my Republican colleagues who are being pressed by their donors and their colleagues, in William F. Buckley's words: "Stand athwart history yelling, stop."

I sympathize. It is hard and it is scary to support progress. It is hard and it is scary to support markets. I hope that you will do what is right in spite of that pressure.

There is no pride in only doing the right thing when it is easy, but history will smile on the brave.

CELEBRATING DUILIO "DEWEY" TURILLI

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an extraordinary Rhode Island veteran, Duilio "Dewey" Turilli.

Born in Italy, Dewey immigrated to this country when he was only 6 years old. Shortly thereafter, he and his family settled in Rhode Island. After graduating from Central High School in Providence, Dewey was drafted as a radio operator for the 457th Fighter Squadron, a P-51 Mustang unit in the Army Air Force.

Dewey's base was the notorious island of Iwo Jima, and he was present when U.S. forces raised the flag there on February 23, 1945, which also happens to be Dewey's birthday.

Mr. Speaker, 78 years later, just one month ago, Dewey celebrated his 100th birthday surrounded by friends and family.

An avid golfer and painter, Dewey now resides in Warwick, Rhode Island, where he is an active member of the local veterans support group.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to please join me in saluting Dewey and thanking him for his tremendous service to our Nation.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING TERRY HOLLAND

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the gentleman from Virginia, former University of Virginia basketball coach, Terry Holland.

Coach Holland was hired in 1974 at the young age of 31 to be the head coach of the UVA Men's basketball program after they had only experienced three winning seasons in 21 years.

Under his leadership, UVA would win more than 300 games in 16 years, make two Final Four appearances, win an NIT Title, an ACC Tournament Championship, and three ACC regular season titles.

Not surprisingly, Coach Holland also won two ACC Coach of the Year awards. He retired from coaching in 1990 then returned in 1995 to serve as the athletic director at UVA. Then, in 2014, he permanently retired, leaving behind a legacy of service and dedication.

Sadly, about 4 weeks ago, on February 26, at the age of 80, Coach Holland succumbed to Alzheimer's disease.

His exemplary life truly impacted the lives of his student-athletes, his coaches, his colleagues, his competitors and, of course, his loyal fans, along with the entire University of Virginia community.

PARENTING HYPOCRISY

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, frankly, I am angry.

This week, D.C. Republicans' hypocrisy is on full display. At the same time they push a bill they claim supports parents, they are slashing funding for critical programs that countless parents depend on.

My daughter Lillian just turned one, and as one of the few people in this Chamber who has changed a diaper recently, I am tired.

Republicans can't claim to be the party of parents when, in the same breath, they are gutting childcare and education funding. They can't claim to be the party of parents when they focus more on banning books than teaching kids to read.

Our kids really are struggling right now. It is time Congressional Republicans put aside their political tantrums and actually do something to help. Better yet, get out of the way and let us parents get it done.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING CREDIT

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, across the country, too many Americans are competing for too few homes. Building material shortages push up development costs, slow construction, and leave families scrambling.

Cities, States, and industry cannot alone overcome these staggering obstacles. They need Federal cooperation, and Washington is failing to be a good partner.

Last Congress, we had a real shot at getting this done. I backed a bipartisan proposal to give States more tax credits to build affordable homes. It would have modernized bond financing requirements to fund more housing with less debt.

These actions could have helped build more than 300,000 homes in California. We would lower costs for families, bring new jobs to our communities, and grow our entire economy.

Americans are struggling because of the housing crisis, a crisis of cost and supply. Californians have a message for Washington: We need help with housing.

WHAT PARENTS WANT

(Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise as a mother who went to many parent-teacher meetings and a few sessions with the principal, and a grandmother who just loves to see my own child's engagement in my grandchildren's education.

Today, the Congressional Republicans are mimicking my home State, Florida's extreme, rightwing, cruel policies.

Alarming and sadly, in Florida, today, lawmakers are banning books. They are threatening to jail teachers. They are bullying LGBTQ+ students, and they are suppressing history.

In Florida, a teacher can actually go to jail for putting a book about Rosa Parks or the Holocaust on a child's table. Teachers can be fined for comforting a gay child who is being teased for her gender. Schools can lose funding if they promote diversity or they teach Black history.

Really?

Mr. Speaker, parents want guns banned. They want their children to feel nurtured. They want their teachers to be paid well.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CAREER OF DETECTIVE HERMAN MOODY

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and career of Detective Herman Moody, who passed away on February 25, at the age of 98.

Herman Moody was the first Black police officer in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. He attended Las Vegas High School and,

afterward, honorably served in the U.S. Navy during World War II.

After the war, in 1946, he began his 31-year service to the Las Vegas community as part of the police department, when the town was still segregated and there was not even a police academy for him to learn.

He was undeterred, however, and taught himself how to file reports that would stand up in court. He found books about Nevada law so he could make good arrests, and he shared that knowledge with his colleagues to raise the standards of the entire Las Vegas police force.

While he battled discrimination and was passed over for promotions, he never let that deter him from his goal. He rose to the highest rank and served as the second highest senior officer in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

My condolences to his wife, Magnolia, to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and to the entire family.

Detective Moody, may you rest in peace.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 241

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation's public schools. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-2. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject

to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 241, providing for consideration of H.R. 5.

The Parents Bill of Rights is to be considered under a structured rule with 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation. The Parents Bill of Rights would secure a fundamental right parents should always be guaranteed: their right to make informed decisions about their children.

As my first time managing a floor debate, I couldn't think of a better bill to focus on. Our families in Indiana and across the country deserve debate on H.R. 5, and we plan to deliver.

As a mother of three children in school, I know how important it is for parents to know what is happening in the classroom. Unfortunately, this bill is necessary because school districts across the country have failed to deliver basic transparency.

That became painfully obvious to parents during the pandemic. Our living rooms became classrooms. Parents came to realize exactly what their children's days looked like.

Many parents were surprised and disappointed by what they were learning about their children's educational experiences.

Like many of my colleagues, I prefer that most decisions regarding education be made at the State and local level, and this bill does not change that.

The actions over the past few years have compelled us to stand up and to act. There has been example after example of this becoming a bigger problem.

In one example, a father from Virginia had to learn his daughter was as-

saulted in the high school bathroom from his child, not the school.

Stories like this one shouldn't become the new normal.

As I said in the Rules Committee during the hearing about the bill just last night: "Sending a child to public school does not terminate parental rights at the door."

I worked in child services. I have cared for children in foster care. When foster parents are caring for their children who are in the custody of the State, they can't give those kids a haircut without getting permission from the child's biological parents. Shouldn't the same rules apply to the students' safety and well-being in our schools?

Yet, parents are left pleading. They are left to plead for information; to plead for the safety of their kids in public restrooms; to plead for the quality of their kids' education; and to plead for anyone who would listen to help restore their parental rights.

This bill would restore transparency, consultation, and notification requirements to existing law. In doing so, it would give parents the right to obtain critical information more easily from school administrators, boards, and teachers to make informed decisions regarding their children's education.

The bottom line: It gives power back to parents.

As the Republican Education and the Workforce Committee members have said, the Parents Bill of Rights contains five basic principles: That parents have the right to know what their children are being taught; that parents have the right to be heard; that parents have the right to see the school budget; that parents have the right to protect their children's privacy; and that parents have a right to keep their children safe.

Now, these goals are hard to fight against, but we have heard critics say this bill is somehow politicizing education or that bureaucrats know better than parents or that we are encouraging the banning of books.

Let me be clear. Nothing in this bill has anything to do with banning books or even that parent engagement is somehow a better model than parental rights. That is simply not true.

Instead, this bill provides an opportunity to ensure our kids are prepared to contribute to this great country of ours. It aims to strengthen parent-teacher partnerships where they exist and close information gaps where parent-teacher partnerships could be improved.

While there are many challenges in our schools, one we should all be able to agree on tackling is that administrators, educators, and parents should be on the same page. The first step in achieving that goal is improving our parents' access to information about their kids' experiences.

One example of this is an amendment I was able to offer during the markup a few weeks ago. The amendment required notification of parents when a

student isn't reading at grade-level proficiency by the end of the third grade. Our child literacy rates are falling behind, and the more parents know, the more they can help, the better.

In the end, by passing the Parents Bill of Rights, we are one step closer to what everyone wants, providing our students with the best learning experience inside and outside of the classroom and giving parents a proper say in their children's future.

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

□ 1230

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that public education plays a central role in our democracy, helping to ensure the Jeffersonian ideal of having an informed electorate to participate in the governance of our country. I think we can also agree that it is vitally important that parents, as their children's primary caregivers, play an active role in their kids' education in our public schools.

That is why governance of our public schools is entrusted to local boards of education, where most school board members are, in fact, parents and are directly responsible to the communities they serve.

In our fast-paced and online world, the glue that so often holds our communities together is our neighborhood schools, the parent-teacher and home and school organizations that support them, and the extracurricular athletics and activities that we all gather at.

That is why it is so disappointing that the Republican majority has chosen to bring to the floor a bill that undermines those community values and does nothing to address the real issues facing America's schools today.

Contrary to its title, this bill does not give parents any more rights than they already have. Even the conservative Cato Institute has criticized this bill for doing nothing to actually empower parents. In fact, many of the so-called rights this bill claims to establish, like parents' ability to meet with their child's teachers, testify at school board meetings, examine school budgets, or protect their children's privacy, are already enshrined in law and are things school districts nationwide already do and in which parents consistently participate in.

What this bill does do is promote efforts to inject divisive D.C. politics and culture wars into our neighborhood schools and create burdensome new Federal mandates for those schools, dictating to our local communities and our local taxpayers how and when to perform certain tasks.

To add insult to injury, this bill doesn't offer any funding to meet these new Federal mandates or propose re-

sources that would actually help students and families or support our public schools, many of which are already struggling to make ends meet under inequitable funding formulas.

This bill would force schools to invest already scarce time and resources toward onerous compliance requirements and administrative costs and away from crucial measures that actually improve student outcomes, all with no additional money and with no discernible benefit to our children.

Ultimately, this bill is an act of Federal overreach that would hinder students' ability to learn and undermine the important work that educators, librarians, and other school professionals do every day. It would undermine the valuable relationships among parents and between parents, students, and teachers, relationships that are built on trust and shared goals.

The truth is that the primary concerns for too many teachers and parents are to make sure that their children have enough to eat, a bed to sleep in at night, and can get to and from school safely. This bill does not address those critical needs or, for that matter, anything else that promotes student success and well-being.

What this bill does is open the door to allowing a noisy minority to dictate what all students can and cannot read or learn, and that hurts both our kids and our communities.

We have already seen in Florida and other States that have passed versions of this bill that the provisions buried in this legislation have allowed right-wing bullies to ban books, gut history lessons, and marginalize some of our communities.

The beauty of our public schools is that they help our children become critical thinkers and functional adults by meeting and learning about the diversity of people, viewpoints, and experiences in the world around them.

Allowing some parents to dictate their worldview to all parents and students in our public schools does a disservice to our schools, our children, and our communities, particularly when, as has been so often the case recently, those efforts have sought to marginalize people of color and the LGBTQ community.

Perhaps my Republican colleagues are discounting the opportunities for parental engagement that are already baked into our public education system because the views they are pushing, to ban books and whitewash history, are not accepted by the overwhelming majority of Americans.

I know how much children benefit when parents and teachers work together to help them reach their full potential. I know this from experience. I spent a decade providing training and representation for parents and students in the public school system. I spent two decades, while my children attended public schools, as a home and school parent, a classroom volunteer, and, like my father and sister before

me, a school board member to help not only my kids but all the kids in our district to succeed.

I often think that school boards are one of the purest forms of local representative democracy. Unpaid members from the community—most of them, like myself, parents—spend endless hours working together with school administrators, educators, and parents, all united by a common goal to do what is best for all of our children.

Over the years, I had countless conversations with involved parents and constituents in grocery stores, at school concerts, on soccer fields, and at formal board meetings about how our schools could best serve our children and taxpayers, where we could do better, and where our options were limited, usually by financial constraints.

Those discussions were sometimes emotional or passionate, and people didn't always agree, but everyone respected our democratic processes and the boundaries of protected speech as we sought to reach the best possible solutions for our community.

Those conversations and deliberations also reflected a core principle of our civil society, one that is important to remember as we struggle to reduce the hyperpartisanship and lack of civility in our politics and to model good behavior for our children. That is the principle of cooperation and compromise, that having the loudest voice or being a bully doesn't mean that you always get to win.

This bill, H.R. 5, does not help parents, educators, and school districts to work together more effectively. Instead, this bill pits parents against each other and against teachers in a way that creates more chaos and community discord. That hurts students and families, disregards talented educators, undermines public schools, and detracts from what should be our ultimate goal, providing the best possible public education for America's children.

Our national motto is "e pluribus unum," "out of many, one," not "my way or the highway." We form a stronger and more perfect community when we bring our diverse talents and strengths together, and this bill undermines that goal.

I now represent a congressional district with 21 school districts in it, including one of the largest in the country, and I talk to a lot of parents in my community.

Parents in my district want to talk about how to help our kids succeed. They want to talk about hiring enough teachers, librarians, and guidance counselors. They want to talk about fixing crumbling school buildings and preparing our children for the jobs and challenges of the 21st century.

They want schools in our communities that serve the healthy food kids need to learn and grow, offer mental health resources, and teach the skills

that every American needs to be engaged and informed citizens and taxpayers to ensure our long-lasting democracy.

Overwhelmingly, these parents are appalled that bills like H.R. 5 threaten to open the floodgates to book bans, more restrictions on what can be said in the classroom, and attempts to rewrite history and censor facts, all at the expense of our students.

While it sounds benign, this bill will be used to eliminate classroom conversations about racism in the American story or portrayals of LGBTQ people in books, all while refusing to deliver on what parents are actually asking for to keep their children safe, the kind of policies that House Democrats are bringing to the table to keep children safe from dangerous toxins like asbestos and lead that are still prevalent in too many schools and to keep children safe from gun violence, now the leading cause of death for American children.

We need commonsense gun safety laws that keep weapons out of classrooms and out of the hands of children so parents aren't scared that one day they will send their kids to school and they will never come home.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle often talk about being the party of small government and local control. They condemn the intrusion of the Federal Government into local affairs, but this legislation is nothing more than an attempt to nationalize our education system and mandate a one-size-fits-all approach across the country, assuming that the size that fits is a rightwing straitjacket.

Even the conservative Cato Institute has said that H.R. 5 suffers from a fundamental flaw: It is not constitutional.

We should give young people the resources they need to learn and grow, not stifle their ideas, threaten their civil rights, censor their classrooms and teachers, or take books off library shelves. We should not promote chaos and bullying in our communities.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HOUCHIN for bringing this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise and fully support H.R. 5. Folks, this bill could be called the parents bill of rights transparency bill because that is all it is, transparent.

As I look to the balcony, I see a lot of young people, middle-aged people, people with children and maybe grand-

children. Nowhere in this bill is it banning any books. Nowhere.

As my good friend from Texas yesterday pointed out during rules debate, my friends on the other side of the aisle had one book. I see they have a stack of books now. Let me see if they will give you an example of books that you can pull up on the internet that are taught in public schools all over the country.

Let me see if they are going to recognize the book "Beyond Magenta." It documents stories on LGBTQ youth. It has very sexually explicit passages: I was sexually active from the time I was 6.

I won't go on to say the other things that they have. Are you going to highlight these books?

Another book, "This Book Is Gay," discusses orgies and kinky sex acts. Are you going to highlight that?

"Gender Queer" is a novel, and it had a debate in the libraries. It had explicit images of oral sex. Are you going to highlight that book?

Let's take "Juliet Takes a Breath." This book discusses a woman's journey coming out as a lesbian and contains graphic descriptions of sexual encounters.

Folks, I could go on and on. It lists I don't know how many different books.

Mr. Speaker, I ask parents if this is something they want their children to read? Is this something that encourages academics and allows that child to compete in the 21st century? Is this a book that promotes what their child needs to know?

It is sad that this bill is even needed, but it is estimated that between kindergarten and the 12th grade, a student will spend over 15,000 hours at school. That is 15,000 hours when parents are trusting other people to do what is in the best interest of their child.

It is good that America's parents are taking a stand now. They are pushing back on these kinds of books that I don't think they are going to mention.

I have 4 children and 17 grandchildren. We got a notice a week ago where the parents are upset because the school is allowing boys to go into—The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, bottom line: The school was allowing males to go into female bathrooms. This is intolerable.

This bill is needed. It gives parents the control, and it gives parents the right to know what their child is being taught.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD a letter from the American Library Association opposing H.R. 5, saying that the bill would create a catalyst for more book banning and censorship.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,

March 16, 2023.

Re H.R. 5, "Parents Bill of Rights Act"—OPPOSE.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND LEADER JEFFRIES: The American Library Association ("ALA") writes to express our opposition to certain provisions of H.R. 5 ("Parents Bill of Rights Act") and to urge a NO vote on H.R. 5.

Unquestionably, parents should have a voice in their child's education. However, we must oppose H.R. 5's school library provisions, which ironically would lead to more government interference in family decisions regarding voluntary reading. These provisions:

Are unnecessary and unwarranted;

[Would create a catalyst for more book banning and censorship;] and

Would create unfunded federal mandates and regulation where none are needed, at the cost of educating students.

This letter explains each of these concerns below and provides background information about school libraries and an analysis of the bill's school library provisions.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES ARE ESSENTIAL TO EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, 88 percent of all public schools had a school library in 2020–21. School libraries and librarians play essential roles in promoting educational achievement, including by fostering a love of reading which encourages students' development of key literacy skills. School libraries offer a variety of age-appropriate materials for voluntary reading, which is central to helping students discover the joy of reading. School library collections are typically overseen by school librarians who hold a Master's in Library Science or comparable degree from an ALA-accredited graduate program, and who in many states are required to hold a state certification. Library collections are developed in accordance with professional standards, the school's collection development and reconsideration policies, and the requirements of applicable law, including the U.S. Constitution.

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 5'S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS

The following provisions, as contained in Rules Committee Print 118–2, would impose new federal requirements on local school libraries.

Section 104 would require local educational agencies that receive funding under federal Education Department programs to notify parents that they have the right to a "list of the books and other reading materials contained in the library of their child's school" and to "inspect such books or other reading materials," and to provide parents with such list and opportunity to inspect such materials at the beginning of each school year.

Section 202 would require local educational agencies that receive funding under federal Education Department programs to make available for inspection by parents "any books or other reading materials made available to students in such school or through the school library of such school," and to adopt a policy providing for such inspection upon the request of the parent.

Section 202 also contains reporting provisions, which would require:

Local educational agencies that receive funding under federal Education Department

programs to annually “report to the State educational agency any enforcement actions or investigations carried out for the preceding school year to ensure compliance with this section” and to “publish such information on its website;”

State educational agencies, in turn, to annually report information received from local educational agencies to the federal Education Department, as well as “a description of the enforcement actions the State educational agency took to ensure parents’ rights were protected;” and

The federal Secretary of Education to annually report information received from states to Congress, along with “a description of the enforcement actions taken by the Secretary [. . .] to ensure full compliance.”

Finally, Section 202 directs the Secretary to “take such action as the Secretary determines appropriate to enforce this section,” including the authority to terminate federal funding “if the Secretary determines that there has been a failure to comply with such section, and compliance with such section cannot be secured by voluntary means.”

The bill would not provide funding to implement these requirements.

THE BILL’S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS ARE UNNECESSARY AND UNWARRANTED

The bill’s school library provisions appear to be a solution in search of a problem. We are not aware of any situations where parents were not allowed access to the school library’s catalog or materials. It is standard practice in today’s school libraries to maintain online catalogs of their library materials and make such catalogs available to parents and students. School librarians welcome the opportunity to engage with parents in support of the student’s education and fostering a love of reading. That is precisely why school libraries exist, and why school librarians have chosen their profession.

Furthermore, these provisions are unwarranted. As described above, school libraries provide access to a variety of age-appropriate materials. Notably, these are not mandatory instructional materials, but voluntary choices for student-directed reading. If a student isn’t interested in a particular book, they can simply choose another book.

THE BILL’S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS WOULD CREATE A CATALYST FOR MORE BOOK BANNING AND CENSORSHIP

We are very concerned about the potential negative unintended consequences of book banning and censorship of viewpoints if these federal requirements are imposed on local schools.

The federal government should not dictate which materials local school libraries can or cannot offer. Indeed, current federal law prohibits the Education Department from exercising “any direction, supervision, or control [. . .] over the selection or content of library resources” by local schools (20 U.S.C. §3403(b)). However, the school library provisions of H.R. 5 would expand federal involvement in that quintessentially local decision and invite more attempts to censor information and ban books.

Imposing new federal regulation—including a federal mandate for local schools to adopt new policies—would be weaponized by a small minority who seek to censor what other parents’ children can read. The sad reality is that an increasing number of state and local politicians in recent years have acquiesced to extreme demands to censor reading choices, and we fear that censorship may become even more prevalent if these provisions are enacted.

We have already seen how destructive censorship can be with the banning of books in many communities. Book bans now include many shocking examples, including the ban-

ning of children’s books regarding the contributions to society by individuals like Condoleezza Rice, Rosa Parks, and Malala Yousafzai. We cannot support provisions that will, even if unintentionally, lead to greater censorship and the banning of children’s books that contain subjects such as the contributions of these historic figures.

THE BILL’S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS WOULD CREATE UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES AND REGULATION WHERE NONE ARE NEEDED, AT THE COST OF EDUCATING STUDENTS

As described above, the bill’s requirements for school libraries are essentially duplicative of standard local practice. Nonetheless, by imposing new federal regulation on local schools, the bill would create new paperwork requirements, compliance burdens, and administrative costs, including for rural and small schools that can least afford them. These unfunded mandates will be another distraction from schools’ fundamental work to educate students. These same provisions would hand the federal Education Department new, broad authority to defund schools deemed to have inadequately complied with these new federal regulations. If enacted, these provisions would take dollars that should be used to pay for books, librarians, and teachers, and require that they instead be spent on administrators, bureaucrats, and paperwork—to the detriment of the students our schools should be focused on serving.

CONCLUSION

We believe that parents should be partners in their children’s education. However, H.R. 5’s school library provisions do nothing to advance that goal. Instead, they would create unnecessary and unfunded federal mandates on local school libraries that likely would result in more government censorship of reading choices.

Congress should support freedom for parents and students to choose what they want to read. Inspired by the wisdom of our country’s Founders, the First Amendment must be our guide star. If anyone is to tell a child that they can’t read a book, it should be the child’s parent, not a politician. Congress should support students by strengthening school libraries and protecting the freedom to read—not imposing more bureaucratic burdens and invitations to censorship.

We are confident that parents want more books, not fewer, in their children’s school libraries.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. INOUE, PH.D.,
Senior Director, Public
Policy & Govern-
ment Relations and
Interim Associate
Executive Director,
American Library
Association.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me get something straight here: Republicans keep saying, as they just did, that nothing in this bill has anything to do with banning books. We keep hearing it over and over and over. We have heard the same thing in State after State as Republicans have passed bills like this.

□ 1245

Now, we have over 1,600 books—and more every month—pulled from the

shelves. They are banned. Democrats put forward amendments to prevent politicians from banning books. They all voted “no.” Democrats put forward six amendments to prevent censorship. They all voted “no.” Now they are trying to pretend like they have no idea why we would be concerned about book bans. Give me a break.

I am a parent. My wife, Lisa, and I have gone to countless parent-teacher conferences when our kids were in public school. Both of my sisters are public school teachers. I know how hard they work to involve parents in their kids’ education. Don’t lecture us. We are parents. We know what this is about. It is about banning books.

This bill is going to be weaponized by far right groups and used to threaten schools with legal action if they don’t pull books off the shelves. It is going to force teachers to decide between staying silent and teaching something that certain politicians in their State don’t like. It is already happening, for God’s sake.

Ask the teacher in Iowa who was told that they cannot teach that slavery was wrong.

Ask the teacher in Texas who was told that they have to teach the opposite perspective on the Holocaust.

Ask the teacher in Florida who was fired for exposing a book-banning spree at the hands of Ron DeSantis that would make the Chinese Communist Party blush.

I have a few books that Republicans want to ban—too many to go through now, but let me recite a few. “The Life of Rosa Parks.” “Who was Sojourner Truth?” “Biography of Nelson Mandela.” “The Story of Harvey Milk.”

Now, do you notice any pattern here? They want to ban books about Black and Brown people, and they want to ban books about LGBTQI+ people. It is sick. It is hateful. What is wrong with them, Mr. Speaker?

If you don’t like a book, don’t let your kid read it. But you don’t get to tell the rest of us parents what our kids should be allowed to read. Talk to your kids’ teachers. Run for school board. Don’t take away money from schools that fall on the wrong side of the MAGA culture wars.

We gave Republicans dozens of chances to amend this bill and make it better to address the actual issues that our schools face. They voted “no” on all of them. Get this, they voted “no” on getting lead pipes out of schools. They voted “no” on that. They care more about getting Rosa Parks out of our schools than lead pipes. I think that says it all.

Never in my life did I think I would see such a reprehensible, disgraceful bill come to the floor. We should trust parents and teachers and students to think for themselves without having toxic MAGA culture wars shoved down their throats by Republicans in Congress.

Vote “no” on this awful rule and on this awful bill.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, let's just make sure the American people know the truth. Parents have the right to know what their children are being taught. Parents have the right to be heard. Parents have the right to see the school budget and spending. Parents have the right to protect their child's privacy. Parents have the right to keep their children safe.

That is what my Democratic colleagues are objecting to. Notice how they are objecting. Notice what they are trying to do. It is a page as old as time in the Democratic playbook—fearmongering, racial division, peddling the lies of hatred, saying that somehow the legislation that would empower parents and give parents the right to know what their child is being educated with, know what they are being told, that somehow that is going to lead to banning of books.

What they are afraid of is they are afraid of a parent being able to come in, armed with the information of what is being taught to their children, armed with what is in the library, and holding school boards accountable, holding their educators accountable. That is precisely what my Democratic colleagues do not want to occur.

They are afraid of the Sunshine going into the classroom because they know that after COVID the veil has been lifted on a corrupted education system that has for too long been indoctrinating our children with racial division and hatred. Parents are now awakened. They have seen what is occurring behind the veil because the veil was lifted.

My colleagues go around peddling the fears of banned books, completely inaccurately trying to claim that books were banned in Duval County that weren't banned, books that were either not ordered—when, in fact, there are on average 13 books about Rosa Parks in every elementary school in Duval County. That is the truth. Nobody wants to pull books about Rosa Parks. Nobody wants to pull books about Roberto Clemente.

If there is legislation passed to make sure that we stop the ridiculousness of what books are being put in front of our kids, then people go: Let's pull books and look at it to make sure what is in it, and then they decide to put those books back when they pass muster. That is what my colleagues want to say are being banned.

What they do not want to talk about are the books that my colleagues from South Carolina just talked about. They don't want to talk about "Flamer," a graphic book about young boys performing sexual acts at a summer camp. They don't want to talk about that.

Who does?

A bunch of fringe leftist groups that want to stick that stuff in our schools for our kids to read.

How about "This Book is Gay," a book containing instructions on the ins and outs of gay sex.

This is what we want being put in the schools for our children?

Our Democratic colleagues do not want the American people, the parents, to know this. That is what this is about. My Democratic colleagues do not want parents to know that information. They don't. They have a bill in front of them that literally gives parents the right to know that and they are opposing it and opposing it with force.

To my colleagues who say: Well, this is sticking the Federal Government into the tent of local government, I say to them: Well, welcome to the club of actually being concerned about Federal Government overreach. I agree.

So I hope they will support my amendment then that would strike all the language and block grant the dollars to the States. They don't want to do that, ladies and gentlemen, because they want to meddle. They just want to meddle the way they want to.

They don't want to have a clean elimination of the Department of Education. I support my colleague THOMAS MASSIE's bill to do that. My Democratic colleagues do not.

My Democratic colleagues will not support a block grant to States because they want to meddle. They want to interfere. They just don't want parents to know the truth. That is a dirty little secret.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a minute—or not even a minute—to correct a couple statements that were made.

First of all, I include in the RECORD an article from Jax Today titled: "Duval Schools to keep 73 'diverse, inclusive' books out of classrooms."

[From Jax Today, Dec. 22, 2022]

DUVAL SCHOOLS TO KEEP 73 'DIVERSE, INCLUSIVE' BOOKS OUT OF CLASSROOMS
(By Claire Heddles)

Dozens of books the Duval County school district ordered in the summer of 2021 will never hit classroom shelves. That's the result of an ongoing review after the district pulled almost 200 books this spring while the Florida Legislature passed limits on what teachers can say about race, gender and sexual orientation in classrooms and set new rules for purchasing classroom materials.

After a 10-month process—delayed by staffing shortages, according to the district—47 titles are being returned to the distributor. Twenty-six others will remain in storage, awaiting further state guidance.

Among the rejected titles are a book about Martin Luther King Jr. intended for fourth graders; a biography of Rosa Parks for second grade classrooms; a first grade Berenstain Bears book about God; and multiple titles including LGBTQ+ characters and families. District staffers are sending the rejected books back to the distributor, Perfection Learning, for exchange.

The rest of the 179 books that had been held for review were determined to meet "statutory guidelines and are useful toward our reading goals," and were distributed to classrooms in October, a district representative tells Jacksonville Today in an email.

All of the books are from the Essential Voices Classroom Libraries collection, which

the distributor says are meant to engage students in "independent reading through these diverse, inclusive" stories.

Explore the full list of books that were pulled for review:

'BANNED BOOKS'

In September, PEN America, an organization advocating for free speech, released a tally of books they said were banned across the country, including more than 550 in Florida, the second-most of any state. Only Texas banned more.

The list included the Essential Voices books the district withheld from classrooms. Duval Schools contested the characterization as a book ban because none of the books was challenged by the public—the district pulled them before they ever went on shelves.

Ami Polonsky is the author of one of the recently rejected books, Gracefully Grayson, a transgender coming-of-age novel intended for fifth grade classrooms. A teacher herself, Polonsky believes books like hers are blocked to appease a small subset of parents.

"Books can save kids' lives, and to know this, but still refuse to take them out of storage is nonsensical, it's immoral. A parenting perspective cannot outweigh a national mental health crisis among trans children," Polonsky told the School Board this month. "Books that are ordered with the best of intentions gather dust, and the LGBTQ children continue to receive the message that their existence is controversial."

Polonsky and two other authors came to Jacksonville to address the Duval School Board in early December at the urging of national free speech organizations PEN America, We Need Diverse Books and Freedom to Read. At the time, the district had not yet publicly released the list of 106 books it now says were distributed to classrooms in October.

NEW STATE LAWS

Another of the authors, Linda Sue Park, wrote a book about South Sudanese sisters on a two-hour walk to get water for their family called Nya's Long Walk. Her book was among the 179 titles initially pulled, but it was since distributed to kindergarten classrooms, according to the district.

Park was in Jacksonville advocating for all the books in the Essential Voices collection, many of which are written by authors of color with main characters of color.

"You never know what book is going to do it for them, what book is going to hit them, and that's why more choice, more access, more variety is so important," she said.

Duval decided to pull the books for review as it grappled with limited state guidance for how to implement at least three new Florida laws that restricted school curricula: HB 1467, HB 7 and HB 1557.

HB 1467, sponsored by Rep. Sam Garrison, R-Fleming Island, requires school districts to maintain a list of library materials and make it easier for the public to contest school books. Districts are also required to have a state-certified media specialist sign off on new materials.

Starting in January 2023, school librarians and media specialists will have to complete an online training program developed by the state Department of Education. In an email this week, a Duval Schools spokesperson said the remaining 26 Essential Voices book reviews will be the first use of this training.

"Once that training [is] released, the district will use this as a great opportunity to go through this process applying the required training," the spokesperson wrote.

Another new law, HB 7, which Gov. Ron DeSantis nicknamed the Stop WOKE Act, limited how teachers can talk about race and

racism and in the classroom. A federal judge blocked the law from taking effect last month, calling it “positively dystopian.” The DeSantis administration is appealing the ruling in federal court.

Though HB 7 is not currently in effect, Duval Schools blocked multiple books that deal with race and history, including a Memphis, Martin, and the Mountaintop by Alice Faye Duncan, about Martin Luther King Jr. and the 1968 sanitation strike; Other Words for Home by Jasmine Warga, about a 12-year-old Syrian refugee in the U.S.; and Separate Is Never Equal: Sylvia Mendez and Her Family’s Fight for Desegregation by Duncan Tonatiuh, a children’s book about the fight to end segregation in California schools seven years before Brown v. Board of Education—the Supreme Court decision that found school segregation unconstitutional.

A third new law, HB 1557, or Parental Rights in Education, bans instruction about sexual orientation and gender identity in first through third grade, “or in a manner that is not age-appropriate” in older grades. Rather than define “age appropriate,” the law that critics call “Don’t Say Gay” allows parents to sue districts if they believe something is not.

Polonsky’s rejected book, Gracefully Grayson, was intended for fifth graders. Other books meant for older grade levels with LGBTQ+ stories are also being sent back, including the fourth grade book, Rainbow Revolutionaries: Fifty LGBTQ+ People Who Made History, by Sarah Prager, and The Stonewall Riots: Coming Out in the Street, by Gayle E. Pitman for fifth graders.

Also in response to HB 1557, the Duval school district dramatically shrank its LGBTQ+ support guide, removed rainbow stickers and posters that supported LGBTQ students from classrooms and took down a 12-minute anti-bullying video that taught middle and high school students how to support their gay and transgender peers.

Ellen Oh, author and CEO of the national nonprofit We Need Diverse Books, says Duval’s actions are particularly concerning because the decisions were made before any parent complained about the books.

“It’s the secretive, the silent censoring part of it that is so troublesome to us,” Oh said ahead of the Dec. 6 School Board meeting. “Books that have been banned have been done publicly. People have challenged books. In this case, these books were pulled because of fear. We can’t live in a society like that.”

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, also, it is not the first time my colleague mentioned the book “Flamer,” which he described as a graphic book about a child at summer camp. In fact, it is a graphic novel, which is kind of a trend that he may not be familiar with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, all of us can agree that the most precious gift God can give us is our children. I am a parent of four children—four children—who all attended public education, K-12. As a parent, I was active and participated in the local school board meetings, teacher-parent conferences, and I was involved with the local PTA because it was my responsibility to know what was going on in my children’s life, especially educational life.

All of us here as Americans, regardless of party affiliation, can agree that protecting our children is one of our most important responsibilities here in

Congress. I agree with my colleagues across the aisle that we need to protect all students, especially, I would say, undocumented students, some of the most vulnerable students in our society.

Last night, I introduced an amendment that would bar any local educational agency, State agency, elementary school, or secondary school from requesting or disclosing a student’s immigration status. Schools, I would say, are the one place in our society that students should feel safe. My amendment would advance this principle. It would say that our students are safe in their schools.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues across the aisle would have voted for my amendment last night, then they would have voted for safety for all of our students in school. Yet, they didn’t do that. By failing to vote for my amendment, they left our most vulnerable students hanging.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, how dare they. How dare they conflate the names of two great people: Nelson Mandela and Rosa Parks—books about these heroes—and conflate them about books about sexual promiscuity of our children. How dare they.

I am starting to see in my short time here in the U.S. Congress how this game is played. It is a conflate and confuse and baffle the American people.

We are here to set the record straight.

Mr. Speaker, if one good thing came out of COVID, when our kids were forced to stay home, it is that parents saw exactly what they were learning and what they were being taught. The parents didn’t like it. The parents raised their voices. And because of that, they were condemned as domestic terrorists. That was wrong, Mr. Speaker. That was just plain wrong.

As a father myself, I understand. I understand that our children are the most important things in our lives. It is our job to put them in a position to have a better life than we did. Raising and rearing children to be smart, capable, contributing members of society should be our number one objective. Of course, we all know this starts at home. Make no mistake, it does continue at our schools and in our classrooms.

Schools are where our children spend the majority of their childhood, shaping the ideas, building the relationships, building the friendships they will have for a lifetime. This is exactly why parents deserve a seat at the table, and this legislation provides this seat.

Parents have a right to know what is being taught. They have a right to be heard. They have a right to see how a school is spending their taxpayer dollars. Most importantly, they have a right to protect their children’s privacy.

When my Republican colleagues and I won back this Chamber, we swore—we swore to the voters and constituents that we were going to defend these rights. The Parents Bill of Rights isn’t the only step, but it is a great first step.

This legislation ensures curriculum information, books, reading material, and learning standards are made public to parents. Parents will now have an open line of communication with teachers and school board officials. They will not be condemned as terrorists.

Folks, this is common sense. To my good friends on the other side of the aisle, this really shouldn’t be a debate.

Then again, I never thought weeks ago that I would have to stand here and condemn socialism that they voted for.

I never thought I would have to stand here and defend the rights of a baby that survived abortion, and yet we had to do that. I thought that was common sense as well, and I was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about changing history, this is about preserving our future as a Nation. This is not about banning books. This is about promoting transparency.

□ 1300

It is our job and it is our responsibility to protect our children from the evils being taught in some classrooms across the country—not all.

I am proud to be a voice for the parents of Missouri, for our district, and for parents across this great land. I am here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is time to take a stand. It is time to take a stand for our children. It is time to take a stand for our families. It is time to take a stand for our schools. It is time to take a stand for our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rules package of this critical piece of legislation.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES), who is a teacher.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 5.

I look around this Chamber, and I think that arguably I have spent more time in a classroom than anyone in this Chamber. I was a classroom teacher for 15 years. I ran before and after-school programs and summer programs. I led programs for parent engagement. I am also the mother of four children. One of them is a public school student right now. As a teacher and a parent, I know that parent-teacher partnerships are critical to student success.

I know that when a teacher can reach out to parents and discuss challenging curriculum and come up with strategies to support their child, students thrive. I know that when parents can reach out to their child’s teacher and ask questions and voice their concerns, or even more, offer their personal perspectives, students benefit.

But this bill does not do that. It does not promote parent-teacher partnerships. It just creates division in our schools at a time when both parents and teachers need all the help they can get.

I have served on curriculum committees, and it is a requirement that there be a parent representative on those committees. These are the committees that select the books that will be read in classes. Teachers don't arbitrarily do that. I have addressed my local board of education. There was always time for public comment, and parents were encouraged to join. Parents of varying opinions were asked to show up and give their input on what we were doing in our schools.

I have gone to a student's home because their parents could not attend a parent-teacher conference, but I knew that they cared deeply about their child and wanted to have conversations with me. So after school, on my own time, I reached out to connect with those parents. That is what teachers do.

All of this misguided direction is from people on the floor who have very little information about what actually happens on the ground level. During COVID it wasn't that teachers were exposed and parents got an inside look at what happens in classrooms. The best teachers are always inviting parents into the classroom.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, in our 16-hour markup, committee Democrats offered strategies for parent engagement. We offered amendments to provide videoconferences so parents could be involved, and we offered legislation to say that kids should have healthy meals in school so that they would be ready to learn. Every single one of them was rejected.

This politics over parents legislation creates unnecessary reporting requirements in our schools and diverts resources.

I am a parent, and this bill actually removes my rights as a parent at the local level and places them in the hands of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill and listen to what parents are saying. They are saying that they want diverse curriculum, diverse books, teachers who are highly qualified and prepared, and for all students, not just some, but all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to this very controversial and very dangerous bill, H.R. 5.

I am a former teacher. I am a parent. My wife and I have two children right now in public schools. This is the life we lead. This is our reality right now.

I can tell you that I offered several amendments because I know what I am talking about. One of the amendments was to protect our schools, our teachers, and our parents from unnecessary, awful, and very expensive litigation. That is what this is going to do. This is going to drown our school districts, our schools, our teachers, and maybe our parents in lawsuit after lawsuit after lawsuit.

I offered amendments because everyone in my district believes in local control. One amendment just said: Hey, if you are a believer in local control, then allow school districts to opt out of this very dangerous bill. That is a local control issue. That amendment and the other amendment was not ruled in order so there will be no vote on it.

I believe that this government that they are proposing has become too big for most Americans. It is too intrusive. They are banning books. You can't say this, you can't say that. They are in doctors' offices, and they are in classrooms. They are going too far and trampling on our freedoms.

If they want to help, then invest in preschool, invest in childcare, invest in prenatal care, invest in stable housing, invest in afterschool programs, and invest in all kinds of things that are going to help children and parents.

Stop telling us what to do with our lives and with our children.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for the time.

Mr. Speaker, again, the facts are completely irrelevant to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—completely irrelevant.

Introduced in the RECORD a little while ago was a story from December, again, trying to perpetuate this myth about book banning. Again, the context here matters that we are talking about legislation in this body to just ensure that parents know what is in the libraries and what is in the curriculum. It does nothing more.

Yet, that is the great offense. They are trying to perpetuate that myth about Federal perpetuation of so-called book banning. Let me be clear. Yes. Some local jurisdictions are removing certain books—absolutely, and God bless them for it—books about explicit sex acts. Let that hang out over the Chamber.

No, I do not want America's children to have to be subjected to that kind of terrible indoctrination in the schools—absolutely not—and parents should be empowered to stop it. Instead, they want to perpetuate this myth.

The facts are true.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article titled: "Facts about library books in Duval County Public Schools."

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

There was no objection.

[Feb. 17, 2023]

FACTS ABOUT LIBRARY BOOKS IN DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Tracy Pierce and Lauren Ricks)

Feb. 17, 2023—Books about Roberto Clemente and Hank Aaron from the Essential Voices collection are among approximately 10,000 books that have been reviewed and approved through the new state-required book review process.

This review process and the status of library books were the subject of conversation and misinformation that appeared in media and social media over the last few weeks.

Much of this misinformation was due to two separate but interdependent topics:

1. The purchase of almost 1,300 books from Perfection Learning (including almost 180 books from their Essential Voices Collection)

2. The current effort to review all media center and classroom library books, which is now required under state law.

This Team Duval News article will address both topics comprehensively to help clarify the misinformation that has spread.

TOPIC ONE: BOOKS FROM PERFECTION LEARNING

1. The district purchased almost 1,300 titles in 2021. When we received that order, more than 1,100 titles went directly to the classrooms.

2. The order included almost 180 book titles from the Essential Voices collection, which we purchased to increase diversity of writers, characters, topics, and viewpoints in our classroom libraries.

3. When we received those books, we quickly became aware that the delivery included titles we did not order. We collected those books from schools and held them in district storage until our media specialists and others could review them. (Note: We have two media specialists at the district level, and their primary responsibility is to support school instruction).

4. When we reviewed the books, we sent 105 titles from this diverse collection to classrooms last fall.

5. We sent 47 book titles back to Perfection Learning. Fourteen of these were because we didn't order them. Others returned were titles that we ordered but upon review, we determined they would not comply with new legislation or were not appropriate for elementary aged children.

6. We held 27 titles as we awaited state guidance to determine the appropriate grade levels and placement (classroom library or media center) for these books.

7. Media specialists received training from the Florida Department of Education in January 2023 after returning from winter break.

8. As of February 13, 2023, all 27 of those titles have been reviewed and approved for designated grade levels, including the books about Roberto Clemente and Hank Aaron.

TOPIC TWO: STATE-REQUIRED REVIEW OF CLASSROOM LIBRARIES

1. State law now requires that every book in our classroom libraries and school media centers be reviewed by certified media specialists.

2. Since the law passed, our small team of certified media specialists (about 54 across all schools and the district) have taken on the task of reviewing more than 1.6 million titles.

3. Based on state training on multiple laws dealing with gender and racial ideology in books, we are reviewing for three things:

a. Material which could be considered pornographic is not allowed. State trainers reminded our team throughout their presentation that this is punishable as a third-degree felony and that reviewers should “err on the side of caution.”

b. Material which could be considered instruction on sexual orientation and gender identity is expressly forbidden in state law for students in grades K–3.

c. Material that could violate Florida Statute 1006.31(2)(d) and 1003.42(3) which, among other requirements, includes material that might describe a person or people as “inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously, solely by virtue of his or her race or sex.”

(Sidenote on item c. above: Since Dr. Greene arrived in 2018, the district has invested more than \$1 million in classroom books from diverse authors and about diverse groups of people. Our goal was—and continues to be—to put books in the hands of children in which they can see themselves and learn from a broad array of perspectives. What that now means is that we have thousands of titles that we must review to ensure our teachers do not unintentionally violate Florida Statutes.)

4. We did direct teachers to temporarily reduce their classroom library collections to titles that were previously approved while waiting for media specialists to curate a more expansive list of approved titles. However, at no time should a classroom have been without reading resources. At all times, students should have had access to state approved books, already approved civics literacy books, Benchmark Advance small group books, Reader’s Theatre, and extensive online resources in our curriculum.

5. We did have a small number of principals interpret directions and guidance more intensely, out of an abundance of caution. We have provided additional guidance to those leaders and they have appropriately adjusted their message to teachers. In their defense, the state training also stressed the accountability of the school principal with respect to the books and materials made available to students.

6. We informed principals clearly that media centers should not be closed. However, because we need all certified media specialists to review books, hours of media centers open to students, along with the availability of media specialists to support teachers, has been considerably reduced in some schools.

7. Through this process, we now have almost 10,000 book titles approved for classroom use, including aforementioned books about Roberto Clemente and Hank Aaron. In addition to our 2021 order from Perfection Learning, we already had multiple titles in classroom libraries and media centers about these historic figures, as well as dozens of books about Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks and other icons of the Civil Rights movement.

8. Another new requirement is creating a searchable, online database of all elementary classroom library books for each of our schools so that parents and the public can see all titles available to students. We also have a process and a committee that will review books if they are challenged by a member of the public. All of this is required by law and adds to the effort and time it will take to comply with the law.

Duval County Public Schools will continue this intensive process of reviewing books both to comply with state laws and to ensure teachers and school leaders do not have to worry about jeopardizing their career because a book may be construed to be in violation of Florida law.

As an educational institution, the district’s main goal is this: To help children learn to read.

There are thousands of books we can use to do that, and the district will take the time and make the effort to ensure our students and teachers have access to a diverse, legally compliant set of books.

Mr. ROY. “February 17, 2023—Books about Roberto Clemente and Hank Aaron from the Essential Voices collection are among approximately 10,000 books that have been reviewed and approved through the new State-required book review process.”

The fact is there was a purchase of 1,300 books from Perfection Learning.

“The current effort to review all media center and classroom library books, which is now required under State law,” was reviewed and completed. Those books were not banned.

As I said earlier, there are, on average, 13 to 14 books about Rosa Parks per school in Duval County. Those are the facts. That is the truth. This is a complete misrepresentation designed to scare people when, in fact, we want to empower parents and provide Sunshine for the American people to protect their kids.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, my colleague from Pennsylvania, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues here in this Chamber, I am blessed to be a parent. My wife and I are proud parents of a 4-year-old daughter, and we are deeply invested in her education and ensuring that she has the ability to be able to live her dreams. Mr. Speaker, you can imagine my surprise and my disappointment when I learned that the Republicans, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, would be spending our time today on this bill, the politics over parents act.

It is a surprise because for so many years my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have bemoaned the role of the Federal Government in public education.

They have lectured us about local control time and time again, and yet here they stand with a bill to impose a variety of unfunded mandates on school districts across the country and eroding local control, as my colleague from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN) articulated.

I am disappointed because these unfunded mandates are so disconnected from the real concerns and fears that parents in my district back home in Colorado are experiencing every day.

Just yesterday the Denver metro area in Colorado was frozen with fear at the news of another incident of gun violence in one of our schools. At East High School, two teachers were wounded, one of them critically. This came on the heels just 2 weeks ago of the tragic death of a 16-year-old student at East High School as a result of gun violence. Our prayers, our thoughts, and our hearts go out to him, his family, his friends, and all the students and the parents who have been impacted in

just the last 14 days as yet another incident of gun violence tears our community apart.

That is what parents in Colorado are concerned about. They are concerned about their students—their children—coming home from school alive. They are concerned about the ability of children to be able to get a quality education and not go hungry, to not be poisoned by lead pipes in some of the dilapidated buildings in rural and urban communities across our country, and about the cost of childcare.

Mr. Speaker, that is what they are concerned about.

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

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, that is what parents and families are concerned about back in Colorado.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule so that we can get on to the business of addressing those concerns I have articulated on behalf of parents and families across our great country.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a few comments.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about things embedded in this legislation. I want to reiterate this is a bill that says that parents have the right to know what their children are being taught, parents have the right to be heard, parents have the right to see the school budget and spending, parents have the right to protect their child’s privacy, and parents have a right to keep their children safe.

We have also heard our colleagues talk about how well school boards work, and for large swaths of the country, I am sure that is true. Just because things work well in some places does not mean they work well in all places. Tell that to Mr. Scott Smith who was arrested at a school board meeting in Loudoun County, Virginia, when he questioned whether the school might be trying to cover up his daughter’s sexual assault by a gender fluid student.

We have heard that this bill pits parents against teachers and against each other. We have heard a lot of those types of comments. The very fact that they characterize this bill as pitting someone against another when I have just stated the facts of what is in the bill should be a red flag.

I sat through a 16-hour markup until the early hours of 2:30 or 3 a.m. in this morning. We did hear dozens of amendments, but what I heard were dozens of chances to empower bureaucrats over empowering parents.

Republicans are proud to stand up for parents on behalf of students.

This is not politics over parents. It is parents over politicians and bureaucrats. We want what parents all across America want: schools to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, and science

with the utmost transparency. Parents want to be involved and informed without having to file 200 freedom of information requests only to be sued by the NEA and the school board, such as Nicole Solis.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, there are many issues that we should be dealing with here.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that states the House's unyielding responsibility to defend and preserve Social Security and Medicare for generations to come and to affirm that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to these vital programs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are foundational to our constituents' economic and health security. Republicans have demanded unconscionable cuts to these programs in exchange for raising the debt limit and paying our Nation's bills.

Some of my Republican colleagues have recently changed their rhetoric and now say that they don't want to eviscerate Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering my friends the opportunity to back up their new-found position.

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

□ 1315

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rules Committee, I do feel compelled to comment upon the amendment process that we have with respect to this rule and bill.

I am astounded that, once again, the Republican majority has reported such an imbalanced rule. This rule actually makes in order every single germane Republican amendment submitted before our meeting yesterday, but for Democratic amendments, the rule blocks 28 of the 31 germane amendments offered by the Democrats. That is a 90 percent suppression rate of the ideas submitted by the minority party, all of which were compliant with the rules of the House but have been blocked by Republicans from being debated or voted upon.

The Rules Committee Republicans actually complained about amendment disparities during the Democratic majority, saying, "There is no context in which such a stifling of minority voices is consistent with the designs of this institution or in the best interest of the American people we represent."

That complaint was written after we made in order 30 percent of the amendments submitted by Republicans to structured rule bills. When we do 30 percent, it is a crisis for the institution, but when they do 5 percent this month, it is okay.

Speaker McCARTHY actually promised both sides "... more openness, more opportunity for ideas to win at the end of the day."

Mr. Speaker, that promise has been broken. This Republican majority knows their bills fail to address real problems, so they continue to block our good ideas from coming to the floor rather than actually debating them. It is wrong, and they need to do better.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to H.R. 5, it does not promote the rights of parents, but it does open the door to censoring teachers and textbooks, threatening the rights of students and their parents, imposing costly burdens on our neighborhood schools that they cannot afford, and infringing on core American values, including freedom of speech and ideas.

It puts rightwing politics over parents and would let a noisy minority push their own agenda and impose their beliefs of what children can or should read or learn onto all parents and students.

Our schools carry out important responsibilities of educating the next generation of Americans, and all children deserve access to an equitable and well-rounded education that equips them for the future.

We should give our schools the resources to help young people feel supported and ready to reach their full potential. We should not create hostile environments for our most marginalized students. We should not pit parents against each other and against educators, and we should not drive wedges between families and their neighborhood schools. I want to do better than that for our kids, and I hope others today want the same.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, we made a commitment to America, and delivering for parents is an important part of that promise.

We must empower parents to be in the driver's seat with respect to their children's education. This isn't about banning books or politicizing education.

How parents having a right to be informed about and involved in decisions regarding their own children's aca-

demic experience is being misconstrued by some is lost on me.

Mr. Speaker, we did have a robust committee markup on this bill that I was part of. We were in committee markup, hearing and debating amendments on this bill, from 10:00 in the morning until 2:30 in the morning. In those many amendments, what I heard over and over again was: there is nothing to see here and that this bill is not necessary and that most schools in America are doing just fine.

Well, most schools, Mr. Speaker, are not all schools. Our parents have a fundamental right to know what is happening in the classroom without having to file a public records request to find it. If things are going so well that our colleagues across the aisle believe that this bill is not needed, then they should stand and join Republicans in support of parents across America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 241 OFFERED BY
MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. BOST) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 241;

Adoption of House Resolution 241, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 406.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (House Resolution 241) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation's public schools, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 204, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Cloud	Fulcher
Alford	Clyde	Gaetz
Allen	Collins	Gallagher
Amodei	Comer	Garbarino
Armstrong	Crane	Garcia, Mike
Arrington	Crawford	Jimenez
Babin	Crenshaw	Gonzales, Tony
Bacon	Curtis	Good (VA)
Baird	D'Esposito	Gooden (TX)
Balderson	Davidson	Gosar
Banks	De La Cruz	Granger
Barr	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Bean (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bentz	Donalds	Green (TN)
Bergman	Duarte	Greene (GA)
Bice	Duncan	Griffith
Biggs	Dunn (FL)	Grothman
Bilirakis	Edwards	Guest
Boebert	Ellzey	Guthrie
Bost	Emmer	Hageman
Brecheen	Estes	Harris
Buchanan	Ezell	Harshbarger
Buck	Fallon	Hern
Burchett	Feenstra	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Ferguson	Hill
Burlison	Finstad	Hinson
Calvert	Fischbach	Houchin
Cammack	Fitzgerald	Hudson
Carey	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga
Carl	Fleischmann	Hunt
Carter (GA)	Flood	Issa
Carter (TX)	Foxx	Jackson (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer	Franklin, C.	James
Ciscomani	Scott	Johnson (LA)
Cline	Fry	Johnson (OH)

Johnson (SD)	Miller (IL)
Jordan	Miller (OH)
Joyce (OH)	Miller (WV)
Joyce (PA)	Miller-Meeks
Kean (NJ)	Mills
Kelly (MS)	Molinaro
Kelly (PA)	Mooleenaar
Kiggans (VA)	Mooney
Kiley	Moore (AL)
Kim (CA)	Moore (UT)
Kustoff	Moran
LaHood	Murphy
LaLota	Nehls
LaMalfa	Newhouse
Lamborn	Norman
Langworthy	Nunn (IA)
Latta	Obermolete
LaTurner	Ogles
Lawler	Owens
Lee (FL)	Palmer
Lesko	Pence
Letlow	Perry
Loudermilk	Pfuger
Lucas	Reschenthaler
Luetkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)
Luna	Rogers (AL)
Luttrell	Rogers (KY)
Mace	Rose
Malliotakis	Rosendale
Mann	Rouzer
Massie	Roy
Mast	Rutherford
McCarthy	Salazar
McCaul	Santos
McClain	Scalise
McClintock	Schweikert
McCormick	Scott, Austin
McHenry	Self
Meuser	

NAYS—204

Adams	Fletcher
Aguilar	Foster
Alfred	Foushee
Auchincloss	Frankel, Lois
Balint	Frost
Barragan	Gallego
Beatty	Garamendi
Bera	Garcia (IL)
Beyer	Garcia (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Garcia, Robert
Blunt Rochester	Golden (ME)
Bonamici	Goldman (NY)
Bowman	Gomez
Boyle (PA)	Gonzalez,
Brown	Vicente
Brownley	Gottheimer
Budzinski	Green, Al (TX)
Bush	Grijalva
Caraveo	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	Hayes
Cárdenas	Higgins (NY)
Carson	Himes
Carter (LA)	Horsford
Cartwright	Houlihan
Casar	Hoyer
Case	Hoyle (OR)
Casten	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Ivey
Cherfilus-	Jackson (IL)
McCormick	Jackson (NC)
Chu	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	Jacobs
Clark (MA)	Jayapal
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)
Cohen	Kamlager-Dove
Connolly	Kaptur
Correa	Keating
Courtney	Khanna
Craig	Kildee
Crockett	Kilmer
Crow	Kim (NJ)
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi
Davids (KS)	Kuster
Davis (IL)	Landsman
Davis (NC)	Larsen (WA)
Dean (PA)	Larson (CT)
DeGette	Lee (CA)
DeLauro	Lee (NV)
DelBene	Lee (PA)
Deluzio	Levin
DeSaulnier	Lieu
Dingell	Lofgren
Doggett	Lynch
Escobar	Magaziner
Eshoo	Manning
Espallat	Matsui
Evans	McBath

Sessions	Sorenson
Simpson	Soto
Smith (MO)	Spanberger
Smith (NE)	Stansbury
Smith (NJ)	Stanton
Smucker	Stevens
Spartz	Strickland
Stauber	Swalwell
Steel	Sykes
Stefanik	Takano
Steil	Thanedar
Steube	
Stewart	
Strong	
Tenney	
Thompson (PA)	
Tiffany	
Timmons	
Turner	
Valadao	
Van Drew	
Van Dуйne	
Possey	
Van Orden	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Waltz	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Wenstrup	
Westerman	
Williams (NY)	
Williams (TX)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Womack	
Yakym	
Zinke	

Sorenson	Thompson (CA)
Soto	Thompson (MS)
Spanberger	Titus
Stansbury	Tlaib
Stanton	Tokuda
Stevens	Tonko
Strickland	Torres (CA)
Swalwell	Torres (NY)
Sykes	Trahan
Takano	Trone
Thanedar	Vargas

Vasquez	Vasquez
Veasey	Veasey
Velázquez	Velázquez
Wasserman	Wasserman
Schultz	Schultz
Waters	Waters
Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman
Wexton	Wexton
Wild	Wild
Williams (GA)	Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (NC)	Cleaver	Leger Fernandez
Blumenauer	Cole	Moskowitz
Bucshon	Costa	Mullin
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Underwood

□ 1400

Messrs. GALLEGO, FOSTER, Mrs. HAYES, Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, TONKO, NADLER, CÁRDENAS, CASTEN, GOLDEN of Maine, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 146.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 205, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

AYES—218

Aderholt	Curtis	Griffith
Alford	D'Esposito	Grothman
Allen	Davidson	Guest
Amodei	De La Cruz	Guthrie
Armstrong	DesJarlais	Hageman
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Babin	Donalds	Harshbarger
Bacon	Duarte	Hern
Baird	Duncan	Higgins (LA)
Balderson	Dunn (FL)	Hill
Banks	Edwards	Hinson
Barr	Ellzey	Houchin
Bean (FL)	Emmer	Hudson
Bentz	Estes	Huizenga
Bergman	Ezell	Hunt
Bice	Fallon	Issa
Biggs	Feenstra	Jackson (TX)
Bilirakis	Ferguson	James
Boebert	Finstad	Johnson (LA)
Bost	Fischbach	Johnson (OH)
Brecheen	Fitzgerald	Johnson (SD)
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Buck	Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)
Burchett	Flood	Joyce (PA)
Burgess	Foxx	Kean (NJ)
Burlison	Franklin, C.	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Scott	Kelly (PA)
Cammack	Fry	Kiggans (VA)
Carey	Fulcher	Kiley
Carl	Gaetz	Kim (CA)
Carter (GA)	Gallagher	Kustoff
Carter (TX)	Garbarino	LaHood
Chavez-DeRemer	Garcia, Mike	LaLota
Ciscomani	Gimenez	LaMalfa
Cline	Gonzales, Tony	Lamborn
Cloud	Good (VA)	Langworthy
Clyde	Gooden (TX)	Latta
Cole	Gosar	LaTurner
Collins	Granger	Lawler
Comer	Graves (LA)	Lee (FL)
Crane	Graves (MO)	Lesko
Crawford	Green (TN)	Letlow
Crenshaw	Greene (GA)	Loudermilk

Lucas Norman
Luetkemeyer Nunn (IA)
Luna Obernolte
Luttrell Ogles
Mace Owens
Malliotakis Palmer
Mann Pence
Massie Perry
Mast Pfluger
McCarthy Posey
McCaul Reschenthaler
McClain Rodgers (WA)
McClintock Rogers (AL)
McCormick Rogers (KY)
McHenry Rose
Meuser Rosendale
Miller (IL) Rouzer
Miller (OH) Roy
Miller (WV) Rutherford
Miller-Meeks Salazar
Mills Santos
Molinaro Scalise
Moolenaar Schweikert
Mooney Scott, Austin
Moore (AL) Self
Moore (UT) Sessions
Moran Simpson
Murphy Smith (MO)
Nehls Smith (NE)
Newhouse Smith (NJ)

NOES—205

Adams Garcia, Robert
Aguilar Golden (ME)
Allred Goldman (NY)
Auchincloss Gomez
Balint Gonzalez,
Vicente
Barragan
Beatty Gottheimer
Bera Green, Al (TX)
Beyer Grijalva
Bishop (GA) Harder (CA)
Blunt Rochester Hayes
Bonamici Higgins (NY)
Bowman Himes
Boyle (PA) Horsford
Brown Houlihan
Brownley Hoyer
Budzinski Hoyle (OR)
Bush Huffman
Caraveo Ivey
Carbajal Jackson (IL)
Cárdenas Jackson (NC)
Carson Jackson Lee
Carter (LA) Jacobs
Cartwright Jayapal
Casar Jeffries
Case Johnson (GA)
Casten Kamlager-Dove
Castor (FL) Kaptur
Cherfilus-Keating
McCormick Khanna
Chu Kildee
Cicilline Kilmer
Clark (MA) Kim (NJ)
Clark (NY) Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn Kuster
Cohen Landsman
Connolly Larsen (WA)
Correa Larson (CT)
Courtney Lee (CA)
Craig Lee (NV)
Crockett Lee (PA)
Crow Levin
Cuellar Lieu
Davids (KS) Lofgren
Davis (IL) Lynch
Davis (NC) Magaziner
Dean (PA) Manning
DeGette Matsui
DeLauro McBath
DelBene McClellan
Deluzio McCollum
DeSaulnier McGarvey
Dingell McGovern
Doggett Meeks
Escobar Menendez
Eshoo Meng
Espallat Mfume
Evans Moore (WI)
Fletcher Morelle
Foster Moulton
Foushee Mrvan
Frankel, Lois Nadler
Frost Napolitano
Gallego Neal
Garamendi Neguse
Garcia (IL) Nickel
Garcia (TX) Norcross

Smucker Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foushee
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Feenstra
Ferguson
Brown
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford

NOT VOTING—12

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1408

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING APPROPRIATE RECOGNITION AND TREATMENT NEEDED TO ENHANCE RELATIONS WITH ASEAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 406) to provide for the treatment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act, and for other purposes on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 33, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—388

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Aubin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Banks
Barragan
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blunt
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Budzinski
Burgess
Burlison
Bush
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Casey
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stanzbury
Stanton
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—33

Biggs
Boebert
Brecheen
Burchett
Cline
Clyde
Collins
Crane
Davidson

Donalds	Jackson (TX)	Norman
Fallon	Lesko	Ogles
Good (VA)	Loudermilk	Perry
Gosar	Luna	Rosendale
Greene (GA)	Massie	Roy
Hageman	McCormick	Self
Harris	Miller (IL)	Steube
Higgins (LA)	Moore (AL)	Tiffany

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (NC)	Costa	Leger Fernandez
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Moskowitz
Bucshon	Edwards	Mullin
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Posey
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	

□ 1414

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 241 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1420

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation's public schools, with Mr. FLOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to recognize the profound importance of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act, and what it means for families across the country.

Over the past several years, parents witnessed the consequences of lessons

taught in classrooms firsthand. Math scores declined by the largest margin ever, and reading scores plummeted to the lowest levels in over three decades. These results are devastating.

Teachers' unions and education bureaucrats worked to push progressive politics in classrooms while keeping parents in the dark. The Parents Bill of Rights Act aims to end that and shine a light on what is happening in schools. This bill will reaffirm a parent's right to review course curriculum, meet with the child's teacher, and be heard at school board meetings without fear of reprisal.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem convinced Republicans are using this bill to punish teachers or push an extreme rightwing agenda. This is false.

Our education system is spiraling out of control as parents are pushed further outside the classroom. This bill will restore the role of parents in schools and provide new mechanisms to promote parent-teacher partnerships.

When parents are involved in their child's education, students thrive. That is the guiding principle of this bill. With the Parents Bill of Rights Act, Republicans will help parents steer the education of their children back onto the correct path where they can learn the skills they need for a lifetime of success.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5, the politics over parents act.

First, let me be clear. House Democrats believe parental engagement is central to student success. Parental engagement in schools is closely linked to better student behavior, higher academic achievement, and enhanced social skills.

Unfortunately, the politics over parents act does not take meaningful steps to increase or support parental engagement. In fact, it lists so-called rights and then declares that this allows the parents to control what is taught. Let's be clear: There is nothing in the bill to give parents the right to dictate what their children are taught.

Instead, this bill is one of many attempts by Republican politicians to give a vocal minority the power to try to impose their beliefs on all parents and students. This extreme education agenda has real consequences for students and educators.

According to PEN America, over 2,500 books were banned in schools during the school year 2021–2022, and nearly 140 additional book bans have taken effect since July 2022.

Let me just list some of the books that Republican politicians have gotten banned under the guise of parental rights: "Diary of a Young Girl," the stories of a Holocaust survivor, by Anne Frank; "The Kite Runner," a novel on the Soviet invasion of Afghan-

istan, by Khaled Hosseini; "Beloved," a novel about slaves during the Civil War, by Toni Morrison; and on and on. Books like that have been banned because of efforts like what we have before us today.

Let's be clear. These books are taught at age-appropriate levels. If you have a problem with it, you should call the librarian. Yet, Republican politicians are actually having them removed from classrooms and school libraries.

Simply put, the politics over parents act is an educational gag order across the Nation which will prevent students from learning and prevent teachers from teaching. These efforts seek to score political points and scare parents into thinking that schools do not have their best interests at heart. Instead, we should be talking about the support that schools and families actually need to improve parent-teacher engagement.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the politics over parents act and join House Democrats in an amendment in the nature of a substitute to deliver real solutions to build partnerships between schools and families.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LETLOW).

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Chair, I rise today to join my voice with millions of American parents as the House considers H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

H.R. 5 is about one simple and fundamental principle: Parents should always have a seat at the table when it comes to their child's education.

We believe that learning is a partnership between a family and their child's teachers. This bill is the vehicle by which we can put parents and educators together at the same table to have a productive dialogue.

This bill is not complex or complicated, nor should it be partisan or polarizing. Contrary to what you may hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is not an attack on our hardworking teachers, who will always be the heroes in my eyes. It is not an attempt to have Congress dictate the curriculum or determine the books in the library. Instead, this bill aims to bring more transparency and accountability to education, allowing parents to be informed and, when they have questions and concerns, to lawfully bring them to their local school boards.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen too many instances where rather than opening their doors to welcome parents in as partners, some schools instead slammed them shut and said that government bureaucrats know what is best for our children.

Parents across this country have overwhelmingly spoken out that they have had enough. They want a seat at the table because, at the end of the day, these are our children, not the government's.

Mr. Chair, I worked in education before I came to Congress, and I am also a mom. I have seen firsthand how when you educate a child, you give them a future.

We know that when parents are involved, it is the students who succeed. We also know that when a family is shut out of their child's education, it will lead to disastrous results.

□ 1430

Mr. Chair, let us give parents that voice in the learning process. Let schools open the doors and welcome them in as partners. Let us work together to build a brighter future for America's children.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member on the Higher Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 5. As an educator, I believe parent voices should be honored in schools. All educators believe this.

We know that this bill is not about that at all. We have always had parents involved in our schools, so stop being foolish and divisive. We always need their input.

This bill is nothing more than a talking point of the extreme MAGA agenda that will hurt children and hurt our schools. Let's face it—there has been a movement to eliminate public education since the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision.

With the election of our President 7 years ago, it pulled the scab of a wound that never healed. Now it is an open, gaping wound, and it is out of control. They are throwing everything at public schools but the kitchen sink: vouchers, excessive testing, poorly paid teachers, banning books, and now they are trying to drive a wedge and create an antagonistic relationship between schools and their parents. How pathetic. How dreadful.

Parents love teachers. Everybody loves teachers. Every parent has an "I love and remember a teacher" story. How disgraceful that we want to terrorize the very people who love our children, keep them safe, and educate them for over 8 hours daily. Our teachers are sacrificial lambs.

You will never eliminate public schools. We will fight you as long as it takes. This is all that the little children who look like me have. Public schools are the bedrock of this Nation.

Let me tell you what a parent's bill of rights should include. I will call it the parents' 10 commandments:

Thou shalt restore the Child Tax Credit; provide free, hot breakfast and lunch; provide free pre-K and free community college.

Thou shalt end the school-to-prison pipeline; put a nurse in every school; offer after-school activities; provide intensive counseling services, particularly to address school shootings.

Thou shalt offer parents the right to improve their education and job skills, love and respect every child's individuality, guarantee that every child's teacher will make a minimum of \$60,000 a year.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN), chair of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chair, should parents have the right to be involved in their child's education?

That is the question before us. Seventy-two percent of Americans have answered "yes" to that question. Parents should be and want to be involved in their child's education.

According to numerous studies, students who have involved parents have better behavior, better grades, better attendance, and develop a lifelong love of learning, which is the key to long-term success.

Today, American parents are fed up, largely because they have experienced 2 years of school closures, misguided COVID policies, disastrous remote learning, and a curriculum focused on what is woke rather than what is essential academic instruction. They have been branded "domestic terrorists" for speaking out at school boards. Some were even arrested for having the nerve to plead with school boards about the safety of their child at school.

Mr. Chair, it is time to re-welcome parents back into education. It is time for parents to have the right to know what is going on in American education today. That is why I—and I encourage everybody—to support H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act, critical legislation that empowers parents and prioritizes the needs of students over entrenched special interest groups.

Today, this body has an extraordinary opportunity to reclaim the moral high ground in America and usher in a newer era of K-12 education that empowers parents, protects kids, and expands educational freedom.

American parents have said they want to be a part of their children's education. It is time for this body to say "yes" and support parents.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the ranking member of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction of the bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5, which should be called the politics over parents act.

After spending 15 years as a very involved public school parent, I can say without hesitation that I strongly support parental involvement in education. You won't meet a Member on this side of the aisle that disagrees with that. The bill before us today misses the mark.

This could have been an opportunity to address the real challenges facing

education, to make changes that would involve parents in a constructive way, and also make a positive difference in education. I am disappointed that we aren't doing that.

House Democrats have shown time and time again that we are committed to providing all parents—including those who traditionally face barriers to engagement—with meaningful involvement in their kids' schools. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly clear that the Democratic Party is the party of parental rights and family values.

We have put forward a substantive plan that will actually increase the frequency, quality, and accessibility of parental involvement and engagement in schools; a substantive plan that invests in evidence-based models and support systems that have been shown to increase family engagement and improve student achievement; a substantive plan that encourages parents to be partners, not adversaries, in their children's education; a substantive plan that roots out discrimination based on race, disability, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, or gender identity in our public schools; a substantive plan that, unlike H.R. 5, doesn't carry dangerous, authoritarian undertones encouraging book bans, discouraging the teaching of scientifically and historically accurate curricula, and leading to the micromanagement of the work of educators.

We welcome a conversation about how to empower parents, and urge our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle to abandon their politically motivated attacks on schoolteachers and students. We should instead be working together on these issues in a bipartisan manner. Our Nation's students and families deserve that.

We need more parents, including those from diverse backgrounds, to feel included, supported, engaged, and welcomed at their kids' school. This bill does not even begin to do that.

I am leading more than 45 of our colleagues on a Bill of Rights for Students and Parents, a resolution that is supported by more than 250 education, civil rights, and parents' groups, including the National PTA.

I have heard colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that history will judge us on how we respond to the needs of students and families at this moment, and I agree with them.

Will we succumb to an extremist, discriminatory, narrow-minded, anti-public-education agenda, or will we work together to advance commonsense, meaningful policies that will support parents, students, and educators?

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to take the approach that still sees public education as the great equalizer for all students regardless of who they are or where they are from, essential to our communities, the economy, and our democratic Republic.

Please join me in rejecting this bill. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a statement from the National PTA in opposition to H.R. 5.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOBBY SCOTT: National PTA and our network of millions of parents and educators across the country urge you to support adoption of the Bonamici Substitute Amendment and oppose the underlying legislation, H.R. 5, on the House Floor tomorrow.

PTA opposes the underlying bill, H.R. 5, because it has the potential to cause significant harm to children and families. If passed as written, H.R. 5 could:

Prevent mental health support for students in need;

Limit access to learning-enhancing technology and educational materials;

Lead to inappropriate and harmful book bans and curriculum censorship;

Create confusion for school staff and burdensome opt-in requirements for families;

Impair relationships between educators and parents; and

Undermine efforts to create safe, welcoming, supportive, and inclusive learning environments for all students and families.

PTA supports Representative Bonamici's Substitute Amendment to H.R. 5 as the ONLY PATH forward to ensuring supports and services are in place for true family-school partnerships. We stand behind our National Standards for Family-School Partnerships that have been in place for over 20 years. The Substitute Amendment provides the opportunity for meaningful and inclusive family engagement in K-12 education and if adopted would replace the current H.R. 5 and enable our Nation's public schools to:

Create a parent coordinator position in public schools;

Reinforce existing parents' rights under federal law;

Prohibit the federal government from curriculum censorship and banning books; and

Invest in full-service community schools and Statewide Family Engagement Centers Program (the new authorization level of \$60 million would allow all states to participate).

As the Nation's oldest and largest child advocacy association, we know what meaningful family engagement looks like and what parents want from their policymakers. We ask you to join us in supporting the Bonamici Substitute Amendment and opposing the underlying bill, H.R. 5 on the House Floor. We thank you for consideration of this request and if you have any questions, please reach out to our Director of Government Affairs, Kate Clabaugh.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman's time has expired. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Was the gentlewoman's request to introduce a statement recognized?

The CHAIR. That request is covered under general leave.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the chair of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Parents Bill of Rights Act. This legislation is just one of many promises we intend to keep in our "Commitment to America."

As a recovering school board member, I know firsthand the importance of hearing from parents and encouraging

them to be engaged in their child's education.

The Parents Bill of Rights Act provides parents an expanded opportunity to engage with their children and the teachers who educate them. This bill implements clear, commonsense protections allowing parents to easily review curriculum information, academic standards, and see how schools are spending our tax dollars.

Parents deserve the right to be heard and should be able to raise concerns and address their school board without fear of harassment or retribution.

This bill includes simple protections to keep our children safe, from protecting their privacy to requiring parents to be notified of violent activity in the school.

As a graduate of the public school system and having raised three sons in the very same school district, I know parental involvement is critical to fostering a successful educational environment.

Mr. Chair, quite simply, this bill is common sense. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that ensures parents are at the center of their child's educational experience.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the politics over parents act as a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, as a member of the LGBTQ community, but above all, as a teacher.

I am an educator and I know how important parental involvement is. All parents, including the parents of LGBTQ kids, have rights. They have rights to send their children to schools where they will be affirmed, protected, and free from harassment, and given the opportunity to thrive. They have a right to be free from bullying and humiliation.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from a million MomsRising.

[Mar. 21, 2023]

SO-CALLED 'PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS' IS ALL WRONG FOR AMERICA'S MOMS, FAMILIES—A TOXIC PLAN THAT WILL CREATE MORE DIVISION, DAMAGE TO OUR KIDS AND COMMUNITIES

Statement of Kristin Rowe-Finkbeiner, Executive Director and CEO of MomsRising, the online and on-the-ground organization of more than one million mothers and their families, on the so-called 'Parents Bill of Rights' (H.R. 5) House Republicans are poised to pass this week:

"The badly misnamed 'Parents Bill of Rights' the House GOP plans to vote on this week is all wrong for America's moms, kids, families, and educators. It is a recipe for censorship, bullying and book bans, and for division based on race, sexual orientation, and gender identity, masquerading as a bill of rights. If it were to become law, the Parents Bill of Rights would create more division by pitting educators against parents. It would do enormous damage to our kids, schools and communities.

"America's moms want schools to be safe and inclusive and to value diversity; for par-

ents to be respectful; and for educators to be able to be honest about their identities and allowed to teach our country's truths, good and bad, and the values that got us to where we are today. We want our children to learn about the history and obstacles faced, and overcome, by members of our Black, Brown, AAPI, Native American, immigrant, religious-minority, LGBTQ+, and other communities. We want our students to be able to access unbiased health information. We want all our youth, regardless of income, disability, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and gender identity, to be safe and included in schools that prepare them to contribute to and succeed in our society.

"And we want a society that rejects 'us vs. them' and puts in place the caregiving and other supports that will allow all families to succeed. MomsRising has more than a million members and we have been working closely with moms in every state for more than a decade. What this country's moms want from Congress is affordable child, elder and disability care; paid family and medical leave; fair pay; health care and medications we can afford; vastly improved maternal health care for all of us; the ability to make our own decisions about if, when and how many children to have; and laws that will end the scourge of gun violence and keep our children, streets, schools and communities safe.

"Coming soon, we will release the Moms Rising for Freedom Agenda with ten key policies lawmakers should support that moms across the Nation really want, instead of the divisive and harmful policies in the 'Parents Bill of Rights.' That is how we build a society in which we can all flourish and thrive."

Mr. TAKANO. In committee, my Republican colleagues have preached about parents' God-given rights. I will tell you now that children have a God-given right not to be physically or emotionally harmed.

As a teacher, I know of instances where children were outed by staff, and as a consequence those children faced severe punishment at home. One student was viciously beaten by his father and transferred out of a district after his family was informed that he was caught being physically affectionate with another boy.

Imagine the situation in which educators are placed when government requires them to out their student to an unsupportive family. I will tell you what happens to those kids:

73 percent of LGBTQ youth report anxiety.

58 percent of them report depression.

40 percent of homeless youth are LGBTQ, and

46 percent, nearly half of them, have seriously considered suicide.

Good teachers care about their kids. Good teachers know that a relationship with parents is important. But when a home is not safe for LGBTQ kids, school becomes their safe place, and teachers need to be their cheerleaders, not their first bullies.

This bill forces good teachers to do bad things. It alienates students from their parents. It outs kids. It forces kids back into the closet. It is a fundamental invasion of privacy that puts children in danger.

In the first 3 months that this Congress has been in session, this is what

Republicans have chosen to spend our time and taxpayer dollars on. The so-called Parents Bill of Rights Act is the exact type of Big Government overreach my colleagues across the aisle proclaim they are against, and puts the cost of their pursuit of political gain on the backs of students and teachers.

This is worse than simply bad legislation. It is a concerted attack on children, parents, and teachers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the bill.

□ 1445

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act. I thank Representative LETLOW and Chair FOXX for their leadership in defending the God-given rights of parents and protecting kids as well.

Parental involvement in their children’s education is paramount to a student’s success. However, in recent years, we have seen a push by some to exclude parents from their children’s education. This is why I recently introduced the PROTECT Kids Act with Senator TIM SCOTT which has been included as an amendment to H.R. 5.

The PROTECT Kids Act would require any Department of Education-funded elementary or middle school to seek and acquire parental consent before changing their child’s pronouns or preferred name on any school form.

This provision is straightforward, common sense, and will safeguard the critical relationship between parents, schools, and children.

When a child goes on a field trip or fails a test, their parents are told and are often required to sign an acknowledgment or a permission slip.

Why should relatively small things require notification but something as significant as a child’s pronouns or a change in accommodations can be withheld from the people who raise and love them?

Recent polling shows this has the broad support of the American people. Three-quarters of Americans believe schools should be required to obtain consent from parents.

Parents have a fundamental right to raise and educate their children how they choose. We must pass the Parents Bill of Rights Act to help mitigate issues we have seen nationwide and to support parents who need the support to do right by their kids as well.

On this side of the aisle, we believe this is the right way to go, and we believe that in the end it will promote education, family, and individualism as well.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), who is a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, Congress should be supporting parents, students,

and teachers, not advancing this politics over parents act which would punish teachers for giving history lessons, ban books, and sow hate and divisiveness against trans kids.

Parents have the utmost confidence in their kids’ teachers. When it comes to writing curricula, 76 percent of parents trust their child’s school. But when it comes to writing laws, political gimmicks, like this bill, keep them from saying the same thing about this very body.

Instead of manufacturing outrage over curricula and books, why don’t we just listen?

Mr. Chairman, 84 percent of parents would rather Congress give free school meals, and 79 percent want support for mental health services. In a survey of parents’ top concerns by The Pew Charitable Trusts, 40 percent said they were extremely or very worried about their children struggling with depression, 35 percent said they were concerned about bullying, and 22 percent were worried about their kids being shot.

Not a single one of those issues on the top list of parental concerns is addressed in this bill. So don’t tell me this is a parents’ bill of rights. This is not addressing gun violence. It is not addressing mental health. It is not addressing childcare, pre-K, and all of the other things that would be a part of a parents’ bill of rights.

Instead, we are spending time on a bill that sows doubt about public education and our teachers and also targets our very vulnerable trans kids who are absolutely no threat to anyone in this body.

Please understand that the provisions in this bill that out trans kids are cruel and dangerous. I say that as a mom of a trans kid. I was very embracing to my daughter when she came out, but not every family is. The reality is that 75 percent of trans kids experience discrimination and harassment.

So why do Republicans want schools to require outing LGBTQ students?

That does not make them better students.

Congress has the constitutional authority to write laws. What a mockery and betrayal of that duty it would be to pass this stunt of a bill that doesn’t address a single priority of parents, bans books, undermines teachers, and hurts our kids.

Democrats are the party of parents and families. We reject this bill, and we commit to fighting for childcare, for universal pre-K, for a child tax credit, and for the ability of people to be free for who they are and express themselves.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD two letters. One is from the National Education Association, and one is from the American Federation of Teachers.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2023.
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 3 million members of the National Education

Association, dedicated and trusted professionals who teach and support nearly 50 million students in public schools across America, we urge you to vote NO on H.R. 5. Votes related to this bill, including extreme amendments that would create a national private school voucher program, may be included in the NEA Report Card for the 118th Congress.

H.R. 5 is unnecessary and ignores the partnerships that exist between parents and educators. Parents and guardians already have the right and the opportunity to partner with educators to ensure students have the learning opportunities, resources, and support for success. Across America, parents are strategizing with educators when children face hurdles and celebrating with them when students achieve milestones, volunteering at events, chaperoning field trips, leading PTAs, mentoring students, and actively engaging in many other ways with students and educators.

In a recent Gallup poll, 80 percent of parents with children in public K–12 schools said they were satisfied with their children’s education. Instead of building on what exists, H.R. 5 would stoke racial and social animosity. Instead of bringing us together to focus on what will really help students—an inspiring, inclusive, and age-appropriate curriculum that prepares them for the future in schools that are safe from gun violence—H.R. 5 would encourage parents to view educators as the enemy. This us-versus-them mindset hurts students, disregards educators’ professionalism, and diverts our attention from a basic American value: All students—no matter their race, ZIP Code, gender orientation, sexual identity, or background—deserve the support, tools, and opportunity to learn and succeed.

H.R. 5 dismisses educators’ education, experience, and dedication.

The legislation tells educators that, despite their expertise, they cannot be trusted to determine what materials are appropriate for learning, design curricula that are age-appropriate and meet students’ needs, or ascertain students’ progress. This will only exacerbate an educator shortage that, from small towns to major cities, is now a five-alarm fire. In an NEA survey last year, 55 percent of educators said they are ready to leave the profession they love earlier than planned. Congress should not pass laws that will accelerate this trend.

H.R. 5 will exacerbate book banning and censorship.

The legislation’s library requirements, including the mandate that school libraries maintain online catalogs that are available to parents and students, are redundant; this is already standard practice. The real aim of the legislation is to elevate the voices and power of a few who wish to foist their ideas about what should be read and taught onto other people’s children. This is already leading to shocking outcomes.

The PEN America Index of School Book Bans lists more than 2,500 instances of book bans across the country from June 2021–June 2022, affecting more than 1,600 titles. Affected books are most often those that look honestly at history and the difficult events that have shaped America, or tell stories of the struggle for self-acceptance in hostile or oppressive circumstances. The banned or censored books include:

Maus, by Art Spiegelman, a graphic novel depicting the experience of the author’s father, a Holocaust survivor;

Walk Two Moons, by Sharon Creech, about a girl of Native-American heritage coping with the disappearance of her mother;

The Bluest Eye, by Nobel Laureate Toni Morrison, about a young African American girl’s struggle to appreciate her humanity in a culture that devalues her; and

Separate is Never Equal: Sylvia Mendez and her Family's Fight for Desegregation, by Duncan Tonatiuh, about a family's efforts to desegregate California schools.

We cannot prepare young people to succeed in our diverse Nation and interconnected world by removing books from library shelves and curricula. We prepare them for the future by planting the seeds for lifelong curiosity and growth.

H.R. 5 will impose several unfunded mandates on already overburdened schools and school districts.

Committee-passed amendments to H.R. 5 include one that would require a "review period," occurring at least every three weeks for a minimum of three school days at a time, during which parents could review any materials to be used in the next three weeks, or that had been used in the past. Districts would be required to find the money, and the time, for this mandate within budgets and school days that are already stretched thin.

H.R. 5 suggests the federal government should be a national school board.

The bill would undermine local control and educators' autonomy to do their jobs by inserting the federal government as a national school board. In fact, the legislation actually undermines the stated goal of H.R. 5. By utilizing the federal government to pave the way for influencing what books should be part of the curriculum and in libraries, H.R. 5 suppresses the voices of many parents and local communities that want their children to receive an honest and accurate education.

While we urge a NO vote on H.R. 5, we support any amendments that highlight the many real needs schools face, including those that: provide more resources for school counselors and parent engagement; ensure books remain available for any student who wants to read them; highlight H.R. 5's true costs to local schools and ensure those costs are not passed on to already resource-deprived schools; and remove extraneous requirements.

We ask you to vote YES on the following amendments:

No. 1 by Rep. Bacon (No. 52 in Rules): Requires Local Education Agencies to provide parents of a student in elementary or secondary school with the number of school counselors in the school;

No. 5 by Rep. Bonamici (No. 40 in Rules): Replaces H.R. 5 with new language regarding: public education and parents' rights to access to public schools; creation of a parent coordinator position in public schools; increased funding authorization for Full-Service Community Schools; increased funding authorization for Statewide Family Engagement Centers; and establishing rules that prohibit bans on books and curricular materials.

No. 8 by Rep. Fitzpatrick (No. 2 in Rules): Requires a GAO report on the cost of H.R. 5's requirements to State Education Agencies, Local Education Agencies, and schools.

No. 9 by Reps. Garbarino and D'Esposito (No. 37 in Rules): Provides that nothing in H.R. 5 or its amendments be construed as authorizing parents to deny any student who is not their own child from accessing any books or other reading materials otherwise available in the school library.

No. 12 by Rep. Jacobs (No. 4 in Rules): Strikes "at no cost" in the bill to ensure that some requirements in H.R. 5 do not fall on overburdened schools that already lack sufficient resources to meet the needs of students.

No. 13 by Rep. Jacobs (No. 6 in Rules): Strikes the provisions relating to reviewing professional development materials in sections 104 and 202.

We oppose amendments that target transgender youth, eradicate inclusive cur-

ricula, potentially open our public schools to frivolous lawsuits, create a national private school voucher program, and eliminate the U.S. Department of Education.

We ask you to vote NO on the following amendments:

No. 2 by Rep. Foxx (No. 45 in Rules): Manager's amendment to the bill that also directs courts to use the strict scrutiny test to evaluate laws involving parents' rights.

No. 3 by Rep. Boebert (No. 46 in Rules): Targets already vulnerable transgender youth by amending Section 104 to include Parent's Right to Know if their child's school operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities to permit a person whose biological sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for women or girls.

No. 4 by Rep. Boebert (No. 47 in Rules): Targets already vulnerable transgender youth by amending Section 104 to include Parent's Right to Know if their child's school allows a person whose biological sex is male to use restrooms or changing rooms designated for women or girls.

No. 6 by Rep. Crane (No. 54 in Rules): Adds a private right of action for parents beyond current law that may lead to more frequent lawsuits, costing taxpayers more.

No. 11 by Rep. Hunt (No. 44 in Rules): Adds a provision that targets diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in schools.

No. 15 by Reps. Massie, Boebert, Gaetz, and Self (No. 7 in Rules): Adds a sense of Congress that the authority of the Department of Education and the Secretary of Education to operate or administer any office or program related to elementary or secondary education should be terminated on or before December 31, 2023.

No. 19 by Rep. Roy (No. 57 in Rules): Creates a national private school voucher program, decimating Title I and taking public funds out of public schools to boost private schools that are not held to any of the requirements included in the underlying bill.

No. 20 by Rep. Roy (No. 61 in Rules): Makes all funds available under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 block grants, which will lead to cuts to key programs serving students.

Educators are devoted to partnering with parents to discover students' interests and unlock their potential. We urge Congress to avoid spending time on divisive issues that do not contribute to student success. Instead, please focus on getting students the individualized support they need, keeping guns out of schools, and addressing educator shortages. If Congress joins with parents and educators, we can support learning by ensuring that students across our great Nation—no matter their race, background, sexual orientation, or gender identity—have the resources, one-on-one attention, and well-rounded curricula they need and deserve. Please vote NO on H.R. 5.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,

*Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
*Washington, DC, March 23, 2023.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I write to express our views on H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Educators know that involving parents in their children's education is essential to student success. We need parent and family engagement, and we welcome Republicans' desire to be engaged in strengthening parents' involvement in schools. We have fought for parental engagement for generations, mostly

on a classroom, school and district level, where the connection between parents and educators—the most important adults in students' lives—is real. But we must do it right; we can't make this work conditional on measures that will hurt kids, hurt parents who disagree with these conditions, or heap unnecessary burdens on educators' already-overflowing plates. We must listen when teachers and parents tell us what will actually help them, but we must also ensure we don't make it harder for teachers to teach and students to learn.

The Parents Bill of Rights Act gets an A for branding, but some of its provisions are genuinely concerning. The bill fails to acknowledge what is already widespread practice in schools—teachers collaborating with parents and families every day to meet the needs of kids and their communities. While it is great to reaffirm current law and practice encouraging parental involvement in schools, why not build on what Congress has already enacted, on a mostly bipartisan basis, by considering what families need and what educators need to support families. We embrace the desire of both Democrats and Republicans to strengthen parental engagement. And we encourage our representatives to spend more time in the classroom with our members to see all the ways we engage parents and where we could use support in helping our kids succeed.

We are concerned about aspects of H.R. 5 that would require schools to divert their limited resources from teaching kids and open avenues for bad actors to censor education, ban books and harm children who are just trying to be themselves and live their lives in peace. That is why we support Rep. Suzanne Bonamici's substitute amendment (No. 40) and urge its adoption by the full House. This amendment keeps some of the positive aspects of H.R. 5, and it amends the parts that would hurt our most vulnerable students and make educators' jobs harder, replacing them with measures that would invest in and support student learning, a goal Democrats and Republicans can all get behind.

The Bonamici amendment proposes a real pathway to improving parental engagement by calling for parent coordinators and increasing funding for family engagement centers and community schools. It also removes parts of the bill that would harm kids, eliminating measures that would target trans kids and restrict the teaching of Black history; Latino history; Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander history; LGBTQIA+ history; women's history; Native American history; and the history of the Holocaust or antisemitism. And it would ban book bans, putting decisions about who is allowed to read certain books in the hands of parents, not the government. This would ensure that parents who want their children to have access to books have the same rights as parents who don't want their children reading particular books.

While we are pleased that the Rules Committee provides for consideration of the Bonamici substitute, it is disappointing that the final rule does not allow for consideration of other important amendments to H.R. 5 focusing on what our students need, such as:

Providing parents with more leave so they can attend parent-teacher conferences and school events;

Increasing students' access to mental health professionals;

Enacting gun safety measures that keep our kids safe and protect parents from the unimaginable;

Supporting increasing starting teachers' pay to \$60,000 a year, so we can start addressing the teacher shortage;

Increasing funding to support our most vulnerable schools and students;

Helping school districts recruit and train diverse teachers to alleviate the teacher shortage; and

Increasing students' access to healthy meals.

We will outline our positions on the amendments made in order in a subsequent message to the full House later today.

We want to ensure any action Congress takes supports, not undermines, the capacity of schools and educators to fulfill their responsibilities. And that is what parents and voters want too. Our recent polling demonstrates clearly that voters overwhelmingly reject the increasing polarization and division in schools. Instead, voters favor solutions like investing in public schools and providing educators with the resources they need to create safe and welcoming environments; boosting academic skills; and paving pathways to career, college and beyond.

We are glad Republicans are thinking about parents and want to address the issues keeping them up at night, but H.R. 5 fails to deliver on what parents want and kids need to succeed. Our students and their families face new and emerging challenges that the House should be focusing on today, working to advance solutions that protect our Nation's students, value our parents and support our educators. Unfortunately, H.R. 5 does not meet that standard, and, at a minimum, it must be amended to include the Bonamici substitute.

Thank you for considering our views on these issues.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,

President, American Federation of Teachers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), who is the vice chair of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairwoman FOXX for yielding, and I thank my Republican colleagues for taking up this very important bill.

Mr. Chair, there has been a push by powerful teachers' unions, leftwing politicians, and, most concerning, the Biden Justice Department to silence parents throughout our country. The Biden administration used the FBI—the most powerful law enforcement agency in the world—to intimidate parents for showing up to school board meetings to oppose Biden's radical agenda.

Parents' rights are nonnegotiable. Parents are the decisionmakers for their child's education, which includes their child's curriculum. Parents want schools focused on reading, writing, and math, not woke politics.

The radical left in our country seeks to silence parents and use public schools and colleges to indoctrinate our youth. They don't want to teach children how to think. They want to teach them what to think.

I am grateful that several of my bills are included in the Parents Bill of Rights Act to protect children from radical gender ideology and to ensure parents are informed when information is being collected about their children through surveys or documents.

Parents have the right to know what is being taught to their child, and they

have the right to opt their child out of any discussion about sexual orientation and gender ideology.

Mr. Chair, I am proud House Republicans are keeping our commitment to fight for parental rights, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida, (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5. I rise in opposition to someone who has actually been a student in our public school system within the last decade. I rise as someone who is the son of a public school educator, special education teacher of 37 years—love you, Mom. I also rise as someone who sat on my local school board for 2 years as a student representative.

This bill is modeled after one that I know very well—Florida's Parental Rights in Education law. Most of us know it as "Don't Say Gay." "Don't Say Gay" infringes on parents' rights, including LGBTQ+ and supportive parents.

Bills like this make schools more hostile, and make no mistake, it results in hate, bigotry, and, yes, sometimes death of our students in schools.

Republican lawmakers won't even allow my amendment to be considered that protects the First Amendment rights of parents. We want to talk about parental rights. What about their First Amendment right to fight for their children, LGBTQ+ children, who are fighting for gender-affirming and life-saving care?

One of my colleagues brought this up, but this bill focuses on parents' rights, but what about the rights of our students? What about the rights of our young people? Why are my Republican colleagues not advocating for our students? Is it because they know that the majority of young people despise legislation like this and do not support legislation like this that is bigoted?

Is it because this generation is the most progressive generation this country has ever seen because they want a world where everybody can succeed, where we see the world through the eyes of the most vulnerable?

See, the party is branded on freedom and liberty, but what about the freedom and liberties of young people and students who actually sit in the classroom?

I mean, if Republican lawmakers cared so much about what is happening in our schools, they would focus on feeding kids so we can ensure that everyone can learn on a full stomach.

If Republican lawmakers cared so much about what is happening in our schools, they would make sure that students have updated technology, teachers have the resources they need so students can actually learn.

If Republican lawmakers cared so much about what is happening in schools, what about the kids who are gunned down in their classrooms? The leading cause of death for young people in this country is gun violence.

None of that is in this bill. This bill is just a vehicle for hate and political nonsense, pushing a chosen wedge issue. It is not about policy; it is about politics. It is not about freedom and liberty. It is about the fear of a problem that doesn't exist.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state the obvious: There is no room for woke ideologies, sexualization of our children, and CRT in our classrooms.

The legislation before us makes a few things clear, but the main point is this: Parents' rights matter. American citizens rose up and demanded a seat at the table when it comes to their child's education and curriculum, and they did that by electing a GOP majority in the House.

I thank our leadership for bringing this legislation to the floor, and as a father, I want to make it a priority that we state that parents can and should protect their children. This bill ensures parents have a voice. It is time to show the American people we stand with parents, not educational bureaucrats who want to restrict our understanding and visibility of the issues.

These parents are not to be labeled as domestic terrorists. They are proud parents who want their children to succeed and not to be indoctrinated.

Mr. Chair, I stand in great support of H.R. 5.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding, and I include in the RECORD a letter from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,

Washington, DC, March 23, 2023.

SUPPORT THE RIGHTS OF ALL STUDENTS AND PARENTS SUPPORT H. RES. 219, OPPOSE H.R. 5

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 230 national organizations to promote and protect the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, and the 228 undersigned organizations, we urge you to support the rights and inclusion of all students and parents in our public school system by supporting H.Res. 219, the Bill of Rights for Students and Parents, and opposing H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act. As the civil and human rights community, we have fought for more than 100 years for the rights of all students and parents to attend and be fully included in well-resourced public schools that prepare them for their futures. The Bill of Rights for Students and Parents sets forth a vision respecting and honoring the dignity and worth of every child—a vision supported by the overwhelming majority of parents in the country. In contrast, H.R. 5 seeks to undermine the relationship between parents and teachers, to facilitate book banning, and to make our most marginalized children less safe.

During this time in which proponents of discrimination and exclusion are creating

policies and legislation to harm students and undermine the learning environment for everyone, support for developing supportive, inclusive, safe, and responsive public schools could not be more important. In a recent national survey, 80 percent or more of parents said that it was very or extremely important that their child be honest, ethical, hard-working, helpful to those in need, and accepting of people who are different from them. It is these parental values that are reflected in H.Res. 219. No matter our color, background, or zip code, we want our kids to have an education that imparts honesty about who we are, integrity in how we treat others, and courage to do what's right.

Similarly, 80 percent of parents want to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves. H.Res. 219 recognizes this near-universal view that censorship and book banning "undermine the education of all students, take choices away from all students and their families, and limit the opportunities of parents, families, and children to access an education and think critically about the world around them."

H.R. 5 seeks to create detrimental harm to our most marginalized children, erase the complicated and difficult history of our Nation, and damage parent and teacher relationships. Instead of promoting the values and priorities that the overwhelming majority of parents from all backgrounds and neighborhoods share, the bill would undermine important public health and child well-being data by effectively eliminating anonymous surveys of students; would harm those most vulnerable LGBTQ+ youth who are unable to come out to even their own parents by forcibly outing them, would embolden a small group of activists who are using book bans to selectively stamp out the perspectives of Black people, LGBTQ+ people, and other historically marginalized groups, and would bog schools down with reporting and commenting requirements that bear no relationship to proven parent and family engagement practices.

We ask that you strongly support H.Res. 219, strongly oppose H.R. 5, and reject attacks on the rights of all students and parents to attend and be fully included in well-resourced public schools that prepare them for their futures. If you have any questions, please reach out to Liz King, senior program director at The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

Sincerely,

National (133): The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; A Way Home America; AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education); Act To Change; Advocacy Institute; Advocates for Youth; All4Ed; American Association of University Women; American Atheists; American Civil Liberties Union; American Humanist Association; American School Counselor Association; Apiary for Practical Support; Arab American Institute (AAI); Asian Americans Advancing Justice I AAJJ; Athlete Ally; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Bend the Arc; Jewish Action.

Campaign for Our Shared Future; Campus Pride; Care in Action; Catholics for Choice; Center for American Progress; Center for Applied Transgender Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for LGBTQ Economic Advancement & Research (CLEAR); CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers; Collective Power for Reproductive Justice; Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; EducateUS; SIECUS In Action; Education Leaders of Color (EdLoC);

Education Reform Now; Empowering Pacific Islander Communities; End Rape On Campus; Equal Rights Advocates.

Equality Federation; Equity Forward; Evaluation, Data Integration, and Technical Assistance (EDIT) Program; Family Equality; Feminist Campus; Fenway Institute; First Focus Campaign for Children; FORGE, Inc.; Girls Inc.; GLAAD; GLBTQ Legal Advocates and Defenders (GLAD); GLSEN; Grandmothers for Reproductive Rights; Hindu American Foundation; Hispanic Federation; Houston Area Urban League; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights First; If/When/How; Lawyering for Reproductive Justice; Impact Fund.

In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Indivisible; interACT: Advocates for Intersex Youth; Interfaith Alliance; Japanese American Citizens League; Juvenile Law Center; KIPP Public Schools; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; Lambda Legal; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Lawyers for Good Government; League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); Matthew Shepard Foundation; MomsRising; Movement Advancement Project; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Association of School Psychologists; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Learning Disabilities.

National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Parent Leadership, Advocacy, and Community Empowerment (National PLACE); National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center for Youth Law; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans; National Disability Rights Network (NDRN); National Domestic Workers Alliance; National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Hispanic Media Coalition; National LGBT Cancer Network; National Organization for Women; National Urban League; National Women's Law Center; New American Leaders Action Fund; New Generation Equity; Oregonizers; People For the American Way; PFLAG National; Physicians for Reproductive Health.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Plume Health; Public Advocacy for Kids (PAK); Public Citizen; Public Justice; Red Wine & Blue; Reproductive Rights Coalition; School Board Partners; Sexual Violence Prevention Association (SVPA); SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change; Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF); SPAN Parent Advocacy Network; SPLC Action Fund; Stand for Children; Tahirih Justice Center; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Arc of the United States; The Education Trust; The Personal Stories Project; The Sikh Coalition.

The Workers Circle; TransAthlete; True Colors United; Trust Women; UnidosUS; Unitarian Universalist Association; United State of Women (USOW); URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; VoteProChoice; Voto Latino; Wayfinder Foundation; We Testify; Whole Woman's Health; Whole Woman's Health Alliance; Woodhull Freedom Foundation; YWCA USA.

State/Local (96): A Woman's Choice of Charlotte; A Woman's Choice of Greensboro; A Woman's Choice of Jacksonville; A Woman's Choice of Raleigh; Acadiana Queer Collective; Aces NYC; Action Together New Jersey; African American Office of Gay Concerns; AIDS Foundation Chicago; Alliance for Quality Education; Arkansas Black Gay Men's Forum; Avow Texas; Bans Off Miami; Black Californians United for Early Care and Education; Carolina for All; Central Florida Jobs with Justice; Chicago Abortion Fund; Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights; Cobalt.

Democrats for Education Reform DC (DFER DC); Democrats for Education Reform Massachusetts; Democrats for Education Reform New York; Detroit Disability Power; DFER Colorado; Disability Law Center; Donald Patton; Dutchess County Progressive Action Alliance; Education Reform Now; Education Reform Now CT; Education Reform Now Texas; Equality California; Equality Illinois; Equality South Dakota; Equality Virginia; Equality Maine; Faces of Fallen Fathers; FL National Organization for Women; Florida Council of Churches; Florida Health Justice Project.

Forever Caring Evonné; Gender Justice; GLSEN New Mexico; Greater Milwaukee Urban League; Greater Orlando National Organization for Women; Illinois Families for Public Schools; Independent Voters of Illinois-Independent Precinct Organization; Indivisible DuPage; Indivisible Georgia Coalition; Indivisible Miami; Jane's Due Process; JASMYN, Inc.; Lafayette Citizens Against Censorship; Latino Memphis; Learning Rights Law Center; Los Angeles LGBT Center; Louisiana Citizens Against Censorship; Louisiana Coalition for Reproductive Freedom; Louisiana Progress; Louisiana Trans Advocates.

Maine Parent Federation; Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition; Mazzoni Center; Memphis Urban League; Michigan Alliance for Special Education; Michigan Education Justice Coalition; Missouri Health Care for All; NASD; National Council of Jewish Women St. Louis; NJ Community Schools Coalition; North Carolina Justice Center; OutFront Minnesota; OutNebraska; Parent Education Organizing Council; Paterson Alliance; Paterson Education Foundation; PAVE (Parents Amplifying Voices in Education); Pride Action Tank; Pro Choice Missouri; Pro-Choice North Carolina.

Progress Florida; Queer Northshore; Rad Family, a project of North Jersey Pride; Reproductive Freedom Acadiana; Save Our Schools NJ; SHERo Mississippi; Silver State Equality-Nevada; Solid Foundation Youth Outreach; Southern Echo Inc.; St. Tammany Library Alliance; The Ezekiel Project; The Parents' Place of MD; The Urban League of Philadelphia; The Womxn Project; Urban League of Greater Pittsburgh; Urban League of Middle Tennessee; Virginia Coalition of Latino Organizations.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am the proud mom of three. Altogether, I have 36 cumulative school years under my belt, and I served on a school board for 6 of those fighting for parents and for kids.

I speak from experience when I call on this Chamber to oppose the GOP's politics over parents act. Once again, the majority is showing us how out of touch they are with American families. They are obsessed with wokeism, even as they struggle to define what that even means, but let me tell you, parents in this country are wide awake.

They wake up every day and do the best they can to provide for their families. They wake up and they want great schools where every single child can learn and excel. Parents want affordable childcare. They know that is the beginning of a great education. Right now parents are spending nearly a quarter of their family budget on childcare and that is when they can find it at all.

Congress had a chance to cut those costs for families. Every single House

Republican voted no. That is politics over parents. Parents know that building a better future means teaching our country's history. They know we have to address our teacher shortage, but demonizing educators, banning books like "To Kill a Mockingbird," that is politics over parents.

Parents know that taking care of a sick child shouldn't cost them their paychecks. They should not have to send that child to school sick because they don't have paid leave. The United States remains one of the only developed countries in the world without paid family leave. Every single House Republican voted against this basic benefit. That is politics over parents.

Moms and dads want schools and communities to be safe. They do not want their children shot while they are in school. Just yesterday, Denver families faced the horror of yet another school shooting. House Republicans refuse to enact commonsense reforms. Why? Politics over parents.

How about something as basic as feeding our children? Nope. House Republicans voted against the child tax credit. They voted to slash food stamps and eliminate free school lunches. Once again, politics over parents.

Then there is the shameless hypocrisy of talking about parents' rights as the GOP strips away American's rights to decide if and when they are going to have children.

At every turn, House Republicans have undermined the rights, freedom, and well-being of our Nation's families. Let's say "yes" to parents and "no" to this shameful bill.

□ 1500

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, it is interesting what we hear from the other side of the aisle. I will have to depart from my prepared text to comment on what we are hearing.

I always come back to what was once put on the Black Lives Matter website, that they wanted to get rid of the Western-prescribed nuclear family.

There is this hostility to traditional values that is seeping into the public schools today. We recently read a poll showing that over 60 percent of people in the baby boom generation are proud to be American, whereas people under 25 are no longer proud to be American.

Where do they get this? They get this because some members of the schools—too many; and you can hear it from that side of the aisle—are obsessed with racism. This in such an open country. People are coming here from all over the world. You would have to be blind to think that racism is a huge problem here.

Their obsession over racism, the obsession over LGBTQ, their hostility to guns are all things that are pounding, pounding, pounding out of that side of the aisle, and we don't like our kids having to pick up on that.

When parents do show up, we have now found out that the FBI may become involved. They are so scared to death of parents sticking their noses into their own children's business.

Our country was made for a moral and religious people. Instead, the other side wants us to become a progressive group of people, whatever progressive stands for. I would have to say it is hostility to religion and an ever-growing government where the government is more and more responsible for everything in society.

Particularly in an age in which elected officials apparently side with the FBI getting involved with parents who stick their noses in their children's lives, it is vital that we pass a bill today clarifying that parents do have the right to get involved in their children's education, and it doesn't matter what the President orders or allows his FBI to do.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I think what we are seeing here today is the Republican Party's attempt to take some of the most heinous legislation that we are seeing passed on the State level to attack our trans and LGBT, as well as people from marginalized communities' right to exist in schools.

This flowery language of "parental rights and freedom" hides the sinister fact of this legislative text. If you notice in these arguments, they are not really discussing what is actually in this legislation.

It includes two provisions that require schools to out trans, nonbinary, and LGBT youth even if it would put said youth in harm's way.

One of the highest rates of youth homelessness is in the LGBT community, from parents who want to kick their children out in households that may be unstable or abusive. For so many children of abuse, school is their only safe place to be.

Before they claim that this is not about banning books and not about harming the LGBT community, let's just look at the impacts of similar Republican legislation that has already passed on the State level.

Look at these books that have already been banned due to Republican measures: "The Life of Rosa Parks"; this apparently is too woke by the Republican Party. "Song of Solomon" is unacceptable to Republican politics. Forty percent of banned books reported are significantly addressing and specifically addressing LGBT issues.

To say and talk about government reach and freedom, this Republican bill is asking the government to force the outing of LGBT people before they are ready.

Talking about the rights of parents, the National Parents Union is here in this gallery today saying: Don't do this.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter where the National Parents Union is asking the Republican Party to: "Keep culture wars out of classrooms. Our children need urgent and aggressive educational solutions. . . ."

THE NATIONAL PARENTS UNION ISSUES STATEMENT CONCERNING THE INTRODUCTION OF THE PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS BY CHAIR FOXX, SPEAKER MCCARTHY, AND HOUSE GOP

March 1, 2023—Boston, MA—The National Parents Union, released a statement following a press conference spearheaded by the Workforce Committee Chair Virginia Foxx, Speaker Kevin McCarthy, and members of the House Republican Conference:

Today, Chairwoman Foxx, of the House of Representatives Education and Workforce Committee, released a new bill that claims to be a Parents Bill of Rights. A true Parents Bill of Rights can only be developed following an extensive process that includes bringing together a broad spectrum of parents representing every intersectionality of the modern American family.

Nowhere in this Parents Bill of Rights does it guarantee parents that their student will have access to a high quality education that prepares them for a life of opportunity. In fact, this faux Bill of Rights glosses over the issues identified as the most important issues facing our children: school safety, the mental health crisis impacting students, and aggressively focusing on addressing the academic challenges that have the potential to hinder our children from achieving economic mobility and competing for the jobs of the future.

This bill has nothing to do with parent rights and everything to do with the radical culture wars that serve as a distraction from what our students' really need to recover from the pandemic. This bill would lead to more education bans, which takes books off classroom shelves and will therefore limit access to education for millions of kids across the country. From national polling we know that the top priorities identified by the vast majority of families are the safety of their children while at school and the urgent need for mental health supports. This bill fails to address either issue and therefore is clearly not intended for the millions of families who have been demanding leadership from federal, state and local lawmakers.

There are ways to write a Parents Bill of Rights in a way that guarantees student progress and addresses the crises that our schools and families face across the country. This is not that.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the American Library Association coming out against this Republican proposal.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,

March 16, 2023.

Re H.R. 5, "Parents Bill of Rights Act"—OP-POSE.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND LEADER JEFFRIES: The American Library Association ("ALA") writes to express our opposition to certain provisions of H.R. 5 ("Parents Bill of Rights Act") and to urge a NO vote on H.R. 5.

Unquestionably, parents should have a voice in their child's education. However, we must oppose H.R. S's school library provisions, which ironically would lead to more

government interference in family decisions regarding voluntary reading. These provisions:

- Are unnecessary and unwarranted;
- Would create a catalyst for more book banning and censorship; and
- Would create unfunded federal mandates and regulation where none are needed, at the cost of educating students.

This letter explains each of these concerns below and provides background information about school libraries and an analysis of the bill's school library provisions.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES ARE ESSENTIAL TO EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, 88 percent of all public schools had a school library in 2020-21. School libraries and librarians play essential roles in promoting educational achievement, including by fostering a love of reading which encourages students' development of key literacy skills. School libraries offer a variety of age-appropriate materials for voluntary reading, which is central to helping students discover the joy of reading. School library collections are typically overseen by school librarians who hold a Master's in Library Science or comparable degree from an ALA-accredited graduate program, and who in many states are required to hold a state certification. Library collections are developed in accordance with professional standards, the school's collection development and reconsideration policies, and the requirements of applicable law, including the U.S. Constitution.

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 5'S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS

The following provisions, as contained in Rules Committee Print 118-2, would impose new federal requirements on local school libraries.

Section 104 would require local educational agencies that receive funding under federal Education Department programs to notify parents that they have the right to a "list of the books and other reading materials contained in the library of their child's school" and to "inspect such books or other reading materials," and to provide parents with such list and opportunity to inspect such materials at the beginning of each school year.

Section 202 would require local educational agencies that receive funding under federal Education Department programs to make available for inspection by parents "any books or other reading materials made available to students in such school or through the school library of such school," and to adopt a policy providing for such inspection upon the request of the parent.

Section 202 also contains reporting provisions, which would require:

Local educational agencies that receive funding under federal Education Department programs to annually "report to the State educational agency any enforcement actions or investigations carried out for the preceding school year to ensure compliance with this section" and to "publish such information on its website;"

State educational agencies, in turn, to annually report information received from local educational agencies to the federal Education Department, as well as "a description of the enforcement actions the State educational agency took to ensure parents' rights were protected;" and

The federal Secretary of Education to annually report information received from states to Congress, along with "a description of the enforcement actions taken by the Secretary [. . .] to ensure full compliance."

Finally, Section 202 directs the Secretary to "take such action as the Secretary determines appropriate to enforce this section;"

including the authority to terminate federal funding "if the Secretary determines that there has been a failure to comply with such section, and compliance with such section cannot be secured by voluntary means."

The bill would not provide funding to implement these requirements.

THE BILL'S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS ARE UNNECESSARY AND UNWARRANTED

The bill's school library provisions appear to be a solution in search of a problem. We are not aware of any situations where parents were not allowed access to the school library's catalog or materials. It is standard practice in today's school libraries to maintain online catalogs of their library materials and make such catalogs available to parents and students. School librarians welcome the opportunity to engage with parents in support of the student's education and fostering a love of reading. That is precisely why school libraries exist, and why school librarians have chosen their profession.

Furthermore, these provisions are unwarranted. As described above, school libraries provide access to a variety of age-appropriate materials. Notably, these are not mandatory instructional materials, but voluntary choices for student-directed reading. If a student isn't interested in a particular book, they can simply choose another book.

THE BILL'S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS WOULD CREATE A CATALYST FOR MORE BOOK BANNING AND CENSORSHIP

We are very concerned about the potential negative unintended consequences of book banning and censorship of viewpoints if these federal requirements are imposed on local schools.

The federal government should not dictate which materials local school libraries can or cannot offer. Indeed, current federal law prohibits the Education Department from exercising "any direction, supervision, or control [. . .] over the selection or content of library resources" by local schools (20 U.S.C. 3403(b)). However, the school library provisions of H.R. 5 would expand federal involvement in that quintessentially local decision and invite more attempts to censor information and ban books.

Imposing new federal regulation—including a federal mandate for local schools to adopt new policies—would be weaponized by a small minority who seek to censor what other parents' children can read. The sad reality is that an increasing number of state and local politicians in recent years have acquiesced to extreme demands to censor reading choices, and we fear that censorship may become even more prevalent if these provisions are enacted.

We have already seen how destructive censorship can be with the banning of books in many communities. Book bans now include many shocking examples, including the banning of children's books regarding the contributions to society by individuals like Condoleezza Rice, Rosa Parks, and Malala Yousafzai. We cannot support provisions that will, even if unintentionally, lead to greater censorship and the banning of children's books that contain subjects such as the contributions of these historic figures.

THE BILL'S SCHOOL LIBRARY PROVISIONS WOULD CREATE UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES AND REGULATION WHERE NONE ARE NEEDED, AT THE COST OF EDUCATING STUDENTS

As described above, the bill's requirements for school libraries are essentially duplicative of standard local practice. Nonetheless, by imposing new federal regulation on local schools, the bill would create new paperwork requirements, compliance burdens, and administrative costs, including for rural and small schools that can least afford them.

These unfunded mandates would be another distraction from schools' fundamental work to educate students. These same provisions would hand the federal Education Department new, broad authority to defund schools deemed to have inadequately complied with these new federal regulations. If enacted, these provisions would take dollars that should be used to pay for books, librarians, and teachers, and require that they instead be spent on administrators, bureaucrats, and paperwork—to the detriment of the students our schools should be focused on serving.

CONCLUSION

We believe that parents should be partners in their children's education. However, H.R. 5's school library provisions do nothing to advance that goal. Instead, they would create unnecessary and unfunded federal mandates on local school libraries that likely would result in more government censorship of reading choices.

Congress should support freedom for parents and students to choose what they want to read. Inspired by the wisdom of our country's Founders, the First Amendment must be our guide star. If anyone is to tell a child that they can't read a book, it should be the child's parent, not a politician. Congress should support students by strengthening school libraries and protecting the freedom to read—not imposing more bureaucratic burdens and invitations to censorship.

We are confident that parents want more books, not fewer, in their children's school libraries.

Thank you for your consideration. If we can provide more information, please contact Gavin Baker.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. INOUEY, Ph.D.,
Senior Director, Public
Policy & Govern-
ment Relations and
Interim Associate
Executive Director
American Library
Association.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, when we talk about progressive values, I can say what my progressive value is, and that is freedom over fascism.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, first I thank Congresswoman LETLOW for introducing this important piece of legislation and Chairwoman FOXX for her steady and unwavering leadership, guiding the Education and the Workforce Committee through a 16-hour debate, ending in a 2:23 a.m. vote a few weeks ago to pass this out of committee.

This bill ensures that parents stay at the center of educating their children, regardless of whether that education occurs at home or in a public school system or anywhere in between. Until we can get the Federal Government completely out of K-12 education, Federal legislation shoring up the rights of parents is absolutely necessary.

H.R. 5, known as the Parental Bill of Rights Act, will keep parents and families at the forefront of their child's educational journey. It will also strengthen those critical partnerships between engaged parents and willing educators. The beneficiary of such partnerships will undoubtedly be the schoolchildren nationwide.

For generations, our classrooms have been a sacred place, a place where children dig in to understand this world and how it works, where they discover their passions and the reason for their creation, and where they prepare for a lifetime of pursuing those passions.

I know this firsthand because before I entered my legal career, I worked in a public school system for multiple years. I married a public educator. About 9 years ago, I helped to start and run an education foundation that supports the fabulous teachers in my local public school district who teach with innovation and passion. Currently, I have four children donning the doors of that very school system, a choice my wife and I proudly make.

However, public classrooms should not be a place for advancing personal agendas or political propaganda. The role of our public educators is to educate, not to indoctrinate. Although the overwhelming majority of educators that I represent in east Texas thankfully understand this, it seems to me that in so many other corners of this country, many others have forgotten this or perhaps they have just simply forsaken this on purpose. In either case, it requires action by this Congress to stand firmly with parents in their partnership with educators.

Neither parents nor educators are the enemy. The enemy here is an unchecked system and political agenda that excludes one of those two essential parties necessary for the proper education of students; namely, the parents.

In 1925, the Supreme Court unanimously held that “the parental right to guide one’s child intellectually and religiously is a most substantial part of the liberty and freedom of a parent.”

This concept is nothing new. We are talking about the fundamental rights of parents. Parents should be at the center of the education of their children, not the Federal Government.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I will continue to fight to keep the Federal Government out of our children’s educational journey while working to increase the voice of our parents and families.

As a member of that committee, I will also continue to applaud the dedicated work of so many educators in this country who have been doing the right thing by both parents and students for decades. For those educators and school districts, this legislation changes little; but for those who see parents as the enemy, this legislation changes much.

Under this legislation, young and impressionable students will be safeguarded from propaganda and undue influence from those who should be educating but who have instead chosen to deviate from this responsibility to pursue a political agenda.

Nearly a century later after the Supreme Court weighed in on this issue, I am proud to stand here in support of

the Parental Bill of Rights Act, which will reinforce the fundamental rights of parents and guardians to make the decision that is best for their families and their children’s academic career.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the great Commonwealth of Virginia for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5, legislation brought to us by the extreme MAGA Republicans that will put politics over parents.

This legislation has nothing to do with parental involvement, parental engagement, or parental empowerment. It has everything to do with jamming the extreme MAGA Republican ideology down the throats of the children and the parents of the United States of America.

Now, House Democrats believe that every single child should have access to a high-quality, first-rate education.

House Democrats believe that every single child throughout America should learn reading, writing, and arithmetic at the highest level possible.

House Democrats believe that every single child should be exposed to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics so that they have the skills to succeed in the 21st century economy.

House Democrats believe that every single child in this great Nation should have the opportunity to robustly pursue the American Dream.

House Democrats believe that the parents of this great country should have the opportunity to be involved intimately and engaged intimately in the education of their children.

We take a back seat to no one on this issue. In fact, we put resources into making sure that parents have the opportunity to be fully involved and engaged in the education of their children.

The other side of the aisle—the extreme MAGA Republicans—have, in fact, voted against legislative efforts to empower parents in our schools.

It is a deeply personal issue for all of us. I am the father of two sons who were in public school every step of the way—kindergarten, elementary school, middle school, high school—and parental involvement and parental engagement is critically important. It was for their journey, for their success, and we want that for every single parent in America.

What we don’t want is the extreme MAGA Republicans trying to tell the parents of America how to educate their children, how to raise their children, what books their children can or cannot be exposed to on their educational journey. That is what the politics over parents bill is all about.

Their educational agenda is pretty simple. They want to ban books. They

want to bully the LGBTQ+ community. They want to bring guns into classrooms, kindergarten and above. That is their educational agenda. They want to ban books about history, ban books about the American journey, ban books about the Holocaust, ban books about slavery, ban books about the civil rights movement, ban books about the LGBTQ+ experience, ban books about the Native American experience, ban books about the Latino experience, ban books about the Asian-American experience, ban books about our collective journey as a great country, a gorgeous mosaic of people from all over the world who come here to pursue the American Dream. That is what makes American exceptionalism so phenomenally important to our collective success as a country, and they want to take that away from the parents of America.

Because of what has happened in several States, they have already banned more than 2,500 books in America, the highest number in recorded history.

What kind of books have they banned? Are these books dangerous to the education of our children? They are too numerous for any of us to go through during the time that we have allotted for this debate, but let’s go through a few of them.

□ 1515

They want to ban a book called “Maus.” It is about the horrors of the Holocaust, an egregious crime against humanity that we should never ever forget—6 million Jews exterminated.

They want to ban “Maus,” a book about the Holocaust. What is so offensive in that book? Let me read a passage. “They took from us our papers, our clothes, and our hair. We were cold, and we were afraid.”

Extreme MAGA Republicans don’t want the children of America to learn about the Holocaust.

What else do they want to ban? They want to ban the book called “I am Martin Luther King, Jr.” There is a Federal holiday in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr., what he meant to the country, the civil rights movement, the march toward a more perfect Union, liberty and justice for all, equal protection under the law, and free and fair elections.

They want to ban the book “I am Martin Luther King, Jr.” What is so offensive about this book? Let me read a passage. “In my life, people tried to tell me I wasn’t as good as they were, just because of the color of my skin. When someone hurts you like that, it can be tempting to hurt them back. You must refuse. When someone shows you hate, show them love. When someone shows you violence, show them kindness.”

That is the book that they want to ban, “I am Martin Luther King, Jr.”

What else do they want to ban? They want to ban a book called “Melissa,” a book describing, in very personal terms, the experience of a trans girl beginning to understand her identity.

What is so dangerous about that? I was taught in my religion, growing up in the Cornerstone Baptist Church, that we are all God's children. Shouldn't we learn about all of God's children? That is what my religion teaches me. What is so offensive about "Melissa"? What is so offensive about this book?

Let me read a passage. "Her heart sank. She had genuinely started to believe that if people could see her onstage as Charlotte, maybe they would see that she was a girl offstage, too."

Extreme MAGA Republicans don't want your child to learn about the LGBTQ+ experience in America. That is not a decision that extreme MAGA Republicans here in Congress should make. The parents of America should be able to make that determination.

What else do the extreme MAGA Republicans want to ban? Now, I grew up in America, where we were taught that whenever you were trying to identify something with this great country, well, there is nothing more American than baseball and apple pie. I am sure if we searched hard enough, they want to ban something about apple pie, but today, we know they definitively have tried to ban a book about baseball, about Roberto Clemente, the first Latino baseball player to make it into the Hall of Fame.

Why do they want to ban a book about Roberto Clemente? What are they trying to hide from you? Let me read a passage from this book. "He had no money for a baseball bat, so he made one from a guava tree branch. His first glove he also made, from the cloth of a coffee bean sack. His first baseball field was muddy and crowded with palm trees."

Isn't that part of what makes America such a great country, that you can aspire to be part of what you see in front of you? In this case, it was baseball for a young kid growing up in Puerto Rico—by the way, part of America—who decides that he wants to be part of this great American pastime.

The extreme MAGA Republicans want to stop your children from learning about the Latino experience in America, even when it relates to baseball and Roberto Clemente.

One last example—I could be up here all day. What else do they want to ban? They want to ban a book called "The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian," which is about a Native teenager's high school experience.

What is more American than Native Americans? They don't want your children to learn about Native American history and experience in this country.

What is so dangerous about this particular book? Let's see. It says: "We Indians have lost everything. We lost our Native land; we lost our languages; we lost our songs and dances. We lost each other. We only know how to lose and be lost."

That is part of the Native American experience in this country. That is part of reality. That is part of our journey.

Extreme MAGA Republicans don't want the parents of this country to have the opportunity to decide for themselves whether the children of America should have an opportunity to learn about the Native American experience. They want to jam their extreme MAGA Republican ideology down the throats of the children and parents in America.

That is unacceptable; that is unconscionable; and that is un-American. That is one of the reasons why we strongly oppose this legislation.

We will fight against this legislation. We will fight against the banning of books and fight against the bullying of children from any community and certainly from the LGBTQ+ community.

We are going to fight against your extreme MAGA Republican agenda that has no interest in dealing with the education of our children, empowering them, and offers up solutions like bringing guns into the classroom.

We will fight against their efforts at banning books, bullying children, and taking away the freedom of parents to make decisions on their own today. We will fight against it tomorrow. We will fight against it forever and always stand with the parents and children of our great country.

Vote "no" against H.R. 5.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, here is the truth about this bill. This bill will not ban any books. I repeat: This bill will not ban any books.

What is dangerous right now is when people misrepresent what is in legislation before us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), my distinguished colleague, the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

I am the father of 6 children and the grandfather of 16 grandchildren. I am also the son of two educators. I know from experience that students succeed when parents and educators work together.

Between crippling learning loss, school closures, and now teacher strikes, our kids have been through enough. They don't stand a chance if parents are kicked out of the driver's seat. Moms and dads are the primary stakeholders in a child's education, not the government, period. They have a God-given right to be involved in their child's education and development, especially in the classroom.

Under the one-party Democratic rule in Washington, parents have been left behind, kept out of the classroom, and even labeled and targeted as domestic terrorists by the Biden DOJ. In Biden's America, parents come last.

Under the House Republican majority, we are supporting parents and fulfilling our commitment to America by making sure moms and dads have a seat at the table.

The Parents Bill of Rights Act is just good, old-fashioned common sense, and

here is the truth of the Parents Bill of Rights Act. Parents have a right to know what is being taught in schools and to see the reading materials. Parents have a right to be heard. Parents have a right to see the school budget and spending. Parents have a right to protect their child's privacy. Parents have a right to be updated on any violent activity at school.

Unfortunately, in committee, 17 Democrats opposed protecting these God-given parental rights. Just remember: Parental rights are nonnegotiable.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to vote "yes" on the Parents Bill of Rights Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to adhere to the protocols of the floor. If I did not, I would shout from the rooftops as a mother and a happy grandmother that I champion parental rights and parents. I am happy to have been one and to continue to be one, and I view parenthood and parents' rights as cherished rights.

Not one Democrat here would argue against that principle. In fact, there is no doubt that we, as Democrats, have fought for parents and their rights.

Child tax credits should now be made permanent, taking care of additional childcare for those parents who are burdened, and for those who need housing, investing more so that children have roofs over their heads, as well as ensuring that no one is left alone looking for housing.

Why I cannot support H.R. 5 is not because of my championing parents' rights. Before I came here from Houston, I was with parents, fighting against the devastating takeover by a Republican Governor and State education commissioner of a school district that has a rating of B.

I am against undermining nutrition in schools. That is in this bill. I am against undermining vulnerable children, such as transgender children. I am against banning books, such as a book about a Black astrologist, a scientist, Neil deGrasse Tyson, or the story of a man ultimately of peace who brought South Africa together, Nelson Mandela.

Banned books, I am against that. I am against it because I want to make sure that parents want to have involvement in what their children learn.

I am against not wanting to hear the words of Elie Wiesel about the Holocaust. He said: "I swore never to be silent whenever wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation."

Don't we want our children to be kind?

Don't we want our children to know that slavery was wrong, as I fight against slavery today that still exists?

Don't we want our children to understand the basis of all of our history, the mosaic of this Nation and African-American history?

Don't we want teachers to get the salaries that they deserve?

Don't we want to make sure that it is important, if you will, to ensure that our school buildings are repaired?

That is why I include in the RECORD the First Focus letter.

FIRST FOCUS
CAMPAIGN FOR CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2023.

Hon. JULIA LETLOW,
Member, Committee on Education & the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, Committee on Education & the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education & the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN LETLOW, SPEAKER MCCARTHY, LEADER JEFFRIES, CHAIRWOMAN FOXX, AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: I am writing on behalf of First Focus Campaign for Children, a bipartisan children's advocacy organization dedicated to making children and families a priority in federal budget and policy decisions, to express opposition to H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act. We do not believe this bill strikes the right balance between the duties of schools, the rights and responsibilities of parents, and the oft-ignored but important rights of children.

PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT IS CRITICAL

First, let's be clear: Parents are fundamental to the upbringing of children and absolutely should be engaged and involved in the education of their children. In fact, children have better outcomes when their parents are involved. As a parent of four children myself, I have engaged with my children's schools by voting in school board elections, attending all parent-teacher conferences, volunteering in my children's classrooms, scheduling time to meet with teachers and administrators when important issues arise, serving on the PTAs at my children's schools, serving on athletic booster clubs, and volunteering as an assistant boys and girls basketball coach for two county schools.

In addition to my personal experiences, I have learned a great deal over the years from both of my parents, my step-mother, step-brother, my uncle, and several cousins, who are all educators. Consequently, I have immense respect for the work, talent, dedication, and concern that the vast majority of teachers and educators bring to their profession on a daily basis—all with the goal of educating our nation's children to best achieve their hopes and dreams while also trying to provide a place of safety and compassion for each and every one of their students.

Again, we strongly support parental engagement in education, but parents should not control all curriculum and educational decisions. Doing so is unworkable.

For example, imagine an elementary school of 500 students where 12 parents oppose the teaching of evolution, 8 parents believe the early is flat, 21 are Holocaust deniers, 14 oppose learning about slavery, 7 believe in racial segregation, 17 believe in the concept of schools without walls, 27 believe in corporal punishment, 12 want Harry Potter books to be banned, 25 want books banned that mention the Trail of Tears, 31 believe parents should be allowed to overrule

a physician's decision that a child with a concussion should refrain from participating in sports, 39 oppose keeping kids out of school when they have the flu, 4 believe that a child with cancer might be contagious, 34 believe students should be "tracked" in all subject areas, 12 believe students should not be taught how to spell the words "sinal tap", "quarantine", or "isolation" because they are too "scary of words," 41 don't like the bus routes, 45 want a vegan-only lunchroom, 4 demand same-sex classrooms, etc. Even though most parents oppose these demands by some parents and many of them are completely false, undermine the purpose of education, threaten the safety of children, or promote discrimination, H.R. 5 would seek to push their accommodation in some form.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a March 7, 2023 letter to President Biden and Secretary Miguel Cardona.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2023.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BIDEN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DR. MIGUEL CARDONA,
Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Education,
Lyndon Baines Johnson Building,
Washington, DC.

CC: CATHERINE E. LHAMON,
Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education,
Lyndon Baines Johnson Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BIDEN AND SECRETARY CARDONA: Public school education around the country is under attack and the actions of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in taking over one the largest school districts in the nation, despite a B+ rating overall and intense work with schools needing additional help the state has underfunded, HISD is further evidence we must support schools, parents and teachers.

We the undersigned Members of Congress are writing to request that the Department of Education take immediate action to investigate systemic and discriminatory state takeovers of public schools receiving federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education throughout the State of Texas. It is imperative that there be some form of federal intervention immediately to prevent a takeover of the Houston Independent School District (HISD) because of the detrimental impact on a predominantly minority school district that is a recipient of major federal funding.

State officials in Texas are actively working to eliminate public education and erode federal protections in educational institutions throughout the State of Texas, causing racially disparate and harmful outcomes for children and families in Black and Hispanic communities in Texas.

The recent actions taken by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the state of Texas are an absolute outrage and a threat to all Texans. There is no justifiable reason for the TEA to take over HISD. Rather, the continued intermeddling and overstepping into our educational systems by Texas state officials is causing further harm and damage to our communities—and it must stop.

Taking over a school district such as HISD makes absolutely no sense at all. HISD is the largest school district in Texas, with 274 schools and a student population of approximately 200,000 students. HISD is rated B+, and 94 percent of HISD schools now earn a grade of A, B or C, up from 82 percent in 2019. Yet, TEA is basing its decision to take over HISD on one school. As of today, Phyllis Wheatley High School is no longer low per-

forming and there are new members on the board. The conditions that existed when the takeover was first proposed no longer exist. Moreover, Wheatley would've passed under the rules that were in place at the time, but TEA changed the rules, and made them fail. Given Wheatley's improvement to a C and the district's overall B rating, the TEA's reason for initiating a takeover bid in 2019 is no longer valid.

TEA has no experience managing a district of this magnitude and should not be engaging in such drastic efforts without any viable justification. The structure that will be used to govern this huge school district will be a board of managers solely selected by the TEA—with no input by voters, teachers, students and/or administrators. There is a question of whether the TEA is operating correctly under Texas State education law and the Texas State Education Code. Pursuant to Senate bill 1365, Section 39.0546 (c) and Texas State Education Code. Section 39.0546(c)(1) and (2) it is unclear that the TEA commissioner even has the authority to takeover HISD because the school in question, Wheatley High School, has maintained a C performance rating at this time. This action is confusion to the constituents of HISD, and the state has no answer as to why they think they have the right to do this—particularly when Wheatley High School is performing, other schools are performing, and the school district is performing, even though there are schools with challenges that the school is focusing on.

While the TEA Commissioner's stated reasoning for pursuing a state takeover of HISD, namely one single underperforming school in Houston ISD, this rationalization further highlights the latest confusing and contradictory actions taken by Texas state officials in their larger efforts to justify stripping locally elected school boards of their authority, and effectively stripping Texans of their federally protected rights.

Despite the long-evidenced fact that state takeovers have targeted low income and Black and Hispanic communities, resulting in lower graduation rates and higher student suspensions, Governor Abbott has made no secret of his support for privately run charter schools—of which do not have to provide a free, appropriate public education under federal law—and his discontent for public schooling for all children in Texas, of which is subject to federal law and oversight. Seizing HISD, the eighth-largest school district in the country is a clear overreach by Texas government officials and their pursuit and intent to turn over state run schools to privately run charter schools.

A state takeover would not only lead to school closures, layoffs and no improvements in test scores, it would also absolutely harm the HISD scholars. All you have to do is look around to see any urban schools that TEA has taken over and you will see that TEA did not make them better. The vast majority of school districts that have been taken over by state agencies (TEA included) have not improved but declined.

There are 15 such instances over the course of three decades, according to state records. None likely offer a case study that would compare to a takeover of the diverse student body of HISD, the largest school district in the state and the eighth largest in the nation—which also serves predominantly Black and Hispanic children and families considered to be "economically disadvantaged". According to the recent article in the Houston Chronicle reporting on this concern of prior Texas state school takeovers, it is pertinent to quote the following information:

Seven of those districts were predominantly Black, including multiple districts with schools significant to Texas' African

American history. Another seven of the districts taught mostly Hispanic student bodies. Only one district—Shepherd ISD—was predominantly white. Around 66 percent of students in that district are economically disadvantaged.

Of HISD's 187,000 students, 62 percent are Hispanic and 22 percent are Black. Nearly 80 percent of its students are economically disadvantaged.

None of the districts previously taken over by TEA come close to comparing in size to HISD. The smallest of those districts, Kendleton ISD, had less than 100 students and the largest, El Paso ISD, has 50,709. Beaumont ISD has around 17,000."

While there are real schools struggling throughout Texas and despite an overall increase in public school performances, TEA is choosing to target only those schools with predominantly Black and Hispanic children over other school districts with far greater rates of performance decline. In fact, TEA released a report for its 2022 A-F accountability ratings for districts and campuses, which showed that of the 1,195 districts and 8,451 campuses rated in 2022, 25% of districts and 33% of campuses improved their letter grade from 2019, and 18% of high-poverty campuses in Texas were rated an A.

It is also important to highlight that Texas is behind the national average in how much it spends per student in the classroom. More specifically, data from the U.S. Census Bureau shows that Texas spends \$3,000 less than the national average. Overall, Texas spent a little over \$10,000 per student in 2020; as the largest school district in the state, HISD spent even less, averaging \$9,380 per student. Given the complete lack of funding infused into school districts like HISD, it should be incumbent upon the State of Texas to reprioritize and shift its focus to allocating more appropriate and equitable funding across shamefully underfunded and underserved communities and school districts.

In fact, it is well known that a critical factor impacting students' academic outcomes is investing even more money into low-income students. Low-income students perform worse in states with larger spending gaps—states whose actual spending is furthest from the amount needed. With data ranging back to the late 1980s, researchers found that most state takeovers don't translate to academic improvements. And in states with no spending gaps, poor students perform at or above the national average for all U.S. students—which shows that states can improve the academic performance of even our poorest students by investing more—not by discriminately targeting schools for state takeovers.

As your agency is aware, Texas is plagued with 154 open and pending cases of reported discrimination currently under investigation at elementary, secondary and post-secondary schools throughout the state. Between 2015 and 2023, there have been at least 51 cases opened at such institutions and are currently pending investigation for racial discrimination and harassment, as well as at least 28 cases for retaliatory discrimination at various educational institutions across Texas. And yet, these numbers do not even begin to account for the countless documented and undocumented cases of current and historical discriminatory practices, of which no state in this nation is immune to.

The Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights serves to enforce several federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities that receive federal financial assistance from the Department of Education. Whereby, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin; Title IX of the Education Amendments

of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability; and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 prohibits age discrimination, the primary role of OCR is to assist student populations facing these areas of discrimination, and to resolve their complaints, as well as to provide guidance and assistance to advocates and institutions promoting systemic solutions to civil rights problems.

These civil rights laws enforced by OCR extend to all state education agencies, elementary and secondary school systems, colleges and universities, vocational schools, proprietary schools, state vocational rehabilitation agencies, libraries, and museums that receive U.S. Department of Education funds, including but not limited to: admissions, recruitment, financial aid, academic programs, student treatment and services, counseling and guidance, discipline, classroom assignment, grading, vocational education, recreation, physical education, athletics, housing, and employment. An additional critically important part of OCR's responsibilities is to foster partnerships and initiatives designed to develop creative approaches to preventing and addressing discrimination.

Unfortunately, Texas educational school systems and their controlling governmental officials are no stranger to running afoul of federal laws your agency is tasked with enforcing and protecting.

In 2018, the Department of Education found the entire state of Texas to be in violation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. By setting an enrollment target for special education, the Texas Educational Agency (TEA) denied tens of thousands of children their federally protected right to free and appropriate public education supports and services. Governor Abbott has long sought to restrict access to free public education to all children in Texas and takeover control of all Texas educational systems in order to implement harmful and discriminatory policies and agendas.

Most recently, Governor Abbott has been pushing for additional voucher programs across Texas—namely an \$8,000 initiative for individuals in rural communities. While some may say that school choice efforts are critical to ensuring that families can decide the best educational settings for their children, such programs are not going to help public school systems. Instead of providing critical funding for underfunded school programs, money and resources simply get diverted away from the public schools that serve the majority of children in Texas.

Now, with the recent Texas Supreme Court ruling to lift the temporary injunction, that kept the TEA Commissioner, Governor Abbott and other state officials from taking over the HISD, the plight of schools and the educational future in Houston, as well as throughout the entire state of Texas, is particularly dire and in need of federal oversight and intervention.

A TEA takeover would have a significant and negative impact on HISD and other Independent School Districts in Texas because a board of managers is not elected, and they don't have to answer to the constituents, including children, parents and teachers, in those districts. This is particularly relevant given the day before the TEA Commissioner announced the state takeover of HISD, voters had democratically elected new members to the school board—raising many unsettling questions about the state's true agenda.

Additionally, we must not lose sight of the fact that teachers and support staff within the education system are some of the most important people in our society. The dedicated public service they provide represents the heart of our nation—as the work they do

is vital to fabric of our communities. They shape generations of our future leaders and hold the key to our children's potential. As we know, however, teachers are underpaid and often go unappreciated in their efforts to make our world a better place. The TEA takeover of HISD would not only result in school closures and job cuts, but the actions of the TEA would also eliminate all of their rights on how to be heard on how they can proceed in the face of such attacks on their livelihoods and service to our communities. Well-meaning and extremely qualified teachers would lose their jobs and their voice.

That is why we are writing to request that the Department of Education, pursuant to its duty and authority under law, investigate and take immediate action to address the recent systematic and dangerous efforts underway by state and local officials in Texas seeking to undermine and undo decades of civil rights protections and advancements in educational institutions and student populations. I am confident that the Department of Education will do all that is necessary to ensure that the rights of Texans and all those impacted by the heightened discriminatory actions by Texas officials are protected and safeguarded.

Thank you very much for your consideration and assistance in this matter. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee at (202) 225-3816, the Representative for the 18th Congressional District of Texas, the jurisdiction where HISD is located.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want us to know that, in supporting parents' rights, we must support not destroying public school education, and we must support the Houston Independent School District to not allow—

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman's time has expired, and the gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

□ 1530

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act. This legislation reinforces parents' indisputable rights to the protection and education of their children.

We have seen a push towards centralizing education by the government, a mentality seen too often with the left taking away those decisions from parents. This bill returns choice to the caretakers of our most precious resource: The next generation.

Why do we need this bill?

We had a Democrat politician running for Governor in Virginia who lost, who said: "I don't think parents should be telling schools what they should teach."

Can you believe that?

I don't think parents should be telling schools what they should teach.

Republicans believe in education, especially when parents are in control. It is ironic that the leftwing has censored or banned books. Harry Potter books have been burned because leftists don't like the author.

Leftwing school districts in California have banned "Of Mice and Men" and "To Kill a Mockingbird."

Mr. Chair, this bill puts parents in control. Everyone who cares about the welfare of our youngest citizens should support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, we oppose H.R. 5 because we stand with the school boards and the PTAs, the parents and the teachers, the students, and 13,000 school superintendents whose letter opposing this legislation I would ask to be included in the RECORD.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from The School Superintendents Association.

MARCH 22, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: AASA, The School Superintendents Association, representing 13,000 school district leaders across the United States, writes to share our view of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights.

Superintendents know that parents are their children's first and most important educators, which is why effective family engagement at the state and local level is one of the key determinants of student and school success. As superintendents who serve at the pleasure of school boards selected by parents, families and community members, it is critical that every child and family who walks through our doors on a daily basis feels welcome and supported in our buildings and classrooms. We know an educational environment that connects and engages families will ensure greater success for all students. We believe that every family should have the opportunity to be an active participant in their child's educational experience and connect directly with their child's professional educators, while working in concert with school staff and administrators to maximize their child's success.

As a national organization representing the CEOs of school systems, our view has always been that local control in K-12 education is not only what is best, but what is most appropriate. It is for this reason that we must oppose H.R. 5. As champions of local control, AASA has long opposed topdown, prescriptive federal education policies that dictate how districts utilize limited federal funding, pressure districts to adopt specific standards or curriculum or create national teacher or educator standards and requirements.

Parents are the locus of local control in education as they provide input on local policies and practices created at school board meetings, connect directly with superintendents, principals and teachers in class and school-wide events, and have access to any and all educational materials, platforms and curriculum their children are utilizing inside and outside of school.

The Parents Bill of Rights is full of district mandates without any funding for these new and burdensome requirements that will be a place a disproportionate hardship on small and rural schools. Provisions that would require a district to print out the curriculum for parental review and comment, send notices about every guest speaker that may address a class, require mental health per-

sonnel to contact parents if a student discloses any mental health concern and share a list of every professional development opportunity the district provides to educators and staff are just a few examples of extreme federal overreach in local education policy.

Aside from AASA's federalism concerns and the many new unfunded mandates that H.R. 5 creates, there are also practical implementation concerns with how the legislation would disrupt learning in classrooms and make it incredibly challenging for educators to meet the significant educational needs of students. For example, giving parents the ability to opt out of the collection, disclosure, or use of personal information collected from students and commonly used education technology in the classroom would make it nearly impossible for schools to meet the educational needs of students and use a host of online diagnostic, differentiated and adaptive assessments and tools to measure a student's understanding, proficiency and growth academically. This change would leave teachers not only ill-equipped to address learning loss in a post-pandemic educational environment thereby exacerbating educational inequities, but forced to find and make use of resources, curriculum, and assessments from several decades ago.

H.R. 5 would make it more challenging to ensure our schools are safe and welcoming environments for every student. The legislation would make it more challenging to direct students to appropriate mental health supports in schools thereby risking the safety of all students and educators. As an example, a counselor who suspects a child may be abused would be required to notify parents and get a signed parental opt-in before the counselor can assess the child's health, safety and well-being at home. The bill would also undermine districts' ability to collect anonymized survey data to gauge student safety and well-being in school and it would make our transgender and nonbinary students more likely to disengage or drop out of school.

While we appreciate the robust discussion about student privacy and support a reauthorization of Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment that will clarify critical issues and update the law to appropriately respond to the twenty-first century learning environments in our schools, the changes to FERPA and PPRA proposed by H.R. 5 are not those AASA can support. Similarly, we welcome a conversation on how to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but we do not support piecemeal changes to critical provisions in Title I of the law and urge Republicans and Democrats to come together—as they always have—to craft comprehensive ESEA policies to better our nations' schools, increase student achievement and ensure our schools are welcoming places for every child and family.

Thank you for considering our views and it is our hope that we can work with both sides of the dais to find common ground this Congress on the policy and funding issues of greatest importance to school district leaders.

Sincerely,

SASHA PUDELSKI,
Director of Advocacy, AASA, THE
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, we stand with local governments against this outrageous power grab by MAGA Republicans in Washington who are supporting book banning, suppression of historical facts about slavery, Jim Crow segregation, racial violence, and favoring top-down micromanagement of our local schools across America.

Is there really a problem for parents like us with finding out what is in our public school libraries?

Well, before you pass a massive new Federal law and a massive new unfunded mandate for our local governments, why don't you take the time to make a phone call?

That is what I did. I called up the person who runs the school libraries for Montgomery County, Maryland, which has more than a million people there. I learned from Andrea Christman, who oversees all the media centers for our county, that the entire catalogue of 2.2 million books is online, freely available, and current as of today. Anybody can go online and find it right now.

If all the info is out there, as local governments want it to be, then what is this about?

Well, it is about book banning, of course.

Mr. Chair, 2 years ago, more than 1,600 books were banned in the United States of America.

Here are three of the key books that the rightwingers have been going after.

Khaled Hosseini's "The Kite Runner," about the dangerous fanaticism, authoritarianism, and abuse of the Taliban, a rightwing religious fundamentalist movement all about censorship and repressing women's control over their own bodies and their own fertility.

"The Handmaid's Tale," Margaret Atwood's extraordinary dystopian novel about a rightwing misogynist movement which uses high technology and depraved religious ideology to control not only the minds of their followers, but their private and public lives and the fertility of women.

Of course, George Orwell's, "1984," because they have no sense of irony. They are always trying to censor this one.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, we need more politicians reading books and fewer politicians trying to censor books in America.

It is amazing to me to see politicians who oppose a universal violent criminal background check and who defend assault weapons after the massacres at Columbine; after Parkland, Florida; at Sandy Hook in Newtown, Connecticut; after Uvalde; after Santa Fe, Texas, that they are now going to keep America's children safe by banning "The Handmaid's Tale" and "1984."

Mr. Chair, we can do better for the children of America.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to address a technical issue I have on the bill.

First, let me say I have been a strong supporter of the Parents Bill of Rights

Act, and I believe this bill gives much-needed certainty to parents that they will have transparency in their child's education.

Simply put, this bill guarantees all parents a voice in the decisions that affect their children and a seat at the table. It makes clear that you do not relinquish your rights as a parent simply by sending your child to a public school.

Now, among the bill's main components, parents have the right to know what their children are being taught. Parents have the right to be heard. Parents have a right to see the school budget and spending. Parents have a right to protect their child's privacy. Parents have a right to keep their children safe.

Some say this is already the case, and that this is just codifying. Well, if that is the case, then great. We are codifying into law the ability and the rights of parents.

Now, these are important safeguards that not only ensure parents' rights, but they also respect State and local control of our schools. It does not get into what is taught in schools, what books or materials are used, or how a school should address a given issue. Those decisions are still left to the State and local school districts.

In addition, when it comes to their child's health and well-being, parents have a right to know if a school employee acts to treat, advise, or address issues of cyberbullying, bullying, hazing, mental health, suicidal ideation or self-harm, possession or use of drugs, an eating disorder, or if a child brings a gun to school.

Now, there are also protections included in this bill that require parents to be informed if their school takes action to change their child's gender markers, pronouns, preferred name, or make sex-based accommodations for locker rooms or bathrooms.

Mr. Chair, I recently met with constituents from the LGBTQ+ community in my district, including trans youth and parents. They raised several concerns about this language, concerns primarily focused on the safety and well-being of these youth, especially trans youth.

So Dr. Foxx, I am hoping that you can clarify some of this for me and for the RECORD.

Does the bill require teachers or school officials to disclose the sexual orientation of a student or statements made by the student about his or her gender identity?

Second, will students still have the ability to speak with teachers, advisers, or school officials without fear that those conversations will be subject to disclosure?

And finally, will States and local school districts still be able to come up with their own policies and best practices for informing parents about these issues so as to ensure the well-being and safety of their child?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York for his questions.

Mr. Chair, I can confirm that the bill does not require a teacher to disclose any of the information that the gentleman described.

The bill does not address a student's identity or statements but is solely focused on notifying parents about actions taken by school personnel to act on a gender transition, such as changing pronouns or switching locker rooms.

I would add, despite the claims from my friends on the other side of the aisle, even The New York Times acknowledged that this is not a partisan issue, writing in January that, "Parents of all political persuasions have found themselves unsettled by what schools know and don't reveal."

Our bill enshrines commonsense transparency for parents of children to reflect these concerns but it does not force any teacher to reveal private conversations or any information about sexual orientation.

The legislation is also clear that education is largely the responsibility of the States and any State or local school district would work with the Department to ensure their compliance with these provisions without violating student privacy. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her clarification.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 8 of the bill, it says that parents have "the right to know if a school employee or contractor acts to:

"Change a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name; or

"Allow a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms;

"The right to know if a school employee or contractor acts to treat, advise, or address the cyberbullying of a student;

"Treat, advise, or address the bullying. . . ."

This says, "a child." It doesn't say their own child. It says a child, so I am not sure what the answer was.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG).

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I support parents' rights, and I am proud to live in the State of Minnesota where parents have a right to remove their child from a class assignment if they are not comfortable with the subject matter. That is State law today in Minnesota.

I hear from parents across Minnesota's Second District every day who are worried about their children. And I hear from teachers every day who need more support and resources for their students.

Mr. Chair, there are more than 800,000 public school students in Minnesota.

I don't think Washington politicians, the people standing here on the House floor today, should mandate which books are in their school libraries.

I don't think Washington politicians should mandate their parent-teacher conference schedules.

I don't think Washington politicians should mandate whether these 800,000 kids get the mental health support they need.

Let's be real about what this bill is actually about.

This is about MAGA Republicans who want to start a fake culture war targeting some of the most vulnerable kids in America in our kids' classrooms. Shame on you.

If you want to support parents, let's fully fund our public schools and sharpen our focus on special education programs. Let's figure out how we recruit and retain talented teachers. Let's get our kids and educators the mental health resources they desperately need.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Minnesota an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Chair, let's leave the power to decide what is best for students at the local level.

Mr. Chair, I support parents' rights, but this bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Association of School Psychologists expressing serious concern with this legislation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS,
Bethesda, MD, March 7, 2023.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, House Committee Education and the
Workforce.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Ranking Member, House Committee Education
and the Workforce.

Re: Markup of Parents Bill of Rights and
Protection of Women and Girls in Sports
Act of 2023

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: On behalf of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), and our 25,000+ members, I write to express significant concerns regarding the harmful impact of the Parents Bill of Rights Act (H.R. 5) and the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2023 (H.R. 734). School psychologists work with families, educators, administrators, and community members to collectively meet the academic, social emotional, and mental and behavioral health needs of students. We are committed to ensuring that every child: has access to well-rounded, comprehensive, and inclusive curricula; receives the comprehensive learning supports they need to be successful and; attends a school with a safe, supportive learning environment free of bullying, harassment, and discrimination for all students. Importantly, we work to foster effective partnerships between families and educators, who share equally the responsibility for the learning and success of all students. School psychologists work with school leaders to create equitable and accessible family engagement systems in which the diverse perspectives of all families are actively sought out, acknowledged, and valued. Collectively, elements of H.R. 5 and H.R. 734 undermine these commitments by: prioritizing the voices and perspectives of a small subset of families; condoning discrimination; limiting curricula; and preventing schools from ensuring physical and psychological safety.

Further, elements of these bills will significantly exacerbate the current youth mental health crisis, particularly for LGBTQ+ and other marginalized youth.

PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS (H.R. 5)

Title I—Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Sec 101 and Sec 103. State and Local Educational Agency Plan Assurances

NASP supports efforts to increase transparency and access to information about school curricula. Existing provisions in FERPA and PRA clearly articulate the rights of parents to review school curricula and materials as well as opt their child out of specific lessons or survey administration. It is critical that parents and families know what is happening in their child's classroom so that they may engage with their children about what they are learning, and even offer differing viewpoints and helping their children think critically. Requirements to make this information publicly available to all creates an unnecessary burden on the SEA and LEA which is unattainable and will further impede already strained local and state education systems. Despite our belief that Sec 101 and Sec 103 are redundant, we offer the following edits to ensure that all information is accessible to all families: families and other persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English:

Sec 101 State Plan Assurances

(O)(i)(I) "posts on a publicly accessible website of the agency, in a manner that is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English, such curriculum;

(O)(i)(II) if such agency does not operate a website, widely disseminates to the public in a manner that is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English such curriculum;

(O)(ii)(I) "posts on a publicly accessible website of the agency, in a manner that is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English:

(O)(ii)(II) "if such agency does not operate a website, widely disseminates to the public, in a manner that is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English, such curriculum;"

(P) "in the case of any revisions . . . the State educational agency will post to the homepage of its website, and widely disseminate to the public, in a manner that is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English,"

Sec 103 Local Plan Assurances

(9) "post on a publicly accessible website of the local educational agency or, if the local educational agency does not operate a website, widely disseminate to the public, in a manner that is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English, the plan . . ."

We also request clarification as to the definition of 'curriculum.' Teachers routinely alter lesson plans or planned pace of curriculum based on students' progress and needs. Teachers must maintain the ability to differentiate instruction and to develop lessons, aligned with state academic standards, that meet the needs of their students. Many students receive interventions, specific modifications, or specially designed instruction (as part of a child's Individualized Education Program) to ensure access to the general curriculum and state academic standards. We strongly caution against considering these instructional materials 'curriculum' as it could inadvertently violate the privacy of students and their families, especially in smaller communities where identification is easier.

Sec 104 Parent's Right to Know

We support that parents should have the right to see what materials are available in the school, to be well informed about potential changes to state academic standards or key programmatic offerings (not limited to the elimination of gifted and talented programs), and to voice their opinion regarding school and school district policy. This information must be accessible to all families, and we request the following revision:

(1) "Notice of Rights"—A local education agency . . . posts, in a manner accessible to persons with disabilities and those who speak a language other than English,"

However, the "right to review" outlined in this section must not be synonymous with the right to demand removal or alteration of specific books or other material available to all students. We remain increasingly alarmed at continued reports of the removal of material highlighting the diversity of our society and our schools. Restricting access to accurate information and removing evidence-based practices that promote inclusivity and cultural responsiveness is fundamentally handcuffing schools and school staff, and it is harming children. Public schools exist to prepare young people to live in a global society and be contributing citizens. Therefore, schools must have resources and curricula which is reflective of the world they live in. We have heard from many school psychologists that parents are frustrated by the removal of certain books and/or materials from classrooms and/or curriculum, and they are angry that their opposition to these removals has been ignored as it is placing unwanted limitation on their child's exposure to diversity and excludes specific identities from curricula. This legislation must clearly articulate that the "right to review" does not give one the legal right to demand removal. Educators, schools, and districts must be empowered to make decisions based on empirical evidence and the needs of the school community, including the unique needs of specific groups of students without fear of reprisal.

Title II—Amendments to FERPA and PRA

Many of the rights articulated in H.R. 5, including the right to inspect instructional material and surveys that may be administered or distributed by the school, and the right to opt their child out of participation in specific activities are statutorily afforded to parents via FERPA and PRA. NASP does not object to more stringent requirements to ensure proper protection of student data and to prohibit the sale of student information for commercial purposes or financial gain. However, we have significant concerns that, collectively, Sec 201(n) 'Disclosure of Information'; Sec 202(b); Sec 202 (c)(2)(D)(i), and the proposed definition of 'Medical Examination or Screening' will significantly impede schools' ability to support student well-being and mental health and prevent school violence. Sec 201(n) would require schools to share with parents, upon request, an individual students' response to any survey. Implementation of this provision would prove impossible in many scenarios as the vast majority of surveys are anonymous by design and identified data is less likely to be valid. Many school-administered surveys are intended to provide critical information necessary to: examine and respond to the global physical and mental health needs of young people; guide school and community violence prevention efforts; inform school safety and school climate initiatives; and guide efforts to reduce substance use and misuse. These data are critical to identifying potential risks to children and youth, and to evaluate system wide efforts to address specific concerns. Parents maintain the right to exclude

their child from participating in these valuable data collection efforts, but students must be empowered to be honest without fear of consequence, punishment, or the unwanted disclosure of personal information without their permission. As such, we request the following revision:

"(n) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—An educational agency or institution or authorized representative of such agency or institution shall;

(1) upon request from a parent of a student disclose to such parent the identity of any individual or entity with whom information is shared from the education record;

(2) upon request from a parent of a student disclose to such parent any response of the student to a survey if

(A) information to accurately identify individual students was collected as part of the survey, as designed, and

(B) the student consents to the disclosure of such information

(3) inform students, prior to their participation in a survey in which identifying information is collected, that their individual responses may be disclosed to a parent upon request."

Current law reflects the requirement for parental consent prior to student participation in specific school administered surveys, rendering Sec 202 (c)(2)(D)(i) redundant, and when considered in conjunction with the proposed definition of 'Medical Examination or Screening, highly concerning. Revision of the current legal definition of 'physical examination' to 'Medical Examination or Screening', which explicitly includes a mental health or substance use disorder screening, combined with parental consent requirements will undoubtedly exacerbate the youth mental health crisis and undermine efforts to improve school safety. The term 'mental health screening' could be interpreted in a manner that results in significant harm to school communities. A mental health screening is not synonymous with a standardized measure or survey intended to gather personal information about an individual for diagnostic use. While those tools may be utilized as part of a holistic approach to identifying and addressing student need, mental health screening is a process by which educators, in collaboration with school psychologists or school mental health professionals, and families, identify students who may need support. School mental health professionals will not engage in a therapeutic intervention with a student without active parental consent. However, students must be allowed to seek out a trusted adult or mental health professional, including school psychologists, at school and these professionals must be able to assess student well-being and (as part of their responsibility as a mandatory reporter) immediately assess if there is concern regarding risk of harm to self or others. As currently written, H.R. 5 would require parental consent prior to any contact with a school mental health professional and could result in unnecessary and preventable harm to self or others. Parents are already notified of reported risk after an assessment is completed and inability to reach a parent for consent to do an assessment can have lethal consequences.

We offer the following suggested revision and would welcome the opportunity to collaborate on statutory language that ensures availability of comprehensive school mental and behavioral health services and balances schools' obligation to support student learning and well-being and maintain a safe school environment with efforts to improve family engagement in all aspects of the education system.

MEDICAL EXAMINATION OR SCREENING.—The term 'medical examination or

screening' means any medical examination or screening that involves the exposure of private body parts, or any act during such examination or screening that includes incision, insertion, or injection into the body, or a mental health or substance use disorder screening, except that such term does not include:

- (i) a hearing, vision, or scoliosis screening;
- (ii) an observational screening carried out to comply with child find obligations under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.);
- (iii) Informal observation screening, or short term consultation, of non-therapeutic nature, with a school based mental health services provider;
- (iv) a process to assess and mitigate the risk of inflicted harm to self or others, provided that parental notification of such screening occurs as soon as is feasibly possible unless there is reasonable evidence that parent notification will result in harm to the child.

PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS
ACT OF 2023 (H.R. 734)

NASP believes, and courts have established, that the civil rights of transgender students are protected as part of U.S. public schools' obligations under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. These rights include honoring a person's right to express gender identity, and the right to modify gender expression when necessary for individual well-being, and to have their gender identify affirmed and acknowledged, the right to explore and question their gender identity, and the right to participate in activities, including sports, that correspond with one's gender identity.

We vehemently oppose any effort, including the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, to define sex based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth, while this legislation, on its face, is narrowly focused on the issue of athletics, it is legally tenuous to assume that Title IX allows for multiple, context specific, definitions of sex. This definition would most certainly be applied across all educational activities and programs and amounts to an assault on the existence and civil rights of transgender, gender nonconforming and intersex children, adolescents, and adults in our communities. Further, H.R. 734 places unfair burden on school administrators, who are not medical providers, to examine and police a student's body. Administrators and the National Association of Secondary School Principals have expressed concern and frustration over individual state's laws which violate Title IX.

This legislation is a "solution" in search of a problem. The policies of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), among others have longstanding guidelines regarding participation on competitive sports teams. The IOC first allowed transgender participation in the Olympic Games beginning in 2004 and the NCAA has done so since 2011. Both the IOC and the NCAA have refined their policy to better align with scientific fact and empirical research; and both organizations, as well as numerous high school athletic associations and professional and amateur sports leagues, currently to allow transgender athletes to compete on teams and in events aligned with their gender identity. Inclusive sports participation benefits all students and ensures equitable opportunities for collegiate sports attainment, collegiate scholarships, and opportunities to compete in professional sports. There is absolutely no evidence that cisgender athletes, or women's athletics in general, are harmed by these policies.

For almost two decades, transgender athletes in the United States have been allowed to participate in some of the most elite national and international competitions as their authentic selves. Yet, it was not until 2020, out of concern for the future of women's athletics, that policy makers sought to prohibit transgender people, particularly transgender women, from participating in sports teams that aligned with their gender identity. This legislation is not about protecting women. This legislation is a thinly veiled attempt at codifying a harmful and discriminatory definition of 'sex' under the guise of "protecting women" from discrimination in sports. This legislation is not about sports, it is about further erasing transgender people from public life. We adamantly oppose this legislation and urge you to do the same.

We welcome the opportunity to collaborate on legislation that promotes effective family engagement, ensures access to a well-rounded and inclusive curriculum, supports student well-being, and affirms the rights and identities of all students. Please contact NASP Director of Policy and Advocacy, Dr. Kelly Vaillancourt with questions, concerns, or opportunities to promote a public education system that works for all students.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN MINKE, PhD, NCSP,
Executive Director.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

□ 1545

Mr. Chair, there is no question that over the past several years, we have seen parents being denied the right to make decisions about their children's education. I don't quite understand the argument from the other side.

The reason I stand before this body today is not because I happen to be in Washington; it is because I am representing parents in my district who want to know what their children are being taught and what they are required to read.

In fact, parents across this country, certain groups, have gone so far as to label the parents "domestic terrorists" just because they wanted a say in their children's education. That is what we are talking about today is giving control back to the parents of our children.

This is not the way our education system was created, and it is not the way it is supposed to work. Allowing families to have a say in their children's education should not be a controversial subject. I don't get it.

Parents have a right to know what is being taught to their children, to give consent for medical evaluations, and to be heard. My goodness, it is in the top 10: Honor thy father and thy mother.

Unfortunately, we have seen Washington Democrats and outside groups push to radically reshape our education system by injecting divisive concepts and curriculum into our schools and classrooms regardless of whether families approve.

House Republicans are working to fulfill our commitment to America by building a future that is built on freedom, for crying out loud, a future where parents' rights are protected and families are given a seat at the table.

I am calling on all my colleagues to join us in support of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 29 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, which we should really call the politics over parents act.

As a mom of three, let me be clear about what this legislation would do. It opens the door to gagging educators, parents, and students, and turns classrooms into archaic tools for a vocal extremist minority.

Worse, it undermines what any mother wants for her child, a supportive classroom space that provides a fact-based education and practical life skills and critical-thinking skills.

Just look at the colossal education nightmare unfolding in my home State of Florida right now. Governor DeSantis and his stooge Florida lawmakers propose prohibiting girls from discussing their menstrual periods with one another while in school. They are already banning books, and they are barring certain elements of African-American history from being taught in school.

Governor DeSantis and his radical allies are also waging a cruel campaign to marginalize Florida's LGBTQ+ community, and suppress the histories of others they deem unworthy.

The Republican revival of the Lavender Scare includes shutting down businesses and passing a "Don't Say Gay" law that bans classroom discussions of sexual orientation and gender identity, even in high school.

Like a cancer, this hateful law has spread, with Republicans now censoring educators on a wide variety of topics, so it is no surprise my colleagues across the aisle want to export these same dangerous policies across America.

Make no mistake, H.R. 5 undermines teachers, and instead of offering students more support, it effectively denies it. The result of this law in Florida has cleared bookshelves and canceled coursework and an AP exam on African-American history.

As a mother whose children attended public schools, I speak for millions of moms when I say all we want for our children is a safe learning environment that ensures they discover the wider world, and not force them to grow into narrow-minded, ignorant adults.

This legislation just hands a vocal and extreme minority of parents the power to dictate what every American child learns.

To all my business-friendly Republicans, every classroom move to censor

and ban leaves our children even less competitive on the global stage. Mark my words.

Take it from this mom: We should reject this misguided legislation and, instead, unite to build classrooms where every child gets the resources and support they need to succeed in the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the First Focus Campaign for Children.

MARCH 20, 2023.

Hon. JULIA LETLOW,
Member, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN LETLOW, SPEAKER MCCARTHY, LEADER JEFFRIES, CHAIRWOMAN FOXX, AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: I am writing on behalf of First Focus Campaign for Children, a bipartisan children's advocacy organization dedicated to making children and families a priority in federal budget and policy decisions, to express opposition to H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act. We do not believe this bill strikes the right balance between the duties of schools, the rights and responsibilities of parents, and the oft-ignored but important rights of children.

PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT IS CRITICAL

First, let's be clear: Parents are fundamental to the upbringing of children and absolutely should be engaged and involved in the education of their children. In fact, children have better outcomes when their parents are involved. As a parent of four children myself, I have engaged with my children's schools by voting in school board elections, attending all parent-teacher conferences, volunteering in my children's classrooms, scheduling time to meet with teachers and administrators when important issues arise, serving on the PTAs at my children's schools, serving on athletic booster clubs, and volunteering as an assistant boys and girls basketball coach for two county schools.

In addition to my personal experiences, I have learned a great deal over the years from both of my parents, my step-mother, step-brother, my uncle, and several cousins, who are all educators. Consequently, I have immense respect for the work, talent, dedication, and concern that the vast majority of teachers and educators bring to their profession on a daily basis—all with the goal of educating our nation's children to best achieve their hopes and dreams while also trying to provide a place of safety and compassion for each and every one of their students.

Again, we strongly support parental engagement in education, but parents should not control all curriculum and educational decisions. Doing so is unworkable.

For example, imagine an elementary school of 500 students where 12 parents oppose the teaching of evolution, 8 parents believe the early is flat, 21 are Holocaust deniers, 14 oppose learning about slavery, 7

believe in racial segregation, 17 believe in the concept of schools without walls, 27 believe in corporal punishment, 12 want Harry Potter books to be banned, 25 want books banned that mention the Trail of Tears, 31 believe parents should be allowed to overrule a physician's decision that a child with a concussion should refrain from participating in sports, 39 oppose keeping kids out of school when they have the flu, 4 believe that a child with cancer might be contagious, 34 believe students should be "tracked" in all subject areas, 12 believe students should not be taught how to spell the words "sinal tap", "quarantine", or "isolation" because they are too "scary of words". 41 don't like the bus routes, 45 want a vegan-only lunchroom, 4 demand same-sex classrooms, etc. Even though most parents oppose these demands by some parents and many of them are completely false, undermine the purpose of education, threaten the safety of children, or promote discrimination, H.R. 5 would seek to push their accommodation in some form.

THE REAL PARENTS AGENDA FOR CHILDREN

We must all do better by our kids.

By an overwhelming 77-11 percent margin, a May 2022 poll by Lake Research Partners found that parents believe "policy involving children should always be governed by a 'best interest of the child' standard." By a 60-19 percent margin, the American people believe we are spending too little as opposed to too much on public education. And when it comes to investing in children, 9-in-10 voters (90-7 percent) agreed with the statement that "investing in children helps improve their lives, development, and outcomes."

When it comes to children's policy overall, a nationwide survey by Global Strategy Group in February 2023 found that American voters have strong priorities in favor of "creating more effective childcare options for all families" (87-8 percent), "expanding family and medical leave" (82-12 percent), bringing back the improved Child Tax Credit (76-13 percent), and "expanding universal preschool for all 3- and 4-year-olds" (73-16 percent). The support for this agenda stands in sharp contrast to the opposition that American voters express to an agenda that would call for "passing legislation banning transgender-focused health care options for young Americans" (41-47 percent), "banning books that some parents find to have questionable content" (32-57 percent), and "banning high school classes like AP African-American history" (21-68 percent).

CHILDREN HAVE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS TOO

Before diving into the details of H.R. 5, it is important to acknowledge that children need the support BY parents and government to be successful, and that they also sometimes need protection FROM parents and government.

The fact is that children have unique and fundamental human rights that should not be ignored or dismissed. These include the right to an education, the right to health care, the right to be protected from abuse and violence at home and in schools, the right to be protected from gun violence and school shootings, the right to not be discriminated against because of their race, ethnicity, gender (including gender identity and sexual orientation), economic status, disability, religion, immigration status, or age.

As for parental rights and H.R. 5's attempts to modify the Protection of Pupil Rights Act (PPRA) and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), it is important to highlight that PPRA was originally enacted nearly 50 years ago (in 1974) and has been modified several times, including in 1978, 1994, and 2002, in order to broaden access and consent requirements.

H.R. 5 ADDS NEW BUREAUCRACY TO SCHOOLS AND DETRACTS FROM THE TIME, ATTENTION, AND FUNDING DEDICATED TO STUDENTS

While the impetus for aspects of H.R. 5 are well-intentioned, our first concern is that the language is duplicative of language already in federal law, policies in state law, and general practice by school districts all across this country in many respects but also potentially adds new bureaucracy and red tape to schools and school districts all across this for no apparent benefit.

Unfortunately, these proposed changes may potentially harm children. Any funding, time, and attention that is shifted away from students and their learning toward added bureaucracy and red tape can be detrimental to students. But H.R. 5 provides no funding to address the many newly imposed bureaucratic requirements upon schools.

For example, H.R. 5 proposes new reporting requirements for schools to include in their "local educational agency report card" a budget that is detailed "for each elementary school and secondary school served by the local educational agency." Requiring detailed accounting of costs, some of which are shared across school campuses (e.g., school nurses, bus drivers, etc.), for the more than 90,000 public schools across this country will likely greatly increase the employment of accountants. However, H.R. 5 does not provide funding to pay for such a mandate. Before proceeding, we should acknowledge that this newly-imposed mandate detracts from the funding, time, and attention school districts and educators have for improving the education and well-being of children.

First Focus Campaign for Children supports tracking funding that is allocated for children's programs as a share of government spending, and thus, annually produce a Children's Budget that analyzes the funding of more than 250 federal programs. We share this report with Congress to raise the awareness and transparency of funding for children. However, we would urge Congress to focus as many of those dollars as possible on the children themselves and not on excessive accounting and reporting measures that consume much of the attention and focus of H.R. 5.

H.R. 5 PROMOTES BOOK BANS RATHER THAN ACCESS TO BOOKS AND READING

Another important concern is language from Sec. 104 and Sec. 202 that would require schools to share with all parents of students at every school "a list of books and other reading materials available to the students of such school in the school library." Again, compiling, cataloging, and sharing such information to all parents would come at great time and expense that is not paid for by H.R. 5. That money and time would come at the expense of librarians and other educators focused on the education of children. Parents already have the right to visit their child's school and its library, to request such information, and to ask their own children what they are learning and reading in school.

Rather than adding the burdens of more bureaucracy and red tape to schools and creating a chilling effect through increasing incidences of censorship and book bans, we should be working together to pass legislation to encourage students to read and learn through greater access to books, such as Reach Out and Read, First Book, Reading Is Fundamental, and other literacy programs. An individual parent should not solely be allowed to object to a book and cause its censorship for all of the children in a school or school district. This violates the parental rights of the vast majority of parents who do not support book bans or censorship.

Even more importantly, it violates the fundamental rights of children. As Justice

Abe Fortas wrote in his majority opinion in *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District* (1969):

Students in school as well as out of school are “persons” under our Constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the State must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the State . . . In the absence of a specific showing of constitutionally valid reasons to regulate their speech, students are entitled to freedom of expression of their views.

Justice Fortas adds:

It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate.

In the Supreme Court case *Island Trees School District v. Pico* (1982), the Court ruled that children have a fundamental right to an education and access to learning that is not limited by the censorship of books based on “narrowly partisan or political” grounds. As Justice William Brennan writes:

Our Constitution does not permit the official suppression of ideas. Thus, whether petitioners’ removal of books from their school libraries denied respondents their First Amendment rights depends upon the motivation behind petitioners’ actions. If petitioners intended by their removal decision to deny respondents access to ideas with which petitioners disagreed, and if this intent was the decisive factor in petitioners’ decisions, then petitioners have exercised their discretion in violation of the Constitution.

H.R. 5 THREATENS ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE, PRIVACY, AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF STUDENTS

Concern about access to health care for our children leads us to oppose the language in H.R. 5 with respect to school health. There were more than 4 million children in this country that were uninsured in 2020. In 2016, the Children’s Health Fund estimated that over 20 million children lacked “sufficient access to essential health care.”

Therefore, the role of school based health clinics, school nurses, school counselors, coaches, social workers, and physical trainers in schools is critically important to the health, education, and well-being of children. The language in H.R. 5 appears to dramatically expand the potential incidences in which all of these school personnel would have to seek out parental notification and consent prior to performing care, such as to check whether a student has a fever, has an ankle sprain, may have experienced a concussion, or need to check for a possible broken bone. In many cases, these may not be considered emergencies, but in the meantime, children languish or must wait while school personnel spend large amounts of time trying to track down parents for consent.

In the report accompanying H.R. 5, the House Education and Workforce Committee majority write, “Americans should never be forced to relinquish these parental rights to government—whether that involves curriculum decisions or *personal medical choices*” (emphasis added).

We strongly disagree.

First, such a statement would threaten the health, safety, and lives of some children in our country. For example, based on that statement, does the Committee majority reject the ability of schools to set graduation requirements? Oppose the teaching of evolution? Allow parents to send children to school even if they are vomiting, have a fever, diarrhea, or have a communicable disease? Does the Committee majority now oppose school vaccine mandates? School concussion protocols?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMER).

Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMER. Mr. Chair, I rise today as a proud mother of twin daughters.

As a parent, I know moms and dads agree that we all want what is best for our children. That is one of the reasons why it is so difficult for us to let our sons and daughters go on their first day of kindergarten. We have to start placing an enormous amount of trust in our teachers and administrators to do what is best for our children.

At the end of the day, nobody will understand a child’s interests and needs more than the people who love them most, their parents.

It is easy to understand why parents want to have and deserve to have the right to know what is going on inside the classroom. It is their responsibility. That is why we need the Parents Bill of Rights Act to help students succeed by ensuring every parent can have a voice in their child’s education.

During the committee markup on this bill, I was honored to lead two proposals that are now included. One will help parents better understand the priorities of their children’s school by bringing much-needed clarity to school budgets. The other sets both parents and teachers up for success by simplifying the curriculum feedback process.

My proposals build on two of the five core principles of the Parents Bill of Rights Act: Parents have the right to know what their children are being taught, and parents have the right to see the school’s budget and spending.

I will always fight to protect parental involvement and to put parents first. I am proud to support the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MCGARVEY).

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5, a bill that promotes conflict over clarity, callousness over kindness, and politics over problem-solving.

I am speaking today, not just as a Member of Congress, but as the parent of three young children, two of whom attend public schools in Louisville, Kentucky, and one who will be soon.

Parents should be involved in their kids’ education, in everything from school board elections to the PTA, to communicating with their child’s teacher on what is going on.

We received a message this morning from our kids’ teacher letting us know that there would be no band because of the fifth grade musical.

This bill is about impeding, not involvement. The reason the American Library Association opposes this bill is because H.R. 5 clearly opens the door to deprive our kids of fact-based education, and it is part of a larger effort to ban free expression and ideas in the classroom. Even Cato thinks it is unconstitutional.

Like a lot of parents, we had to step in and teach some during the beginning of the pandemic. It wasn’t easy, and I can assure you that curriculum should

be ultimately determined by experts, not untrained individuals with extremist views.

In addition to restricting parents’ rights, H.R. 5 hurts some of our most vulnerable kids in the LGBTQ community. Why?

According to the Trevor Project, one LGBTQ youth attempts suicide every 45 seconds, 45 seconds. Why?

Why are we being more cruel?

I believe that not just in politics but in life we are judged by how we treat those on the margins. My message to my colleagues is simple: Stop being mean to kids. We can be involved and be inclusive.

Normally, we warn our kids about dealing with bullies in their classrooms. We shouldn’t have to warn them about bullying from adults, too. This message is simple, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST).

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Chair, in many places across our great Nation, parents are being denied, being denied a voice in discussions around what their children are being taught in schools.

As Republicans, in our Commitment to America, we made a promise, a promise to establish the rights of parents to protect their children from indoctrination in our classrooms.

As a product of the public school system and father of two sons who graduated from public school, I understand the significant role our schools play in the education of our future leaders.

However, far-left ideas have seeped into America’s classrooms and have blurred the line between education and indoctrination. We cannot allow that to continue.

This bill simply protects the rights of parents, the rights of parents to know what their children are being taught, what their children are hearing in school, the right to see the budget that the school is spending, the right to protect their children’s privacy, and the right to keep their children safe.

Simply put, this bill protects those parents who want to play a role in their child’s life and to protect their children from indoctrination in the classroom.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this critical and commonsense piece of legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. MCCLELLAN), the newest Member of the House.

Mrs. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5.

I am the mother of two young children who you saw stand with me in this very Chamber 2 weeks ago, and I have near-daily conversations with the parents in my district about their hopes and concerns. I can assure you, they have a seat at the table in the school room, and they are not concerned with banning books, censoring our curriculum, or dictating what bathrooms students use.

Parents want increased resources for mental and behavioral health services, inclusive school environments that foster critical thinking and learning, and more funding to repair outdated and crumbling school buildings and address security issues.

They want their children to learn a complete and accurate history of our country and our world, and they want the peace of mind that their children are safe.

Three days after my son stood with me on this floor and watched me take the oath of office, one of his classmates shot himself accidentally with an unsecured gun, and he died. It was a devastating loss for our community.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Mrs. McCLELLAN. It was a devastating loss for our community and the community at large. These are the issues that matter to parents as they deal with the mental fallout of that incident. These are the issues they are talking about.

H.R. 5 does nothing to address these priorities. It would create unnecessary reporting requirements and divert critical resources away from meeting the real needs of our students and families.

I urge our colleagues to vote “no” on the politics over parents act.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the esteemed gentlewoman from North Carolina for allotting me some time here today.

I rise in support, strong support, Mr. Chair, of H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

As parents, we put trust in our local schools and teachers and expect that our children are receiving an appropriate education, and in most cases, they do.

We have all had great teachers that have positively impacted our lives, and our children have, and we are very grateful for that and we will remember them forever.

In recent years, for varying reasons, there have been well-known instances where the trust between schools and parents has been eroded, in fact, broken, and primarily those issues stem from parents being excluded or having their participation in the educational process removed, such as curriculum review being very limited.

Everyone agrees that such instances, whether they occur often or infrequently, should not happen, and when they do, they are unacceptable.

As a father, I know that to a mom and dad there is nothing more precious than their children, and being included in the education process should be a parent’s right, especially as taxpayers. Any rational adult, whether parent or educator, knows what the reasonable level of involvement should be.

Parents should have the right to be heard and to know what their child is being taught. Parents should have the right to see the school budget. Parents should have the right to be alerted if there are instances of violence or problems in the child’s schools. Parents are not asking too much. They are simply asking to be involved, which helps create a strong family and a better educational environment for all.

It is our responsibility as elected officials to honor their requests and guarantee they will be included in the education process and school activities. That is why this Republican majority has put forth the Parents Bill of Rights Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I include in the RECORD a statement from Equity-Minded Education, Civil Rights, and Immigration Advocates on H.R. 5 that concludes that we urge Congress to focus on real and meaningful efforts to truly support our students, parents, and teachers, and to stop using parents as a decoy to launch political attacks on our schools.

[Mar. 7, 2023]

JOINT STATEMENT FROM EQUITY-MINDED EDUCATION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND IMMIGRATION ADVOCATES ON H.R. 5

As equity-minded education, civil rights, and immigration organizations, we work to ensure that our nation’s students are learning, feel safe and respected at school, and have the supports they and their families need to succeed. As such, we are deeply concerned about the Parents Bill of Rights Act (H.R. 5) recently introduced in the House of Representatives. This legislation, like similar bills in a growing number of states that ban books or censor curriculum and textbooks, is divisive and designed to politicize our schools rather than provide what parents really want: a great education for their children.

In addition to enabling book bans and curriculum censorship, the bill is redundant and out of sync with what parents want. Provisions in the bill that allow a parent to demand inspections of schools and school budgets are designed to disrupt teachers’ ability to teach students, and hinder school administrators’ ability to run safe and welcoming schools. The bill also inserts the federal government to help determine the frequency of parent-teacher conferences—something nearly all school districts across the country establish through locally determined policies. Moreover, recent polling indicates that the top priorities for parents are not these wedge issues; rather they want to keep their children safe from violence at schools, ensure adequate mental health supports for them, and help in their learning recovery. Federal law should—and already does—require that parents receive information on what their kids are learning, how they are achieving, and on the qualifications of their child’s teachers.

We support and encourage a broader view of the rights of parents and students: the right to have access to fully-resourced schools, prepared and qualified teachers, safe and welcoming places for students to learn, and the supports to make sure all students can thrive. The ability of the U.S. education system to provide these essential requirements should be the primary focus of Congress. We have supported bipartisan efforts

over the years to help achieve these goals, including the funding of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund to provide schools with the resources to safely reopen and to help students get back on track after the disruption and loss caused by the pandemic, and additional resources for mental health needs through the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. We urge this Congress to focus on real and meaningful efforts to truly support our students, parents, and teachers—and to stop using parents as a decoy to launch political attacks on our schools.

All4Ed

Center for American Progress

Education Reform Now

National Center for Learning Disabilities

National Parents Union

Schoolhouse Connection

The Education Trust

UnidosUS

National Urban League

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a statement from Third Way, which concludes: “Protecting the ability of parents to make the best decisions for their children is a fundamental American value. This proposal is a serious distraction from what our students really need right now: to be learning in an academically challenging and safe environment that engages families and teachers in true partnership to support students.”

WASHINGTON.—Third Way released the following statement from Lanae Erickson, Senior Vice President for Social Policy, Education, and Politics:

“This week, the House majority will bring H.R. 5 to the floor under the guise of increasing parental engagement in schools—but its substance would do nothing to advance that goal. Instead, this bill would censor parents, undermine student mental health, ban books from school libraries, redirect resources and personnel away from meeting families’ real needs, and ultimately function as a gag order on teaching and learning across the country.

“We should be empowering school boards and Parent Teacher Associations to make informed decisions when it comes to their students’ education. This bill would invite Congress to dictate the schedule of parent-teacher conferences and control course instruction in every one of the nearly 100,000 public schools from coast to coast. We should be supporting the well-being of students by increasing access to mental health professionals. This legislation would limit families’ access to crucial mental health services in an era when we know they are needed more than ever. We should be investing in the safety of our students by keeping firearms out of classrooms. This bill would focus only on reporting violence once students have already been hurt or killed.

“Protecting the ability of parents to make the best decisions for their children is a fundamental American value. This proposal is a serious distraction from what our students really need right now: to be learning in an academically challenging and safe environment that engages families and teachers in true partnership to support students.”

□ 1600

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this controversial and highly dangerous bill, H.R. 5.

I am a former teacher. My parents were teachers. I have been doing child education advocacy my entire career. My wife and I are parents of two public school children right now. This is our lives. This is what we do day in and day out.

I want to be very clear so that my colleagues understand what rights I have as a parent, which are the same rights that all Americans, all parents in America, have if their children are in public schools.

I can go speak to the school board whenever I want. I can do that now. I have that right.

Madam Chair, I can ask about the books. I can ask about the budget.

Of course, I can get information about the medical condition of my children. I have that right now.

My colleagues have to know this. If they do not, and this is news to them, they can pull the bill.

Right now, this new national ban and set of controls will simply lead to our schools, our teachers, and many of our parents drowning in lawsuits.

I offered two amendments. One was a litigation shield to help protect our folks from obviously dangerous lawsuits that would come of this if this bill were to pass. The second was to opt out if a district does not want to be part of this because I believe in local control, as do most of the people in my district. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents believe in local control. Let school districts opt out.

It is not about local control. This is about taking a small, teeny ideology and forcing it on the rest of us. As a parent, I can say on behalf of so many parents, leave us alone.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. GREENE of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Madam Chair, we need politicians at the State level and D.C. politicians with this bill to get out of our lives, get out of our doctors' offices, get out of our classrooms, and, as a parent, get out of my house. Let me parent my child.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 5.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, today, the National Parents Union released a poll that supports an alternative version of H.R. 5 and does not support H.R. 5 in the least.

In fact, the majority of people believe that the bill of rights should guarantee that students should have access to a high-quality, well-rounded education with resources to support their individual needs. They overwhelmingly agree that parents' own personal beliefs should not prevent other students from accessing certain curricula and materials.

The majority encourage the teaching of topics like women's history, Black history, Native American history, and Latino, Latina, and Hispanic history.

The majority of parents want Congress to focus on issues like anti-bullying measures in schools and providing students with access to career and technical education and academic tutoring.

They rank requiring public schools to provide parents with a list of books and reading materials in the library as the least important priority for Congress compared to other issues.

They say that public schools should teach about and discuss concepts like kindness, empathy, cooperation, and collaboration.

Ninety percent say that students should have access to high-quality, well-rounded education. Ninety percent say that students should be protected from any form of discrimination against them at school. Eighty-nine percent say that students should be taught using educational materials that are historically accurate. Eighty percent say students should be taught using educational materials that reflect the diversity of the United States. Eighty-three percent say students should be taught about how government works so they can be prepared to participate in democracy.

My colleagues, H.R. 5 misses the mark. Please, vote it down. I will be offering a substitute amendment. We have something we can stand for that will really, truly address the needs of students and parents.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Council of the Great City Schools in opposition to H.R. 5.

COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS®,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2023.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Council of the Great City Schools, the coalition of the nation's largest central city school districts, writes to offer our perspective on H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act pending before the Committee. Urban schools have long supported and encouraged family involvement in our students' education and view parental engagement as an invaluable tool to further school improvement. Yet H.R. 5 includes excessive and redundant federal requirements that are costly, time-consuming, and unnecessary to improve student performance. The bill also contains problematic requirements, such as provisions that impede school districts' ability to operate effective instructional programs and ones that may deter the identification of students that need mental health support. The Council does not support H.R. 5 and urges House leaders to develop legislation that focuses on the instructional improvements and supports that provide our students with the best opportunity for success in school and life.

Urban school districts provide an endless number of engagement opportunities and have longstanding local policies and state laws to foster this connection. Parental involvement on school-based committees is routine in urban schools, with positions designated specifically for parents and family members to review library materials and textbooks, budget expenditures, school safe-

ty procedures, and school improvement plans to increase student learning. The inclusion of federal requirements in H.R. 5 that, for example, mandate a specific number of in-person teacher meetings per year, the annual disclosure of library and reading materials at each school, and detailed budget publications needlessly duplicate commonplace practices in districts that customarily have multiple parent-teacher meetings, online card catalogs, and regular public meetings for developing annual district-level and school-level budgets that are posted on the districts' websites.

We also do not support provisions that hinder districts' ability to provide the instruction and support that our students need to succeed. Urban school districts have worked hard to ensure that the benefits of content-rich resources are available to our children and have invested in online tools to promote an "anywhere/anytime" approach to learning. Encouraging parental objections to the use of such technology will likely prove extremely disruptive for all students and creates avoidable strictures for school and district staff. Similarly, any restrictions on access to school psychologists and counselors to support mental health will unsettle school districts that are prioritizing the well-being of those students that need it most.

Urban school districts are committed to their students, parents, and families and have long worked to keep them informed, inspired, and ready to partner with their local schools. Authentic parent engagement is essential to increasing student achievement and readiness for college, career, and life. The Council urges a NO vote on H.R. 5 and encourages Congress to develop legislation that will help our districts and school communities reach these goals.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND HART,
Executive Director.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, it has been a pleasure to work on the Parents Bill of Rights Act. While working on this bill, I have heard from parents' groups who offered their support. I would like to mention what just a few of them said.

The Independent Women's Voice wrote: "The Parents Bill of Rights Act acknowledges parents' fundamental right to make decisions for their children."

"Parents do not simply turn children over to government schools with the assumption that the school will make every decision without parental input. As parents, we have a right to direct the upbringing, care, and education of our children."

The Concerned Women for America Legislative Action Committee said: "Americans have been awakened to the troubling fact that public schools are failing our children. The lack of educational standards combined with the radical ideologies being taught in the classroom have led more and more parents to question the public education system. . . . This act reasserts the proper role of parents in their children's education."

Finally, Parents Defending Education Action said: "There is an intentional and universal lack of transparency and accountability among school districts. Concerning incidents

are major and widespread. . . . The Parents Bill of Rights Act, introduced by Congresswoman JULIA LETLOW, addresses the primary issues parents have vocalized over the last 2 years: academics, free speech, safety, fairness, and transparency. We hope Congress will be receptive to the Parents Bill of Rights Act and vindicate parents who have spoken up and yearn for such legislation."

After hearing statements like this, it should be clear that this bill gives parents what they want. Polling shows that overwhelming majorities of parents want more control over what their children are taught. According to survey results, 72 percent of Americans support curriculum transparency. Additionally, 67 percent believe that parents should be able to opt their children out of curriculum they believe is inappropriate or harmful. Nearly 8 in 10 parents polled nationally want to have influence over what is taught in K-12 classrooms.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES), a former teacher of the year.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, the politics over parents act.

One of the most dangerous provisions of this bill is the banning of books. Across our Nation, books that illustrate our rich history and our diversity are being pulled from library shelves. According to PEN American's "Index of School Book Bans," of the 2,500 books banned last year, 41 percent of these books explicitly address LGBTQ themes, and 40 percent contain prominent characters of color.

My colleagues across the aisle say that nothing in this legislation will ban books or censor libraries. If this is true, I invite them to support my amendment, which ensures this legislation will not go into effect until the Comptroller General of the United States can confirm that the bill will not lead to censorship or banning books for children or affect learning outcomes for students.

Throughout history, the voices of women, persons of color, and members of the LGBTQ community have been suppressed. Their voices, experiences, and stories have been labeled controversial, oversexual, and even un-American.

As a teacher, you do not get to pick the parts of history you deem worthy to teach. When I was a teacher, I told the entire story honestly, the good and the bad, and gave students the tools that they needed to participate in their communities in a conscientious and productive way.

I will tell you a personal story. My son is currently reading "To Kill a Mockingbird," one of the books on this list of banned books. In his initial observation of this book, he said: "Mom, they use the n-word a lot." I mean, a

lot, and I don't like it, but it opened the door to broader conversations between me and my son about segregation and Jim Crow laws, and it led him to ask some very difficult questions of me.

In his final observation of Harper Lee's novel, he said: "But yet and still, Atticus Finch defended Tom Robinson." Through this complex story, his takeaway was not hateful, hurtful, or angry. It was that, even then, good people existed.

That is what books do. That is how kids learn, not through censorship.

Teachers do not have the autonomy to indoctrinate students. Everything we are talking about here today is already published. Budgets are public. Curriculums are public. Parents are marching in, being a part of our classes.

When I was introduced by the ranking member, he mentioned that I was the National Teacher of the Year. That doesn't happen without parent-teacher partnerships.

This bill will not improve educational outcomes. This bill caters to a small group of individuals who seek to impose their world views on entire school districts, on my child.

Madam Chair, I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

Mrs. Hayes of Connecticut moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE VII—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 701. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the Comptroller General of the United States—

(1) makes a determination that this Act will not—

(A) result in the banning or censorship of books for children attending public elementary and secondary schools; or

(B) negatively affect learning outcomes for such children; and

(2) submits notice of such determination to Congress.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Chair, I am going to say again and again and again and again, this bill does not do anything to ban books.

My understanding is that the book "To Kill a Mockingbird" was banned by a liberal school board in California, so don't blame us for what liberals do.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Madam Chair, let's lay out the fundamental rights of parents. That is what we are discussing here today.

Number one, every parent should be given a choice and a voice on how their child receives an education.

Number two, school curriculum should not be used to politically indoctrinate our children.

Number three, parents deserve options. They deserve a choice on how their child receives an education.

In my family, my wife and I made a personal decision to homeschool our children. Every parent should be free to make that choice, not just the wealthy ones.

What is the parents bill of rights? What are the pillars of this bill?

Parents deserve the right to know what is being taught in schools and to see the reading material. It is very simple.

Parents deserve to be heard.

Parents deserve the right to see where the taxpayer dollars are going, how they are spent, and how they are being used. It is a fundamental principle of good governance.

Parents have the right to protect their children, to protect their children's privacy.

Parents absolutely should be updated and informed in the instances of violence that seem to be increasing in our schools, many of which go unreported.

I am very honored to be a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and to support this bill, to support parents, and to support parents' rights, particularly that our children get the best possible education. This is a significant step forward.

□ 1615

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I want to get back to something that was said a little earlier because it is a little disturbing the way this legislation, a notice of rights—that people have a right to information about their child, their child, their child. You have a right to notice before a person speaks to their child at a class, school assembly, or any other school-sponsored event.

If you have a field trip, I guess you have a right to notice before anybody at the museum can speak to your child. But under subsection L, it says you have: "the right to know if a school employee or contractor acts to change a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name. . . ."

That means any child—if any teacher addresses any child, everybody has a right to notice if they change their minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name. I think that is concerning. I don't know what is meant by that, but that is the way it reads.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. KILEY. Madam Chair, as we speak, a half million California students are locked out of school. Los Angeles Unified, America's second largest district, has shut down for the week. Taxpaying parents in this district have no place to send their kids to school.

Sadly, they have had to get used to it. This dysfunctional district and its union have lurched from one strike, one shutdown to the next, and seized on COVID-19 as a golden opportunity to close schools indefinitely. Kids in LA were without in-person instruction longer than anywhere in the country, a year and a half for most students.

Even when some high schools resumed, students walked into a Kafkaesque Zoom in the room setup where there were a few students and a teacher there instructing from a laptop sitting on a desk in the classroom. The eventual resumption of classes was anything but normal. You had kids who were forced to eat lunch on gymnasium floors or outside, even when it was raining. They would have to wear masks all day every day without any public health rationale. The district then imposed an illegal student vaccine mandate that the California courts had to intervene and strike down.

By the way, this was a failing school district even before COVID—on the brink of bankruptcy, with students testing several years behind grade level.

The hundreds of thousands of parents in this school district have been subjected to one abuse after another. Their experience is shared by many parents across the country who have lost the right to control their child's education at the hands of a corrupt education establishment driven less by student success than by special interests and social agendas.

Today's Parents Bill of Rights Act is a desperately needed course correction, shifting the paradigm of public education in this country back toward one that is student-centered and parent-directed.

My addition to this legislation is the school choice amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KILEY. The only parents in Los Angeles whose kids are not at home right now are those who have the resources for private school or the time and wherewithal to seek out a charter school or limited interdistrict transfer options.

My amendments will enable more parents to do the same, providing a clear path to find a school that better serves their child.

This will not only increase the educational outcomes of particular students but induce the sort of systemic change that we need to benefit all students.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a list of groups that either oppose or express concerns about H.R. 5, over 225 different organizations.

LIST OF GROUPS THAT EITHER OPPOSE OR HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERNS ABOUT H.R. 5

AASA, The School Superintendents Association; All4Ed; American Federation of Teachers (AFT); American Library Association (ALA); A Way Home America; AACTE (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education); Act To Change Advocacy Institute; Advocates for Youth; American Association of University Women; American Atheists; American Civil Liberties Union; American Humanist Association; American School Counselor Association; Apiary for Practical Support; Arab American Institute (AAI); Asian Americans Advancing Justice (AAJC); Athlete Ally; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; A Woman's Choice of Charlotte; A Woman's Choice of Greensboro.

A Woman's Choice of Jacksonville; A Woman's Choice of Raleigh; Acadiana Queer Collective; Aces NYC; Action Together New Jersey; African American Office of Gay Concerns; AIDS Foundation Chicago; Alliance for Quality Education; Arkansas Black Gay Men's Forum; Avow Texas; Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Bend the Arc; Jewish Action Campaign for Our Shared Future; Bans Off Miami; Black Californians United for Early Care and Education; Care in Action; Catholics for Choice; Center for American Progress; Center for Applied Transgender Studies; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for LGBTQ Economic Advancement & Research (CLEAR).

Center Link: The Community of LGBT Centers; Collective Power for Reproductive Justice; Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Campaign for Our Shared Future (COSF); Cato Institute; Center for American Progress (CAP); Campus Pride; Carolina for All; Central Florida Jobs with Justice; Chicago Abortion Fund; Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights; Cobalt; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Democrats for Education Reform DC (DFER DC); Democrats for Education Reform Massachusetts; Democrats for Education Reform New York; Detroit Disability Power; DFER Colorado; Disability Law Center; Donald Patton.

Dutchess County Progressive Action Alliance; Education Reform Now; Education Trust; EducateUS; SIECUS In Action; Education Leaders of Color (EdLoC); Education Reform Now; Empowering Pacific Islander Communities; End Rape On Campus; Equal Rights Advocates; Equality Federation; Equity Forward Evaluation, Data Integration, and Technical Assistance (EDIT) Program; Education Reform Now; Education Reform Now CT; Education Reform Now Texas; Equality California March; Equality Illinois; Equality South Dakota; Equality Virginia; EqualityMaine; Family Equality.

Feminist Campus; Fenway Institute; First Focus Campaign for Children; FORGE, Inc.; First Focus Campaign for Children; Faces of Fallen Fathers; FL National Organization for Women; Florida Council of Churches; Florida Health Justice Project; Forever Caring Evonne; Girls Inc.; GLAAD; GLBTQ Legal Advocates and Defenders (GLAD); GLSEN; Grandmothers for Reproductive Rights; Gender Justice; GLSEN New Mexico; Greater Milwaukee Urban League; Greater Orlando National Organization for Women; Hindu American Foundation.

Hispanic Federation; Houston Area Urban League; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights First; If/When/How; Lawyering for Reproductive Justice; Impact Fund; In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Indivisible; interACT: Advocates for Intersex Youth; Interfaith Alliance; Illinois Families for Public Schools; Independent Voters of Illinois-Independent Precinct Organization; Indivisible

DuPage Indivisible Georgia Coalition; Indivisible Miami; Japanese American Citizens League; Juvenile Law Center; Jane's Due Process; JASMYN, Inc.; KIPP Public Schools; Lafayette Citizens Against Censorship.

Latino Memphis; Learning Rights Law Center; Los Angeles LGBT Center; Louisiana Citizens Against Censorship; Louisiana Coalition for Reproductive Freedom; Louisiana Progress; Louisiana Trans Advocates; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; Lambda Legal; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Lawyers for Good Government; League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC); Matthew Shepard Foundation; MomsRising; Movement Advancement Project; Maine Parent Federation; Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition; Mazzoni Center; Memphis Urban League.

Michigan Alliance for Special Education; Michigan Education Justice Coalition; Missouri Health Care for All; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Association of School Psychologists (NASP); National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Learning Disabilities (NCSL); National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Parent Leadership, Advocacy, and Community Empowerment (National PLACE); National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center for Youth Law; National Council of Asian Pacific Americans; National Disability Rights Network (NDRN); National Domestic Workers Alliance; National Education Association (NEA); National Employment Law Project; National Hispanic Media Coalition; National LGBT Cancer Network; National Organization for Women; National Parents Union.

National Urban League; National Women's Law Center; New American Leaders Action Fund; New Generation Equity Oregonizers; NASD; National Council of Jewish Women St. Louis; NJ Community Schools Coalition; North Carolina Justice Center; OutFront Minnesota; OutNebraska; People For the American Way; PFLAG National; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Plume Health Public Advocacy for Kids (PAK); Public Citizen; Public Justice; Parent Education Organizing Council; Paterson Alliance; Paterson Education Foundation.

PAVE (Parents Amplifying Voices in Education); Pride Action Tank; Pro Choice Missouri; Pro-Choice North Carolina; Progress Florida; Queer Northshore; Red Wine & Blue; Reproductive Rights Coalition; Rad Family, a project of North Jersey Pride; Reproductive Freedom Acadiana; Save Our Schools NJ; SHERo Mississippi; Silver State Equality-Nevada; Solid Foundation Youth Outreach; Southern Echo Inc.; St. Tammany Library Alliance; School Board Partners; Sexual Violence Prevention Association (SVPA); SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change; Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF).

SPAN Parent Advocacy Network; SPLC Action Fund; Stand for Children; Schoolhouse Connection; Software & Information Industry Association (SSIA); Tahirih Justice Center; The Advocates for Human Rights; The Arc of the United States; The Council of the Great City Schools; The Education Trust; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Personal Stories Project; The Sikh Coalition; The Workers Circle; TransAthlete; True Colors United; Trust Women; Third Way; The Ezekiel Project; The Parents' Place of MD.

The Urban League of Philadelphia; The Womxn Project; Urban League of Greater Pittsburgh; Urban League of Middle Tennessee; UnidosUS; Unitarian Universalist Association; United State of Women (USOW);

URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; VoteProChoice; Voto Latino; Virginia Coalition of Latino Organization; Wayfinder Foundation; We Testify; Whole Woman's Health; Whole Woman's Health Alliance; Woodhull Freedom Foundation; YWCA USA.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I will respond to a comment that my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned a few minutes ago.

I point out that the manager's amendment that we will debate clarifies the intent of the language the ranking member was reading.

The manager's amendment makes it clear the school district's responsibility is to the parents' child, not any child.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, in that case, the individual child will be identified and will be, essentially, outed, and that is even worse than the underlying language. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, in closing, despite our colleagues' claims, the politics over parents act would only further politicize our children's classrooms while doing nothing to meaningfully improve partnerships between parents and educators. It will lead to censoring books.

Last night at the Rules Committee, a significant amount of time was taken to identify books that ought to be banned, and although the bill does not technically, directly censor books, the reporting requirements will allow national groups to find books all over the country that they don't like, and they could threaten each of those schools—wherever they find the book, they can threaten lawsuits unless the book is actually banned.

House Democrats tried several times to ensure that this legislation would actually address real challenges facing students, parents, and educators, and increase parental involvement.

For example, Democrats offered amendments to prevent this bill from banning books or censoring the curriculum. Moreover, in committee, we offered 25 amendments to actually improve student success, such as improving access to teacher training, fully fund parent engagement centers, and ensure students have access to mental health resources, among others. Unfortunately, they were struck down.

Madam Chair, Democrats are dedicated to improving parental engagement and ensuring that every child receives a well-funded and accurate education. This legislation does nothing to achieve that goal and would only advance an extreme education agenda at the expense of students and parents.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, we have heard a lot about what this bill is going to do in the future, and it is all bad from the other side.

What has been particularly disturbing to me to hear today are comments that truly misrepresent what is in the legislation before us. That scares the public, and that is not what we should be about.

This bill is not going to cause people to be mean to schoolchildren. It does not attempt to hurt anyone. It is not going to ban books.

Our colleagues say, on one hand that a list of all the books is already available out there to parents, and then they say, this bill is going to force those lists to be put out and that will cause the banning of books.

We have heard that books have been banned. In the Rules Committee last night, books that they said had been banned inappropriately—those assertions were refuted.

It has been truly troubling, in our committee markup in the Rules Committee last night and today, to hear the terrible misrepresentations about this bill.

As my colleagues and I have said, this Parents Bill of Rights Act is to help parents be more involved with their children's education, as they should be.

I am urging my colleagues to support H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act, and by doing so we will send a strong message that parents are an integral part of their child's education and must be respected.

For too long, parents have been kept at a distance in schools and classrooms. Teachers' unions and education bureaucrats made significant efforts to conceal what was truly being taught in classrooms. What came out of COVID was parents saw what was being taught and they didn't like it.

For years, students were falling behind in critical subject areas such as mathematics and reading, but prolonged school closures hastened the deterioration of learning.

Now, the Parents Bill of Rights Act will foster robust parent/teacher partnerships and close the gap between families and educators. That is what this bill is about—setting up true partnerships between families and educators.

We respect educators. We want to support what they are doing in the classroom. But parents want to know what is being taught in the classroom. We want transparency and we want accountability.

To recover lost learning and promote a safe learning environment, parents must be involved in the classroom. Parents are the best advocates for the best interests of their child, and teachers are an important part of enhancing the well-being of students.

I hope our colleagues will not continue to misrepresent what is in this bill but will work with us for the benefit of America's children. That is what we are about on our side of the aisle, not to hurt, not to be mean, but to support.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to do what is best for students, support this important bill.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, when a mother or a father drops their child off at school in the morning, they should not have to wonder what that child will hear, read, see, or learn that day. Families should feel confident in the American education system, and when they sense that there is a problem, they deserve the right to have a voice, and for that voice to be heard.

Parents deserve the right to know what is being taught. There are too many classrooms in America that take time away from reading, science, mathematics, and arts; and give that time to inappropriate, age-inappropriate explicit sexual education, historically inaccurate critical race theory, and fluid gender ideology.

Parents are the ones most invested in their child's education—you will not find someone with more stake in—or more long-term influence on—the success of a child, and research continually shows that parental involvement yields measurable and consistent success.

Furthermore, it is our most vulnerable students who often suffer the most when schools focus on agendas other than academic success. Minority and lower income children are too often trapped in under-performing schools, vulnerable to the ideological agenda of the left infiltrating their curriculum and falling victim to the education establishment's monopoly system.

This important legislation directly identifies and protects the rights that parents inherently hold.

As Chair of the House Values Action Team, as a Representative for the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama, and most importantly, as a father of two, I support the Parents Bill of Rights and urge its passage. This legislation matters, because children matter, and parents matter.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5, the Politics Over Parents Act. This bill is an attempt by House Republicans to attack public education in America and restrict the free exchange of ideas that fosters critical thinking. It is part of a harmful, nationwide extreme Republican march toward censorship and book bans. For example, in the 2021–2022 School Year, the most banned book titles included 'Beloved' and 'The Bluest Eye' by the groundbreaking author and Nobel Laureate Toni Morrison—not unlike the way 'To Kill a Mockingbird' by Harper Lee has been the subject of book bans since the 1960s.

This censorship deprives students of opportunities to learn, grow, and obtain information from a variety of perspectives. Other types of censorship under this bill would deprive students of an accurate and fact-based education.

The strength of America comes from its diversity. But instead of delivering the support and resources our schools need, so-called

“parents’ rights” bills like this empower extremists to impose their beliefs on all students and parents.

My mother worked in a library. She taught me it is important that every child in every community has a safe place to learn and grow. Democrats are focused on improving public education, making our schools safer, and ensuring schools and students have what they need to recover from the pandemic.

This legislation is irresponsible and is yet another divisive political stunt by the Republican majority.

It should be rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-2. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Parents Bill of Rights Act”.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SEC. 101. STATE PLAN ASSURANCES.

Section 1111(g)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(g)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (M), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (N), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(O) the State will ensure that each local educational agency in the State—

“(i) in a case in which the curriculum for an elementary or secondary school grade level is freely and publicly available on the internet—

“(I) posts on a publicly accessible website of the agency, such curriculum; or

“(II) if such agency does not operate a website, widely disseminates to the public such curriculum; or

“(ii) in a case in which the curriculum for an elementary or secondary school grade level is not freely and publicly available on the internet—

“(I) posts on a publicly accessible website of the agency—

“(aa) a description of such curriculum; and

“(bb) information on how parents can review such curriculum as described in section 1112(e)(1)(A); or

“(II) if such agency does not operate a website, widely disseminates to the public the description and information described in items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I); and

“(P) in the case of any revisions to the State’s challenging State academic standards (including any revisions to the levels of achievement within the State’s academic

achievement standards), the State educational agency will post to the homepage of its website, and widely disseminate to the public, notice of such revisions and a copy of such revisions, except that the State educational agency shall not be required to submit such notice or such revisions to the Secretary.”.

SEC. 102. ANNUAL LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REPORT CARDS.

Section 1111(h)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)(2)) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) BUDGET.—Each local educational agency report card shall include the budget for the school year for which such report card is being prepared (including all revenues and expenditures (including expenditures made to private entities)) for the local educational agency as a whole, and for each elementary school and secondary school served by the local educational agency. In addition to the detailed budget information required under the preceding sentence, the agency shall include a separate fact sheet that summarizes such information in a clear and easily understandable format.”.

SEC. 103. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLAN ASSURANCES.

Section 1112(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) meet the requirements described in section 1111(g)(2)(O);

“(9) post on a publicly accessible website of the local educational agency or, if the local educational agency does not operate a website, widely disseminate to the public, the plan for carrying out the parent and family engagement described in section 1116 and all policies and procedures that result from such engagement;

“(10) ensure that each elementary school served by the local educational agency notifies the parents of any student enrolled at such school when the student does not score as grade-level proficient in reading or language arts at the end of the third grade based on the reading or language arts assessments administered under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) or another assessment administered to all third grade students by such school; and

“(11) ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by the local educational agency provides to the parents of students enrolled at such school, before a person speaks (in-person or virtually) to such students in a class, school assembly, or any other school-sponsored event, notice that includes the name of the speaker and the name of the organization or other entity being represented by the speaker.”.

SEC. 104. PARENTS RIGHT-TO-KNOW.

Section 1112(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (6), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following:

“(1) NOTICE OF RIGHTS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency posts on a publicly accessible website of the school or, if the school does not operate a website, widely disseminates to the public, a summary notice of the right of parents to information about their children’s

education as required under this Act, which shall be in an understandable format for parents and include, at minimum—

“(A) the right to review, and make copies of, at no cost, the curriculum of their child’s school;

“(B) the right to know if the State alters the State’s challenging State academic standards;

“(C) the right to meet with each teacher of their child not less than twice during each school year in accordance with paragraph (5)(A);

“(D) the right to review the budget, including all revenues and expenditures, of their child’s school;

“(E) the right to—

“(i) a list of the books and other reading materials available in the library of their child’s school; and

“(ii) inspect such books or other reading materials;

“(F) the right to information about all schools in which their child can enroll, including options for enrolling in or transferring to—

“(i) other schools served by the local educational agency;

“(ii) charter schools; and

“(iii) schools served by a different local educational agency in the State;

“(G) the right to address the school board of the local educational agency;

“(H) the right to information about violent activity in their child’s school;

“(I) the right to information about any plans to eliminate gifted and talented programs in the child’s school;

“(J) the right to review any professional development materials;

“(K) the right to know if their child is not grade-level proficient in reading or language arts at the end of the third grade as described in subsection (c)(10);

“(L) the right to know if a school employee or contractor acts to—

“(i) change a minor child’s gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name; or

“(ii) allow a child to change the child’s sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms;

“(M) the right to know if—

“(i) a school employee or contractor acts to—

“(I) treat, advise, or address the cyberbullying of a student;

“(II) treat, advise, or address the bullying or hazing of a student;

“(III) treat, advise, or address a student’s mental health, suicidal ideation, or instances of self-harm;

“(IV) treat, advise, or address a specific threat to the safety of a student;

“(V) treat, advise, or address the possession or use of drugs and other controlled substances; or

“(VI) treat, advise, or address an eating disorder; or

“(ii) a child brings a weapon to school; and

“(N) the right to the notice described in subsection (c)(11) before a person speaks (in-person or virtually) to their child in a class, school assembly, or any other school-sponsored event.”;

(3) in paragraph (2)(B) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) by redesignating clause (i) and clause (ii) as subclause (I) and subclause (II), respectively;

(B) by striking “(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—” and inserting:

“(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) SCHOOL LIBRARY.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall

ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school—

“(I) at the beginning of each school year, a list of books and other reading materials available in the library of such school; and

“(II) the opportunity to inspect such books and other reading materials.

“(iii) VIOLENT ACTIVITY.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school timely notification of any violent activity occurring on school grounds or at school-sponsored activities in which one or more individuals suffer injuries, except that such notification shall not contain names or the grade level of any students involved in the activity.

“(iv) GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAMS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school timely notification of any plan to eliminate gifted and talented programs in such school.”; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

“(5) TRANSPARENCY.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall provide the parents of each child who is a student in an elementary school or secondary school served by such agency—

“(A)(i) the opportunity to meet in-person or virtually via videoconference with each teacher of such child not less than twice during each school year; and

“(ii) a notification, at the beginning of each school year, of the opportunity for such meetings, including the option to attend such meetings virtually via videoconference; and

“(B) the opportunity to address the school board of such local educational agency on issues impacting the education of children in such agency.”.

SEC. 105. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8549C as section 8549D; and

(2) by inserting after section 8549B the following new section:

“SEC. 8549C. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

“(1) Parents have a First Amendment right to express their opinions on decisions made by State and local education leaders.

“(2) States and local educational agencies should empower parents to communicate regularly with Federal, State, and local policymakers and educators regarding the education and well-being of their children.

“(3) Transparent and cooperative relationships between parents and schools have significant and long-lasting positive effects on the development of children.

“(4) Parents’ concerns over content and pedagogy deserve to be heard and fully considered by school professionals.

“(5) Parent and other community input about schools that is presented in a lawful and appropriate manner should always be encouraged.

“(6) Educators, policymakers, elected officials, Executive Branch officials and employees, and other stakeholders should never seek to use law enforcement to criminalize the lawfully expressed concerns of parents about their children’s education, but should

never hesitate to contact public safety officials if there is a credible threat to the safety and security of students, parents, educators, policymakers, elected officials, executive branch officials or employees, or other stakeholders, school faculty, or staff.

“(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the First Amendment guarantees parents and other stakeholders the right to assemble and express their opinions on decisions affecting their children and communities, and that educators and policymakers should welcome and encourage that engagement and consider that feedback when making decisions.”.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO FERPA AND PPRA

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT OF 1974.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 444(f) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (also known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”) (20 U.S.C. 1232g(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary shall comply with the reporting requirement under section 445(e)(2)(C)(ii) with respect to the enforcement actions taken under this subsection to ensure compliance with this section.”.

(b) PROHIBITION ON EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES OR INSTITUTIONS ACTING AS AN AGENT OF A PARENT.—Section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (also known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) PROHIBITION ON EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES OR INSTITUTIONS ACTING AS AGENT OF A PARENT FOR USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—An educational agency or institution may not act as the agent of a parent of a student in attendance at a school of such agency or at such institution for purposes of providing verifiable parental consent for the use of technology in the classroom for purposes of educating the student without providing notice and an opportunity for the parent to object to the use of such technology.

“(l) PROHIBITION ON EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES OR INSTITUTIONS ACTING AS AGENT OF A PARENT FOR VACCINES.—An educational agency or institution may not act as the agent of a parent of a student in attendance at a school of such agency or at such institution for purposes of providing verifiable parental consent for a vaccination.”.

(c) PROHIBITION ON SALE OF INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.—Section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (also known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PROHIBITION ON SALE OF INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no educational agency or institution or authorized representative of such agency or institution may sell student information for commercial or financial gain.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition described in paragraph (1) shall not apply to products sold to students by or on behalf of the educational agency or institution, such as yearbooks, prom tickets, and school pictures.”.

(d) PARENTAL CONSULTATION.—Section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (also known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) PARENTAL CONSULTATION.—In developing a privacy policy or procedure, an edu-

cational agency or institution shall engage meaningfully with parents of students in attendance at the schools served by such agency or institution.”.

(e) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (also known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—An educational agency or institution or authorized representative of such agency or institution shall, upon request from a parent of a student, disclose to such parent the identity of any individual or entity with whom information is shared from the education record of the student or any response of the student to a survey.”.

SEC. 202. PROTECTION OF PUPIL RIGHTS.

(a) AVAILABILITY FOR INSPECTION BY PARENTS OR GUARDIANS.—Section 445(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) AVAILABILITY FOR INSPECTION BY PARENTS OR GUARDIANS.—A local educational agency (as such term is defined in subsection (c)(6)(C)) that receives funds under any applicable program shall ensure the following:

“(1) INFORMATION AVAILABLE.—Each of the following shall be available for inspection by the parents or guardians of the children in attendance at the schools served by such agency, and the availability of each of the following for inspection shall not be conditioned on any requirement that such parents or guardians sign a nondisclosure agreement:

“(A) All instructional materials, including teacher’s manuals, films, tapes, or other supplementary material which will be used in such school or in connection with any survey, analysis, or evaluation.

“(B) Any books or other reading materials made available to students in such school or through the school library of such school.

“(C) Any professional development materials.

“(2) COMMENT PERIODS FOR PARENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The agency shall provide comment periods during which parents or guardians of the children in attendance at the schools served by the agency may inspect and provide feedback on any of the materials referred to in paragraph (1) that—

“(i) are expected to be used to teach such children during the three weeks following the comment period; or

“(ii) were used to teach such children during preceding portions of the school year.

“(B) FREQUENCY AND DURATION.—The comment periods described in subparagraph (A) shall be held not less frequently than once every three weeks during the school year and each comment period shall be not less than three school days in duration.”.

(b) SINGLE ISSUE NOTIFICATION.—Section 445(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h) is amended—

(1) by striking “prior consent of the student” and inserting “prior written consent of the student”; and

(2) by inserting “, which is provided specifically for such survey, analysis, or evaluation” before the period at the end.

(c) DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF LOCAL POLICIES.—Section 445(c) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “PHYSICAL” and inserting “MEDICAL”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “in consultation with parents” and inserting “in consultation with parents in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) The right of a parent of a student to inspect, upon the request of the parent, any instructional material used as part of the educational curriculum for the student, and any books or other reading materials made available to the student in a school served by the agency or through the school library; and”;

(C) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) The administration of medical examinations or screenings that the school or agency may administer to a student, including—

“(i) prior notice to parents of such a medical examination or screening, and receipt of consent from parents before administering such an examination or screening; and

“(ii) in the event of an emergency that requires a medical examination or screening without time for parental notification and consent, the procedure for promptly notifying parents of such examination or screening subsequent to such examination or screening.”; and

(D) by amending subparagraph (E) to read as follows:

“(E) The prohibition on the collection, disclosure, or use of personal information collected from students for the purpose of marketing or for selling that information (or otherwise providing that information to others for that purpose), other than for a legitimate educational purpose to improve the education of students as described in paragraph (4), and the arrangements to protect student privacy that are provided by the agency in the event of such collection, disclosure, or use for such a legitimate educational purpose.”.

(d) PARENTAL NOTIFICATION.—Paragraph (2) of section 445(c) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “CONSULTATION AND” before “NOTIFICATION”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as subparagraphs (B) through (D), respectively;

(3) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) in the case of an activity described in clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (D), offer an opportunity and clear instructions for the parent (or in the case of a student who is an adult or emancipated minor, the student) to opt the student out of participation in such activity.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in the case of an activity described in subparagraph (D)(i), a description of how such activity is for a legitimate educational purpose to improve the education of students as described in paragraph (4); and

“(iv) not require a student to submit to a survey described in subparagraph (D)(ii) without the prior written consent of the student (if the student is an adult or emancipated minor), or in the case of an unemancipated minor, without the prior written consent of the parent, which is provided specifically for such survey.”;

(4) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so amended and redesignated), the following:

“(A) PARENTAL CONSULTATION.—The parental consultation required for the purpose of developing and adopting policies under paragraphs (1) and (3) by a local educational agency shall ensure that such policy is developed with meaningful engagement by parents of students enrolled in schools served by that agency.”; and

(5) in subparagraph (D) (as redesignated by paragraph (2))—

(A) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) Activities involving the collection, disclosure, or use of personal information collected from students for a legitimate educational purpose to improve the education of students as described in paragraph (4).”; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “invasive physical” and inserting “medical”.

(e) UPDATES TO EXISTING POLICIES.—Paragraph (3) of section 445(c) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) UPDATES TO EXISTING POLICIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Parents Bill of Rights Act, a local educational agency that receives funds under any applicable program shall—

“(i) review policies covering the requirements of paragraph (1) as in effect on the day before such date of enactment; and

“(ii) develop and update such policies to reflect the changes made to paragraph (1) by the amendments made by the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

“(B) CONSULTATION AND NOTIFICATION.—In developing and updating the policies under subparagraph (A), the agency shall comply with the consultation and notification requirements under paragraph (2).”.

(f) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (4)(A) of section 445(c) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)) is amended by amending the matter preceding clause (i) to read as follows:

“(A) EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTS OR SERVICES.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E), the collection, disclosure, or use of personal information collected from students for a legitimate educational purpose to improve the education of students means the exclusive purpose of developing, evaluating, or providing educational products or services for, or to, students or schools, such as the following:”.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (6) of section 445(c) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) MEDICAL EXAMINATION OR SCREENING.—The term ‘medical examination or screening’ means any medical examination or screening that involves the exposure of private body parts, or any act during such examination or screening that includes incision, insertion, or injection into the body, or a mental health or substance use disorder screening, except that such term does not include a hearing, vision, or scoliosis screening, or an observational screening carried out to comply with child find obligations under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.)”; and

(2) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking “or”;

(B) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) an email address.”.

(h) ENFORCEMENT AND REPORTING.—Subsection (e) of section 445 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) ENFORCEMENT AND REPORTING.—

“(1) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall take such action as the Secretary determines appropriate to enforce this section, except that action to terminate assistance provided under an applicable program shall be taken only if the Secretary determines that—

“(A) there has been a failure to comply with such section; and

“(B) compliance with such section cannot be secured by voluntary means.

“(2) REPORTING.—

“(A) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—On an annual basis, each local educational agency (as such term is defined in subsection (c)(6)(C)) that receives funds under any applicable program shall—

“(i) without identifying any personal information of a student or students, report to the State educational agency any enforcement actions or investigations carried out for the preceding school year to ensure compliance with this section; and

“(ii) publish such information on its website or through other public means used for parental notification if the agency does not have a website.

“(B) STATES.—On an annual basis, each State educational agency shall provide to the Secretary a report, with respect to the preceding school year, that includes all actions local educational agencies have reported under subparagraph (A), and a description of the enforcement actions the State educational agency took to ensure parents’ rights were protected.

“(C) SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Parents Bill of Rights Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate—

“(i) the reports received under subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) a description of the enforcement actions taken by the Secretary under this subsection and section 444(f) to ensure full compliance with this section and section 444, respectively.”.

TITLE III—PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN CURRICULUM

SEC. 301. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system.

TITLE IV—GENDER MARKERS, PRONOUNS, AND PREFERRED NAMES ON SCHOOL FORMS

SEC. 401. REQUIREMENT RELATED TO GENDER MARKERS, PRONOUNS, AND PREFERRED NAMES ON SCHOOL FORMS.

As a condition of receiving Federal funds, any elementary school (as such term is defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) or school that consists of only middle grades (as such term is defined in such section), that receives Federal funds shall be required to obtain parental consent before—

(1) changing a minor child’s gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form; or

(2) allowing a child to change the child’s sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms.

TITLE V—ACCESS TO SCHOOL BROADBAND

SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that all public elementary and public secondary school students should have access to broadband.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

SEC. 601. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that all public elementary school and secondary school students should have opportunities to learn the history of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except

those printed in House Report 118–12. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BACON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118–12.

Mr. BACON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 4, strike “and” at the end. Page 9, line 9, strike the period, closed quotation mark, and semicolon and insert “; and”.

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following: “(O) the right to be informed of the total number of school counselors in their child’s school.”

Page 11, line 4, strike the closed quotation mark and “; and”.

Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new clause:

“(v) SCHOOL COUNSELORS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school the information described in paragraph (1)(O).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 241, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BACON. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 5 that supports students, parents, and school personnel. My amendment would simply add that local education agencies provide to parents the number of school counselors employed at their child’s school so that parents have a better idea about their child’s education and safety during the school day.

As we all know, school counselors play an important role not only in the academic and career development of our students, but they address emotional challenges that are a critical component of safety in our schools. This simple provision gives parents the full knowledge and transparency needed to decide if their children need additional resources outside of the academic environment. This can assist our educators in making sure our children are best prepared for school and learning.

So, Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which has support from both sides of the aisle. A happy and healthy student empowers our educators to provide the best possible education, and parents deserve to be empowered to best help their children achieve that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, as with most of the underlying bill, this is yet another unfunded mandate placed on our schools requiring them to issue yet another report as a condition of receiving much-needed title I funds.

The majority would prefer to impose additional burdens to already understaffed schools rather than do what they were trained to do, and that is teach and work with parents.

I would agree with the gentleman’s comments about the need for counselors. He is absolutely right. We need more counselors. However, this amendment does not increase the number of counselors. It just reports the number they have. It doesn’t improve students’ mental health.

So for those reasons, Madam Chair, since it doesn’t improve mental health or increase the number of counselors, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Madam Chair, this amendment doesn’t increase the number of counselors, but it allows the parents to know if the number of counselors is adequate or not. This is very important for our parents to have.

This is being requested by teachers and parents. I have received this request from teachers and parents to have this added to the bill because they said it will make the bill better.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACON. Madam Chair, I will close by saying that I would appreciate the support of both sides of the aisle. This bill has support from teachers and parents to have this added in.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118–12.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 13, insert after “right” the following: “(provided in accordance with the requirements of section 445(a)(2) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(a)(2)) with respect to such local educational agency)”.

Page 11, line 4, strike the closed quotes, and “; and”, and insert the following:

“(v) ENROLLMENT OPTIONS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this

part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school the information described in paragraph (1)(F), including the enrollment and transfer options described in such paragraph.

“(vi) SCHOOL EMPLOYEE OR CONTRACTOR ACTIONS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency notifies the parents of any child who is a student in such school if a school employee or contractor takes, with respect to such child, any action described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(L).

“(vii) SCHOOL AND STUDENT SAFETY.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency notifies—

“(I) the parents of any child who is a student in such school if a school employee or contractor takes, with respect to such child, any action described in clause (i) of paragraph (1)(M); and

“(II) the parents of each child who is a student in such school if any child takes the action described in clause (ii) of paragraph (1)(M).

“(viii) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MATERIALS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school the opportunity to review professional development materials to ensure the parental right described in paragraph (1)(J); and”.

Page 12, line 3, strike “Title VIII” and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VIII

Page 13, after line 21, insert the following:

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 8549C; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 8549B the following:
Sec. 8549C. Sense of Congress on First

Amendment Rights.

Sec. 8549D. Technical assistance.

Page 12, after line 11, insert the following new paragraph, and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

“(1) The right of parents to educate their children is a pre-political natural right that the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized as ‘beyond debate’ and rooted in the ‘history and culture of Western civilization.’”

Page 13, strike lines 15 through 21, and insert the following:

“(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(1) the First Amendment guarantees parents and other stakeholders the right to assemble and express their opinions on decisions affecting their children and communities, and that educators and policymakers should welcome and encourage that engagement and consider that feedback when making decisions; and

“(2) parents have a fundamental right, protected by the U.S. Constitution, to direct the education of their children, and the strict scrutiny test used by courts to evaluate cases concerning fundamental rights is the correct standard of review for government actions that interfere with the right of parents to educate their children.”

Page 28, line 22, insert “from the Department of Education” after “Federal funds”.

Page 29, line 2, insert “such” before “Federal funds”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 241, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, it has been a pleasure to support the Parents Bill of Rights Act. I am especially proud of the work that our committee has put into crafting this bill.

Our committee worked late into the night and early morning and considered dozens of amendments. Nearly 20 were adopted to make the bill even better. I am proud that we have reported to the floor a commonsense bill that has broad support and aligns with what the vast majority of Americans want.

The amendments we passed during the committee markup accomplished the same goal we had when writing the bill: protecting parents' rights and making sure that schools can never cut parents out of their children's education decisions.

This manager's amendment makes a few minor technical changes to make sure that the amendments we passed during the committee markup will be implemented correctly and that the rights promised are fulfilled.

In addition, the manager's amendment adds language to the First Amendment's sense of Congress included in the underlying bill. The new language affirms the fundamental rights of parents to direct the education of their children and encourages courts to use the strict scrutiny standard in evaluating cases related to parental rights.

Schools should always be accountable to parents, and the parents should always know what their children are being taught and what their children are being exposed to. The Parents Bill of Rights Act protects those fundamental rights.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of both this amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, this is another effort to turn classrooms into the epicenter of a culture war. The politics over parents act doesn't do anything to actually help students succeed and seeks to scare parents into thinking that schools do not have their best interests at heart. Children benefit when their parents and teachers work together, but the politics over parents act would not take any meaningful steps to increase that parental cooperation.

The bill would create necessary and burdensome reporting requirements on schools. It would divert essential resources and personnel from their jobs, meeting the family's real needs into reporting and everything else in the bill, and it would open the door to dictating what students can and cannot read or learn.

The underlying bill distracts from what our public schools really need. Similarly, the manager's amendment does nothing to provide the families with real parental engagement as some of the amendments would have done that were rejected.

The bill, for example, gives a so-called Federal right of action to address the school board. We know that many school boards in recent years needed police protection to conduct their meetings because of credible threats of violence. These are elected officials. They don't need a Federal law to instruct them to be polite. The voters can take care of that. There is no right that is being given. We already have the right.

Now, one thing that is a little concerning is that I had an amendment to allow this right to take place with reasonable limitations.

If 100 people show up at a school board meeting, does the school board have to listen to each and every one as long as they want to speak without any limitation?

Each one has a Federal right of action where they can bring a lawsuit to compel the school board to sit up and listen to each and every one without limitation.

If they have heard from 10 or 15 or 20 people on one side of the argument or one side of a debate and nobody on the other side, then do they have to listen to the other 80?

I don't know. That is what the bill suggests. I don't know any jurisdiction where you don't have the right to address the school board in a reasonable way, and that is what this bill does and that is what the manager's amendment does.

Madam Chair, I ask Members to defeat the manager's amendment and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, the gentleman from Virginia I think will remember that I believe it was in the Loudoun County Public Schools where the father of a child who had been sexually molested in a bathroom by a young boy dressed as a girl who then was transferred to another school, and the parents were never notified that this had happened, when the father stood up at the school board meeting to bring this issue up, he was not allowed to speak. Furthermore, he was arrested. He was wrestled to the ground and arrested.

So, again, we hear from our colleagues two different scenarios: one, well, parents already have the right to address their school boards. Yes. That is in our First Amendment. We have the right to petition our elected officials for grievances. However, that is not happening as we have seen in certain places.

Whether or not there is a time limit, I would hope that people would be reasonable about that, but we are not dictating that. That will be dealt with. As the gentleman says, those school board

members in most cases are elected, and it will be up to them to deal with the public in that respect. If they don't do it correctly, then my assumption is that there will be consequences.

Madam Chair, the manager's amendment, again, strengthens the underlying bill, I urge its adoption, and I also urge passage of H.R. 5.

With this legislation we have an opportunity to make a stand for the rights of parents. I hope all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will vote with what they say they believe, which is that parents have rights and that we want to have the best education for children.

Madam Chair, join us in this effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report No. 118-12.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 4, strike "and".

Page 9, line 9, strike the semicolon, closed quotation marks, and period and insert "and".

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following:

"(O) the right to know if their child's school operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities that permit an individual whose biological sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for individuals whose biological sex is female."

Page 11, line 4, strike the closed quotation marks and "and".

Page 11, after line 4, insert the following:

"(v) ATHLETIC PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school the information described in paragraph (1)(O)."; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 241, the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, this amendment is simple and straightforward. My amendment simply requires notification to parents if their child's school operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities to permit a person whose biological sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for biological females.

Madam Chair, women's sports are under attack. Woke policies backed by far-left extremists who demand male participation in female sports are completely delusional and contradict

science. This allows men who identify as women to undermine legitimate women's accomplishments. American women and girls deserve to compete against biological women in sports, opportunities for athletic scholarships, and their rightful places on the winner's podium without the fear of being sidelined and beat out by a biological male.

This was on complete display when William Thomas, a biological man who previously competed in men's swimming, stole Emma Weyant's first-place trophy at the 2022 NCAA Division I Women's 500-Yard Freestyle Final.

□ 1645

As a competitor in men's swimming from 2018 through 2019, Mr. Thomas ranked 554th in the 200-yard freestyle and 65th in the 500-yard freestyle. After deciding to compete against women, this mediocre male athlete, Mr. Thomas, ranked fifth in the 200-yard freestyle and won the 500-yard freestyle.

Mr. Thomas stole Emma's championship trophy and took former Olympic swimmer Reka Gyorgy's spot in the 2022 NCAA Division I swim meet.

Last Congress, I led a couple of dozen Members in introducing a resolution honoring Emma Weyant as the rightful winner of the 2022 NCAA Division I women's 500-yard freestyle race.

I am also a cosponsor of Representative STEUBE's bill, H.R. 734, the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2023.

Madam Chair, I refuse to allow our children and grandchildren to be groomed by big corporations, schools, and politicians and to think it is okay for men to compete in women's sports.

Again, my amendment simply requires notification to parents if their child's school allows males to participate in female-designated sports. I hope that we could all come to agree that parents have the right to know this before it occurs.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, all school systems are members of athletic leagues. They are dealing with this controversy. They don't need a Federal law to apply all over the country. In higher education, the NCAA is dealing with this.

We don't need a Federal law to tell local school divisions what to do in all cases. Local school divisions are dealing with this.

This is controversial, and I think we would do well just to let them work this out.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, we have so many people who see the idiocy in men pretending to be women and stealing opportunities from females. These girls practice their whole lives and sacrifice their bodies with strains and other injuries in sports at times only to be outpaced by a biological male. I think it is very common sense for parents to simply be notified that this is taking place.

There is Federal funding going to our public schools. If we are going to see this extremism take place in our public schools, I believe we have some sort of nexus with that to at least say parents have a right to know what is going on and that it is not being taken from them.

Other than this very simple, commonsense amendment, I am more in favor of abolishing the Federal Department of Education and getting the Federal Government completely out of public schools, but we are not there right now. We do fund public schools, and there is a mess going on there. Our children are hurting and suffering because of it.

Madam Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to support this simple, commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, did the gentlewoman yield back her time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Colorado yielded back the remainder of her time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, as I said, the NCAA is working on this, and I just assume rather than disparage trans youth, let them work it out.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 4, strike "and".

Page 9, line 9, strike the semicolon, closed quotation marks, and period and insert "and".

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following:

"(O) the right to know if their child's school allows an individual whose biological sex is male to use restrooms or changing rooms designated for individuals whose biological sex is female."

Page 11, line 4, strike the closed quotation marks and "and".

Page 11, after line 4, insert the following:

"(v) ACCOMMODATIONS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school the information described in paragraph (1)(O)."; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of my amendment, which will require schools to notify parents if they allow biological males to use restrooms or changing rooms designated for biological females.

Throughout our debate today, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have continued to mischaracterize this bill as extreme. They harp on the same talking points, saying that this bill is looking to ban books, censor curriculums, and punish teachers. I would like any child's pornographic books to be banned, but that is not exactly what we are talking about here in this amendment.

All the while, under Democrat control, we have seen public K-12 schools promote: critical race theory, teaching our children to hate their country and to hate their fellow classmates simply because of the color of their skin; radical gender ideology; and even drag shows to impressionable young children. That is what is extreme.

A school in my home State of Colorado has even changed a child's gender pronouns and preferred names and kept that information from the child's parents.

Speaking as the mother of four boys and a soon-to-be grandma, enough is enough. I don't send my boys to school to receive indoctrination from the woke mob or be sexualized by groomers. If they are, I sure as heck want to know about it and have the right to speak up, and so do these parents.

Let me set the record straight. House Republicans want parents to be involved in their child's education. We want to take control back as parents of our children's education rather than leaving it to partisan politicians or unelected bureaucrats. We don't want to send the FBI after them as domestic terrorists.

We want to foster an active learning environment, not shut schools down and enforce outdated and unnecessary mask and vaccine mandates on our children. We want children to feel safe at school and not pave the way for school administrative staff to hide a sexual assault from parents, like we saw in Loudoun County.

Less than 2 years ago, about 30 miles from here, a ninth-grade girl was sexually assaulted by a man wearing a skirt in the women's restroom at school. This male was allowed to follow the victim into the restroom because of Loudoun County Public Schools' inclusive transgender bathroom policies.

When the father of the victim came to a school board meeting to protest these policies that caused his teenage daughter to be raped, he was arrested after an altercation with a woman who

said that she didn't believe his daughter was raped. The superintendent also defended the school's transgender bathroom policy at that meeting.

The man in the skirt was found guilty of two counts of forcible sodomy, a count of anal sodomy, and a count of forcible fellatio. He was also charged with the sexual assault of another student that occurred months later at a different Loudoun County school.

The left's ideology is far more delusional, and it is dangerous. These inclusive policies have paved the way for sexual predators to use the left's definition of gender to take advantage of their victims. Unfortunately, this is just one example of many biological males using bathrooms to assault women and children.

Madam Chair, my amendment would grant parents the right to know if schools that their children are attending are forcing their children to share vulnerable spaces with potential predators.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I don't think we need a Federal law to help schools tell students which bathroom to use.

In Loudoun County, that situation is under investigation, including criminal charges. I think it is time we stop disparaging trans youth.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 118-12.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I have a substitute amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

TITLE I—FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS
SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Education is fundamental to the development of individual citizens and the progress of the Nation.

(2) There is a continuing need to ensure equal access for all students to educational opportunities of high quality, and such educational opportunities should not be denied because of race, religion, color, national origin, disability, or sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity).

(3) Parents have the primary responsibility for the education of their children, and

States and localities have the primary responsibility for supporting that parental role.

(4) In our Federal system, the primary public responsibility for education is reserved respectively to the States and the local school systems and other instrumentalities of the States.

(5) The importance of education is increasing as new technologies and alternative approaches to traditional education are considered, as society becomes more complex, and as equal opportunities in education and employment are promoted.

(6) The purposes of the Department of Education include—

(A) to strengthen the Federal commitment to ensuring access to equal educational opportunity for every individual;

(B) to supplement and complement the efforts of States, the local school systems and other instrumentalities of the States, the private sector, public and private educational institutions, public and private nonprofit educational research institutions, community-based organizations, parents, and students to improve the quality of education;

(C) to encourage the increased involvement of the public, parents, and students in Federal education programs;

(D) to promote improvements in the quality and usefulness of education through federally supported research, evaluation, and sharing of information;

(E) to improve the coordination of Federal education programs;

(F) to improve the management and efficiency of Federal education activities, especially with respect to the processes, procedures, and administrative structures for the dispersal of Federal funds, as well as the reduction of unnecessary and duplicative burdens and constraints, including unnecessary paperwork, on the recipients of Federal funds; and

(G) to increase the accountability of Federal education programs to the President, the Congress, and the public.

(7) Parents, families, students, educators, and community members are key stakeholders in the public education system and provide valuable input with respect to such education system.

(8) When parents, families, students, schools, and community members work together, students have better school attendance, earn higher grades and test scores, and have greater long-term success.

(9) All students deserve an education that helps them develop important life skills and prepares them for success in and beyond the classroom.

(10) An inclusive education benefits all students, not just by making them feel valued and accepted, but also by helping them build important knowledge and skills that will prepare them for future success and create a safer environment for all students.

(11) The United States has much to be proud of and learning about the history of our Nation helps students see how far we've come and how they can continue our progress.

(12) Federal law contains numerous provisions that protect parental rights in elementary and secondary education, including the following:

(A) Sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(x), 1112(e)(4), and 1116(f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)(B)(x); 6312(e)(4); 6318(f)) give parents the right to receive communications from schools, to the extent practicable, in a language that they can understand.

(B) Section 1111(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(d)) gives parents of children in a school

identified for support and improvement the right to be involved in the development of the support and improvement plan for the school to improve student outcomes.

(C) Section 1111(h) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)) gives parents the right to know how their child's school is performing.

(D) Section 1112(e)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(e)(1)), gives parents of children in schools receiving funds under part A of title I of such Act the right to—

(i) know the professional qualifications of the teachers and paraprofessionals who teach their children;

(ii) receive information about the level of achievement of their children; and

(iii) receive notice that their children have been taught for 4 or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet applicable State certification or licensure requirements.

(E) Section 1112(e)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(e)(2)), gives parents of children in schools receiving funds under part A of title I of such Act the right to information regarding any State or local educational agency policy regarding student participation in any assessments mandated by section 1111(b)(2) of such Act and by the State or local educational agency, which must include a policy, procedure, or parental right to opt the child out of such assessments, where applicable.

(F) Section 1112(e)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(e)(3)(A)) gives parents of children identified as English learners and who are participating in a language instruction educational program under title I or title III of such Act the right to receive information with respect to the reasons for that identification, level of English proficiency, methods of instruction, academic needs, exit criteria, individualized education plan objectives, if applicable, and the right to remove their children from the program.

(G) Section 1112(e)(3)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6312(e)(3)(C)) gives parents of English learners in a local educational agency that receives funds under part A of title I of such Act the right to receive information with respect to how the parents can be involved in the education of their children and be active participants in assisting their children.

(H) Section 1114(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6314(b)) gives parents of children in a school with a schoolwide program plan under title I of such Act the right to be involved in the development of the schoolwide program plan and for the information contained in such plan to be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.

(I) Section 1116(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318(a)) gives parents of children in a local educational agency that receives funds under part A of title I of such Act the right to meaningfully participate in the development of a district parent and family engagement policy.

(J) Section 1116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318(b)) gives parents of children in a school that receives funds under part A of title I of such Act the right to participate in and approve a written parent and family engagement policy, and to be notified of the policy in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.

(K) Section 1116(c) of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318(c)) gives parents of children in a school that receives funds under part A of title I of such Act the right—

(i) to attend, at the school's invitation and encouragement, an annual meeting—

(I) where parents will be informed about the school's participation in part A of title I of such Act;

(II) that explains the requirements of such part, including that parents have a right to be involved; and

(III) that discusses parent and family engagement policy;

(i) to be involved in the planning, review, and improvement of programs including the school parent and family engagement policy and the joint development of the schoolwide program;

(iii) timely information about such programs, a description and explanation of the curriculum in use at the school, the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and the achievement levels of the challenging State academic standards; and

(iv) if requested by parents, opportunities for regular meetings to make suggestions and participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children.

(L) Section 1116(d) of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318(d)) gives parents the right to jointly develop with their child's school, if the school receives funds under part A of title I of such Act, a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the school staff, and students will share responsibility for improved student academic achievement and how the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help the children achieve the State's high standards, including—

(i) the importance of ongoing communication between teachers and parents through parent-teacher conferences;

(ii) frequent reports to parents about their children's progress;

(iii) reasonable access to staff; and

(iv) opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class and observe classroom activities.

(M) Section 1116(e) of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318(e)) requires school and local educational agency served under part A of title I of the Act—

(i) to provide to parents assistance, materials, and training to ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership among the school involved, the parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement;

(ii) to educate teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, principals, and other school leaders and staff about—

(I) the value and utility of contributions of parents; and

(II) how to—

(aa) reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners;

(bb) implement and coordinate parent programs; and

(cc) build ties between parents and the school; and

(iii) to receive information related to school and parent programs, meetings, and other activities in a format and, to the extent practicable, a language the parents can understand.

(N) Section 1116(g) of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318(g)) requires schools and local educational agencies in a State operating a Statewide Family Engagement Center under part E of title IV of this Act, to be informed about the existence of the program.

(O) Section 4001(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7101(a)) requires a State, local educational agency, or other entity receiving funds under title IV of such Act to obtain from parents prior written, informed consent for a child under age 18 to participate in any mental health assessment or service that is funded under such title IV of such Act and conducted in connection with an elementary or secondary school under such title of such Act.

(P) Section 4502 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7242) authorizes the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish Statewide Family Engagement Centers to carry out parent education and family engagement in education programs, or provide comprehensive training and technical assistance to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, schools identified by State educational and local educational agencies, organizations that support family-school partnerships and other organizations that carry out such programs.

(Q) Section 8528(a)(2)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7908(a)(2)(A))—

(i) gives parents of secondary school students the right to submit a written request to their child's local educational agency that receives funds under such Act that their child's name, address, and telephone listing not be released to military recruiters without the prior written consent of the parents; and

(ii) upon receiving such a request, prohibits the local educational agency from releasing the student's name, address, and telephone listing for such purposes without the prior written consent of the parent.

(R) Section 8542 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7922) prohibits the Department of Education from relying on such Act to—

(i) prohibit a parental determination that a child may travel to or from school on foot or by car, bus, or bike when the parents of the child have given permission; or

(ii) expose parents to civil or criminal charges for allowing their child to responsibly and safely travel to and from school by a means the parents believe is age appropriate.

(S) Section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) gives parents the right, with respect to student education records maintained by educational agencies or institutions, to—

(i) inspect and review such education records;

(ii) seek amendment of such education records where they contain information that is inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise in violation of the privacy rights of a student; and

(iii) with some exceptions, exercise some control over the disclosure of personally identifiable information from such education records.

(T) Section 445(c)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)(1)) requires that parents be consulted about the development and adoption of policies by a local educational agency, which is defined for purposes of that subsection to include an elementary school, secondary school, school district, or local board of education that receives funds under an applicable program, to provide parents with the right to inspect, upon request—

(i) certain surveys;

(ii) instruments used to collect personal information from students for the purpose of marketing or sale (or otherwise distributing such information for that purpose), with some exceptions; and

(iii) instructional materials used as part of the educational curriculum for the student.

(U) Section 445(c)(2) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)(2)) requires a local educational agency, which is defined for purposes of that subsection to include an elementary school, secondary school, school district, or local board of education that receives funds under an applicable program, to provide parents with advance notice, and an opportunity to opt a student out, of—

(i) activities involving the collection, disclosure, or use of personal information collected from students for the purpose of marketing or sale (or to otherwise distribute such information to others for that purpose), with some exceptions;

(ii) non-emergency, invasive physical examination or screening required as a condition of attendance, administered by their school, scheduled by their school in advance, and not necessary to protect the immediate health and safety of a student, with some exceptions; and

(iii) certain surveys.

(V) Section 445(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h(b)) gives parents the right to consent before an unemancipated minor student is required to submit to a survey, analysis, or evaluation that is funded by the Department of Education if that survey concerns one or more of the following protected areas—

(i) political affiliations or beliefs of the student or the student's parent;

(ii) mental or psychological problems of the student or student's family;

(iii) sex behavior or attitudes;

(iv) illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating, or demeaning behavior;

(v) critical appraisals of other individuals with whom respondents have close family relationships;

(vi) legally recognized privileged or analogous relationships, such as those of lawyers, physicians, and ministers;

(vii) religious practices, affiliations, or beliefs of the student or student's parent; or

(viii) income (other than that required by law to determine eligibility for participation in a program or for receiving financial assistance under such program).

SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that students deserve school environments that promote—

(1) the ability of teachers and administrators to encourage students to reach their full potential and take actions that help them meet that goal;

(2) the empowerment of parents to engage in their child's education and help them succeed;

(3) significant opportunity for all children to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps;

(4) learning environments free from discrimination; and

(5) an education that is free from censorship.

TITLE II—PARENT COORDINATOR

SEC. 201. PARENT COORDINATOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each local educational agency (as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (8 U.S.C. 7801)) that receives financial assistance under such Act, the following requirements shall apply as a condition on continued receipt of such assistance:

(1) The recipient shall ensure that each elementary school and each secondary school under the jurisdiction of the agency has at least 1 full-time employee designated to serve as a parent coordinator.

(2) The recipient shall ensure that students, parents, school staff, and parent

groups are made aware of these employees and their roles.

(3) A parent coordinator should not have any other school-related responsibilities that may create a conflict of interest, including serving in the school administrative leadership or local educational agency administrative leadership (such as serving as a principal, vice principal, headmaster, superintendent, board member, or general counsel).

(b) DUTIES.—Each parent coordinator described in subsection (a) shall—

(1) establish partnerships with parents, parent-teacher associations, and other parent groups within the community to provide resources and support for parents, students, and schools;

(2) ensure that parents, parent-teacher associations, and other parent groups within the community are familiar with the academic expectations of a school in order to improve student success;

(3) strengthen relationships between the school and parents in the community;

(4) ensure that parents understand their rights under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6318), including—

(A) the right to meaningfully participate in the development of—

(i) a parent and family engagement policy for the local educational agency in accordance with subsection (a) of such section; and

(ii) a parent and family engagement policy of the school in accordance with subsection (b) of such section;

(B) the right to attend, at the school's invitation and encouragement, an annual meeting—

(i) where parents will be informed about the school's participation in part A of title I of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.);

(ii) that explains the requirements of such part, including that parents have the right to be involved; and

(iii) that discusses parent and family engagement policy; and

(C) the right to timely information about programs under this part, including a description and explanation of, the curriculum in use at the school, the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and the achievement levels of the challenging State academic standards;

(5) ensure that parents understand their right to give consent before allowing the child to participate in any mental health assessment or service funded by title IV of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.); and

(6) in carrying out paragraphs (1) through (5), focus on parents from underrepresented groups.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2024 and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

TITLE III—ESEA AMENDMENTS

SEC. 301. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 4506 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7246) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020” and inserting “\$60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2029”.

SEC. 302. FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS.

Section 4601 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7251) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) of subsection (a), by inserting “(except for section 4625)” after “part”;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (1) of subsection (b)(2)(B), by inserting “(except for section 4625)” after “subpart 2”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 4625—

“(1) \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

“(2) \$600,000,000 for fiscal year 2025;

“(3) \$700,000,000 for fiscal year 2026;

“(4) \$850,000,000 for fiscal year 2027; and

“(5) \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2028.”.

TITLE IV—RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 401. PROHIBITION ON BOOK BANS AND CENSORSHIP.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to allow the banning or censorship of books in public elementary or public secondary schools.

SEC. 402. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN CURRICULUM.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution, school, or school system, including with respect to—

(1) Black history;

(2) Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander history;

(3) Latino history;

(4) Native American history;

(5) women's history;

(6) LGBTQ+ history; and

(7) history of the Holocaust or anti-Semitism.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute is a commonsense piece of legislation that makes tangible investments in parental involvement. It enhances the ability of school districts to involve all families, not just the privileged few.

By adopting this amendment in the nature of a substitute, we will invest in evidence-based, full-service community schools, public schools that coordinate closely with community organizations to improve the integration, accessibility, and effectiveness of services for students and families; provide families with access to critical wraparound services; and, importantly, improve student achievement.

We will be able to hire dedicated parent coordinators in public schools to work directly with parents, connecting them with the resources and support they need to help their children succeed and ultimately improve parental involvement and student success.

We will direct more investments toward the Department of Education Statewide Family Engagement Centers program so States can share best practices on parental engagement, and school districts can receive the support and training they need to increase parental participation and involvement.

Madam Chair, I was a very involved parent, and I talked to parents who

wanted to come to school and wanted to participate, but they were working extra shifts, didn't speak English, or didn't have transportation. Let's break down those barriers.

Importantly, we will prohibit the banning of books and curricula in our public schools and restore the ability of students to receive a historically accurate, well-rounded education.

Madam Chair, I worked on this substitute with the input of stakeholders who are in our public schools each and every day, who are parents themselves, and who represent diverse communities in red and blue States across our Nation. I am proud to introduce this amendment in the nature of a substitute for consideration on the House floor because, unlike the bill it seeks to amend, it reflects the true diversity of our Nation and embodies the approach we should be taking to make lasting improvements to public education, an inclusive, collaborative, and evidence-based approach.

On behalf of all students and parents, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for this amendment and soundly reject H.R. 5, a bill that should be named the politics over parents act.

Madam Chair, I thank the staff of the Education and the Workforce Committee for all of their help with this amendment in the nature of a substitute. I also thank my own staff in my office, Sujith Cherukumilli and Dr. Alfonso Garcia, both of whom have spent time as classroom teachers. I acknowledge the work of the staff on this important work, as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, while I appreciate the substitute put forward by the Congresswoman, the Democrat proposal is wholly inadequate and will do little to solve the problems that parents face.

Instead, the Democrats' amendment resorts to a tired old Democrat strategy: spend more money, hire more people, and hope for the best.

Madam Chair, parents need more than that. They don't need massive new amounts of taxpayer spending at the Federal level controlled by bureaucrats when our country is already deeply in debt, nor do parents need schools to hire massive numbers of new administrators.

What parents need is for their rights to be protected. The Democrats' substitute does nothing to ensure that parents are the ultimate decision-makers in their child's education.

Of course, that shouldn't be a surprise. There has been a push to silence parents around the country. Powerful teachers unions, several school boards, Democrat politicians, and the Biden

Justice Department have all voiced opposition to the rights of parents to have a say in their child's education.

This kind of rhetoric and political posturing has real-world consequences for parents. For example, in 2021, a Rhode Island mother of two, Nicole Solas, talked to an elementary school principal in South Kingstown, Rhode Island, about what was being taught in schools. After persistent stonewalling, the school district directed her to file a public records request. She did, and the local teachers union filed a lawsuit against her.

This kind of treatment is outrageous. Ms. Solas was subjected to endless stonewalling, public humiliation, and an interminable and costly legal battle. No parent should have to go through that.

The Democrat substitute would do nothing to ensure that stories like this never happen again, but the Parents Bill of Rights Act would. Our bill will ensure that parents can never be sued for wanting to know their child's curriculum.

Secretary of Education Miguel Cardona recently published an op-ed about the Democrat vision for parent empowerment. In his vision, parents should be satisfied when the Federal Government spends taxpayer dollars on top-down solutions. By contrast, Republicans want an authentic give-and-take between parents and the education system about what students learn, how they are taught, and how they should be protected.

That is why I am proud to stand behind our bill.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Democrat substitute and in favor of the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, in response, again, I reiterate that every single Democrat on our side of the aisle absolutely supports parental involvement and parental engagement. We talked about that in the debate on the bill.

About costs, it is my understanding that the so-called Parents Bill of Rights Act doesn't have any additional funding with all the extra obligations that are put on our schools, districts, and teachers.

There is no effort to silence parents. We want parents to be involved, peacefully, and peacefully state their concerns.

I know that Ranking Member SCOTT talked about how Democrats tried to put an amendment in to put some reasonableness in there. If you have 200 parents show up at a school board meeting, and each one of them wants to speak for 2 hours, that is not reasonable.

We absolutely support parental involvement. We want to do that. We want to provide that evidence-based engagement and, again, make the relationship collaborative, not adversarial.

That is why I encourage colleagues to support this collaborative, evidence-based approach to involve all parents in education.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I want to say again that the approach our colleagues want to take is to spend more money.

Ms. Solas, who I mentioned earlier; Mr. SMITH, who was mentioned earlier; and others, they certainly did not have the right to peacefully speak to their school boards and get responses, so that is not going to happen under the Democrats' amendment.

We also are not mean, and again, we do not ban books. We do not condone the banning of books.

We think, again, that the substitute presents the perfect picture of Republicans' and Democrats' approaches to parent engagement. Democrats believe protecting parents' rights means spending more taxpayer dollars to impose a top-down vision. Republicans believe in giving parents real power to secure the best education possible for their children.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time as I believe I have the right to close.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I want to say again that our bill is meant to give parents their God-given rights to be involved with their children's education and to seek the best education possible.

We do not want anyone to be treated unfairly. We want everyone to be treated fairly. We do not ban books.

I urge the public to read this bill. It is fairly short, about 30 pages, to make sure where the truth lies in terms of this piece of legislation.

Madam Chair, I reject the amendment that has been offered in the nature of a substitute. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment and a "yes" vote on H.R. 5.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, after line 20, insert the following:

TITLE VII—PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION

SEC. 701. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A parent aggrieved by a failure to comply with a provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) amended by title I of this Act, or a provision of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) amended by title II of this Act, may commence a civil action against the individual or entity responsible for the failure.

(b) RELIEF.—In any action under subsection (a), the court may award appropriate relief, including—

- (1) temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief;
- (2) compensatory damages;
- (3) punitive or exemplary damages; and
- (4) reasonable fees for attorneys.

(c) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—An action under this section shall be brought not later than 30 days after the date on which the failure to comply occurred.

(d) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In a case in which a parent commences a civil action under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall have the exclusive authority to oversee, as appropriate, any investigation conducted by the Federal Government in connection with such action.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "parent" has the meaning given such term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I think it is pretty sad that we even have to offer this bill and that I have to offer this amendment, but I think the American public realizes and is completely outraged with what is going on in this country—how they don't feel like they have a voice anymore, how they don't feel like they are being recognized in their rights to be parents and have authority over their own children.

It is also very disgusting, quite frankly, what has been going on in our kids' schools. Parents across this country—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, all of us—are furious with what is going on at these schools. That is why we even have to do this.

My amendment adds a private right of action for parents to hold schools accountable for not honoring the rights set forth in title I and title II of this bill. It seeks to strengthen enforcement mechanisms within the Parents Bill of Rights Act. My amendment, if passed, would ensure parents can sue if school districts force teachers or students to accommodate critical race theory curriculum, compel students to observe obscene or sexual material without parental consent, use pronoun changes without parental consent, violate student privacy without parental consent, or neglect to report sexual assault or harassment on school property.

The bill as it is currently written puts the protection of parental rights

in the hands of Department of Education bureaucrats. It is not enough for Congress to leave enforcement to Department of Education bureaucrats or wait for the corrupt Department of Justice to file a lawsuit on a parent's behalf. I don't trust the Biden administration to go after woke school administrators that force dangerous ideologies on innocent children.

Parents should have the opportunity to sue these schools. For far too long, the public school system has undermined parental involvement in education decisions. If we want to truly empower parents' rights, we should give parents the tools to enforce those rights through this amendment, not leave it in the hands of bureaucrats.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Chair, I support passage of the underlying bill, but I also rise in support of this amendment, which I think would truly empower parents.

Adding a private right of action places the ultimate protection of parental rights back where it belongs, in the hands of parents, not Department of Education bureaucrats.

For too long, the public school system has undermined parental involvement in education decisions, and parents have been helpless to hold them accountable.

The union-driven COVID policies in our schools served as a wake-up call for many parents, and school boards across the country have tried to stop them from raising their voices in protest.

A private right of action would make a meaningful change to the balance of power so parents can rightfully have a say in what their children are being taught.

This amendment wouldn't unleash lawsuits against schools. The private right of action could only be used if the school is not forthcoming with the commonsense provisions of this bill. If the school shares curriculum, teaching materials, and their budget openly, then there is no problem. If the school notifies parents about actions from the school administrator to change a child's pronouns, then there is no standing under this bill. There is also a limit that the private right of action must be filed within 30 days of the violation.

Parental rights precede government. Our government was created to protect our God-given rights. When government is working to subvert those rights, it is the right of the people to put new guardrails in place to secure our precious liberty.

Guaranteeing a private right of action will ensure public schools are held accountable to the important tenets of this bill.

Madam Chair, I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I think the amendment speaks for itself. If a hundred parents show up at a school board meeting, and each demands to be heard for as long as they want to speak, this bill will give them a private right of action in Federal court to enforce their right to speak to the school board.

My local school board limits people to 3 minutes. I think that is a reasonable limitation, but when the amendment to allow reasonable limitations was defeated, you have the bill that they have—everybody has a right, each and every one of the hundred people who show up, no matter how repetitive or irrelevant it may be.

I think people need to know what is in the amendment and can judge it for themselves.

People have said that some parents have been arrested by the police for showing up at the school board. Let me tell you, that can only happen if the police believe that a crime is being committed.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 118-112.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE VII—MANDATORY OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIODS

SEC. 701. MANDATORY INTRA- AND INTER-DISTRICT OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a local educational agency may not receive Federal funds under title I or title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.; 20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) for a school year unless the agency—

(1) holds an open enrollment period as required under subsection (b); and

(2) complies with the notification requirements under subsection (d).

(b) OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIOD.—To be eligible to receive Federal funds as described in subsection (a), each local educational agency shall, before the beginning of each school year, hold an open enrollment period during which—

(1) a child who is eligible to attend an elementary or secondary school served by the agency may apply to attend any other elementary or secondary school served by the agency; and

(2) a child who is not otherwise eligible to attend an elementary or secondary school served by the agency because that child lives outside the geographic region served by the agency may apply to attend any elementary or secondary school served by the agency.

(c) APPLICATION AND APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A parent of a child seeking to enroll in a school pursuant to subsection (b) shall submit an application to the local educational agency involved at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the agency may reasonably require.

(2) APPROVAL.—A local educational agency that receives an application under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) give the application full and fair consideration;

(B) approve or disapprove the application within a reasonable time; and

(C) give the parent who submitted the application prompt notice of such approval or disapproval.

(3) DURATION OF APPROVAL.—A child with an application approved under paragraph (2) shall remain eligible to attend the school for which approval was given for a period of not less than one school year.

(d) NOTICE.—To be eligible to receive Federal funds as described in subsection (a), each local educational agency shall post on a publicly accessible website of the agency or, if the agency does not operate a website, widely disseminate to the public, the following:

(1) Information and procedures for open enrollment under subsection (b).

(2) Information on the application process under subsection (c), including—

(A) how and where to obtain an application;

(B) when and how parents will be notified when approval or disapproval occurs; and

(C) approval rates based on the most recent data available to the agency.

(3) Information on how long an enrollment approved under subsection (c) remains valid.

(4) Contact information for at least one individual employee of the agency who is responsible for answering questions on the open enrollment process.

(e) ESEA TERMS.—In this section, the terms “child”, “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “parent”, and “secondary school” have the meanings given those terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, this amendment requires any public school receiving Federal funds under Title I and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to hold an open enrollment period both for students living inside and outside the school district.

Parents have a right to decide where their child goes to school, and this amendment grants parents this important right to choose the best education for their child, no matter the ZIP Code.

It is important to note this applies only to Federal funds. Some might argue, well, local schools have different tax jurisdictions. This is only for the Federal funds.

School choice is critical to not only the parent, but also to the student who deserves a safe, high-quality education, not indoctrination.

We must provide families with freedom to choose. It is the parents' duty to make the best choice for their children, and choice is the ultimate enforcement mechanism for this Parents Bill of Rights Act.

My amendment also requires that these schools post an announcement on their website with details about the open enrollment period to ensure parents have all the information needed to make an informed decision, such as an application deadline, the approval rate of applications, and how long the enrollment period will be valid. Again, this gives parents the power and ability to make the most informed decision.

Under this amendment, schools must give every student that applies via the open enrollment process, "a full and fair consideration," an important detail to ensure that every student receives the opportunity to succeed.

Open enrollment and the increase in educational freedom is imperative to the success of our youth. It is a parental right and it is in the best interests of every student to be granted this opportunity.

This amendment provides every single parent with the power to choose.

Madam Chair, I urge support for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I think I would prefer that we fixed all of the schools so that all students are provided with an opportunity of a high-quality education and a safe and healthy environment.

All this amendment does is give people the right to scurry around and try to find the best schools. Those that are the best at identifying the best schools may end up there, but frankly, all this is going to do is cause confusion because when word gets around as to which are the best schools, everybody will want to go to that school. Then what?

The majority has offered the amendment in committee to let parents know that if they can work the system, they may get their child into a good school but all the rest end up in a school that is dilapidated, unaccredited, or otherwise undesirable.

We need to work to improve all of the schools, not just figure out a scheme where some can figure out how to get their child into a good school and leave everyone else behind.

Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 118-112.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE VII—GAO REPORT

SEC. 701. GAO REPORT.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report that evaluates and analyzes the impact of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, on—

(1) protecting parents' rights in the education of their children; and

(2) costs to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, elementary schools, and secondary schools (as such terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Chair, I rise today in favor of my amendment, designated as amendment No. 8 to H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Madam Chair, we have a responsibility to be mindful of the cost and implementation of this bill on our schools, parents, and communities.

My amendment would require the GAO to report on the impact of this legislation and provide peace of mind to taxpayers, educators, and families alike.

Our priority must be to set our children up for success. That means giving parents the transparency and voice they deserve in their child's education.

It also means making the Federal Government answerable to the potential costs of this bill on State and local educational agencies and individual schools throughout our Nation.

We have made a commitment to our constituents to demand more account-

ability from their government over the use of their taxpayer dollars, as well as to safeguard a better future for the next generation of Americans. My amendment would guarantee that we keep that promise.

Madam Chair, I urge the amendment's adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I support the amendment because the GAO report will actually expose the legislation for what it is. It is a waste of money, will provide no meaningful rights, and it will adversely affect the education of the children.

Madam Chair, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. FISCHBACH) having assumed the chair, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation's public schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "PRUDENCE AND LOYALTY IN SELECTING PLAN INVESTMENTS AND EXERCISING SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS"—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-18)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 199, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of

title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights”.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of March 21, 2023, at page H1299.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the veto message on H.J. Res. 30.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of overriding President Biden’s veto of H.J. Res. 30, a Congressional Review Act resolution nullifying the Biden administration’s attempt to politicize the retirement savings of Americans.

This is *deja vu* for the American people. With this veto, the President once again insists on undermining the financial security of the very people who elected him.

Republicans will stand with American workers and retirees in protecting their savings.

ESG investing puts the future of millions of Americans in jeopardy when they are already facing economic hardships and inflation brought on by this administration’s reckless spending.

The President says H.J. Res. 30 would make it, “. . . illegal to consider risk factors . . .” but that statement is blatantly false and misleading.

The Trump rule, which H.J. Res. 30 would reinstate explicitly states, “Nothing in the final rule is intended to or does prevent a fiduciary from appropriately considering any material risk with respect to an investment.”

Last year, the Department of Labor, DOL, published a rule encouraging retirement plan fiduciaries to consider ESG factors when making investment decisions. Biden protected this rule with his veto.

Now, thanks to Democrats, workers can be placed into ESG investment vehicles by default. If a fiduciary finds that two investments are equal, the fiduciary is allowed to use collateral

ESG factors to break the tie without justifying or documenting that decision.

This is especially concerning since ESG investments often underperform and are riskier than other investment strategies.

The left is using ESG investment criteria as a political tool to cudgel companies into accepting leftist policies. If we do not override this veto, the left will use ESG investing to push non-compliant companies out of the marketplace.

Congress debated and it came to the bipartisan conclusion to overturn the Biden rule. Now the administration persists through executive fiat.

Americans invest to secure their future, not to fund the Green New Deal or leftist pet projects. That is why I supported the resolution to nullify the Biden administration’s destructive rule.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to quit playing petty politics and vote in accordance with the best interests of the American people.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the House Republican majority’s effort to override President Biden’s veto of H.J. Res. 30.

This resolution sought to nullify a popular and sensible rule that enabled retirement plan managers to make fully informed investment decisions.

I commend the President for his veto. Workers should be able to invest their retirement savings in a way that reflects their values, such as combating climate change, without sacrificing investment returns.

That is why the Biden-Harris administration issued a rule to clarify that retirement plan managers may consider the economic effects of climate change and other environmental, social, and governance factors, or ESG factors, when they make investment decisions for participants in retirement plans.

Simply put, this rule is not an ESG mandate. It just allows participants to make those decisions.

Additionally, the rule does not change the fiduciary standard to which the professionals who make the investment decisions for retirement plans are bound. They must still prioritize the interests of retirement plan participants and cannot sacrifice investment returns to pursue ESG goals.

Today’s debate is not a referendum on the administration’s rule or even ESG in general. We had that debate last month.

□ 1730

The debate is about two things. First, it is about arithmetic.

As my colleagues know, overriding the President’s veto requires support of two-thirds, or 290 Members of the House. H.J. Res. 30 passed the House

with 216 votes, nearly all of which came from the Republican Caucus. Anyone who can count knows that the Republican majority will not have the votes to override the President’s veto; and everyone should be asking why are we going through the motions.

Second, the debate is a window into the Republican majority’s agenda. Unfortunately, they would rather spend precious time on the floor on a doomed effort instead of advancing legislation that would help put people over politics.

While we are considering the veto override, we could have been considering ensuring women received equal pay for equal work; ending workplace discrimination; strengthening a worker’s ability to join a union and negotiate for better working conditions; help people balance work and family by providing paid sick leave and family and medical leave; or raising the minimum wage.

House Democrats and the Biden administration are focused on these priorities and remain committed to lowering costs for our constituents, creating better-paying jobs, and making our communities safer.

Madam Speaker, before I reserve the balance of my time, I will ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD President Biden’s veto message of H.J. Res. 30. It says, in part: “There is extensive evidence showing that environmental, social, and governance factors can have a material impact on markets, industries, and businesses. But the Republican-led resolution would force retirement managers to ignore these relevant risk factors, disregarding the principles of free markets and jeopardizing the life savings of working families and retirees. In fact, this resolution would prevent retirement plan fiduciaries from taking into account factors, such as the physical risks of climate change and poor corporate governance, that could affect investment returns.”

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the complete veto message be entered into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[March 20, 2023]

MESSAGE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—PRESIDENT’S VETO OF H.J. RES. 30

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.J. Res. 30, a resolution that would disapprove of the Department of Labor’s final rule titled “Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights.”

The Department of Labor’s final rule protects the hard-earned life savings and pensions of tens of millions of workers and retirees across the country. It allows retirement plan fiduciaries to make fully informed investment decisions by considering all relevant factors that might impact a prospective investment, while ensuring

that investment decisions made by retirement plan fiduciaries maximize financial returns for retirees.

There is extensive evidence showing that environmental, social, and governance factors can have a material impact on markets, industries, and businesses. But the Republican-led resolution would force retirement managers to ignore these relevant risk factors, disregarding the principles of free markets and jeopardizing the life savings of working families and retirees. In fact, this resolution would prevent retirement plan fiduciaries from taking into account factors, such as the physical risks of climate change and poor corporate governance, that could affect investment returns.

Retirement plan fiduciaries should be able to consider any factor that maximizes financial returns for retirees across the country. That is not controversial—that is common sense.

Therefore, I am vetoing this resolution.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2023.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Virginia is prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Today, we have heard a lot about ESG and other topics, but nobody made a convincing case that there are the votes to override the President's veto, and that is because a convincing case cannot be made.

The Republican majority may think this futile attempt to override the President's veto is an appropriate use of the House's time and resources, but we disagree.

The first quarter of this year is nearly over, and there is so much the Republican majority has failed to do to improve the lives of Americans.

In contrast, under Democratic leadership during the last Congress, the House made significant progress to deliver for the American people. We took action to create millions of jobs, reduce unemployment to near-record lows, to save workers' pensions, to deliver historic funding for education, to improve child nutrition, and to bring the number of uninsured Americans down to the lowest level ever.

By that standard, this current majority has a long way to go. However, at the very least, we should agree that we can't afford to waste time on futile efforts that we know won't go anywhere.

I urge my colleagues to quickly join me in rejecting the veto override, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I obviously disagree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle that a compelling argument to override the veto has not been made. I believe

that we have offered a compelling argument.

I believe there are two points of view on what my colleague said about the successes of what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done for the last 2 years.

We have the highest debt that we have ever had in this country. We are staggering under an inflation rate that is historic, and so we obviously don't think what we have inherited from the last 2 years of total Democratic dominance in this country is positive.

I think we can make a small attempt to make some changes here by overriding the President's veto. I urge even my Democratic colleagues to vote "yes" to protect workers and retirees. Override the President's veto.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of President Biden's veto rejecting legislation to overturn a Labor Department rule related to ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance)—based investing strategies.

On December 1, 2022, the Department of Labor issued a final rule on "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights." This rule clarifies that retirement plan fiduciaries may consider climate change and other Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors in selecting retirement investments and exercising shareholder rights, when those factors are relevant to the risk and return analysis.

The bill Republicans passed would have rejected that rule, instead mandating that retirement plan managers ignore this type of risk—whether it be a company's poor corporate management, human rights violations, carbon emissions, or any of the other factors that fall under the ESG framework.

When retirement plan managers are unable to fully explain all of the risks in a portfolio, those risks jeopardize the hard-earned retirement dollars of tens of millions of hardworking Americans. ESG factors should be allowed to be taken into account in one's investment and retirement strategies. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)'s just-released report* offers a catastrophic outlook if nations like the U.S. do not take urgent action to fight the climate crisis. Clearly superstorms, severe flooding, and sea-level rise, for example, elevate risks. ESG strategies are one tool to help individuals take an action of their own in pursuit of a future on a livable planet.

Should Minnesotans want to divest from fossil fuel interests, they should be allowed to do so. Their retirement plan managers should have the freedom to make fully-informed investment decisions—whether related to ESG or not.

Republicans' nonsensical attempt to frame ESG investments as "woke capitalism" is a waste of this governing body's efforts and would put Americans' futures at risk. Vetoing this bill is just common sense.

President Biden has made clear that Democrats believe we must protect hardworking Americans' life savings and retirement.

The previous question was ordered. THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 200, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—200

Adams	Boyle (PA)	Casten
Aguilar	Brown	Castor (FL)
Allred	Brownley	Cherfilus-
Auchincloss	Budzinski	McCormick
Balint	Bush	Chu
Barragan	Caraveo	Cicilline
Beatty	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Bera	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
Beyer	Carson	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Carter (LA)	Connolly
Blunt Rochester	Cartwright	Correa
Bonamici	Casar	Courtney
Bowman	Case	Craig

Crockett	Kilmer	Ross
Crow	Kim (NJ)	Ruiz
Davids (KS)	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Kuster	Ryan
Davis (NC)	Landsman	Salinas
Dean (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
Deluzio	Lee (PA)	Schiff
DeSaulnier	Levin	Schneider
Dingell	Lieu	Scholten
Doggett	Lofgren	Schrier
Escobar	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Magaziner	Scott, David
Espallat	Manning	Sewell
Evans	Matsui	Sherman
Fletcher	McBath	Sherrill
Foster	McClellan	Slotkin
Foushee	McColum	Smith (WA)
Frankel, Lois	McGarvey	Sorensen
Frost	McGovern	Soto
Galleo	Meeks	Spanberger
Garamendi	Menendez	Stansbury
Garcia (IL)	Meng	Stanton
Garcia (TX)	Mfume	Stevens
Garcia, Robert	Moore (WI)	Strickland
Goldman (NY)	Morelle	Swailwell
Gomez	Moulton	Sykes
Gonzalez,	Mrvan	Takano
Vicente	Napolitano	Thanedar
Gottheimer	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Green, Al (TX)	Neguse	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Nickel	Titus
Harder (CA)	Norcross	Tlaib
Hayes	Ocasio-Cortez	Tokuda
Higgins (NY)	Omar	Tonko
Himes	Pallone	Torres (CA)
Horsford	Panetta	Torres (NY)
Houlahan	Pappas	Trahan
Hoyer	Pascrell	Trone
Hoyle (OR)	Payne	Underwood
Huffman	Pelosi	Vargas
Ivey	Peltola	Vasquez
Jackson (NC)	Perez	Veasey
Jackson Lee	Peters	Velázquez
Jacobs	Pettersen	Wasserman
Jayapal	Phillips	Schultz
Jeffries	Pingree	Waters
Johnson (GA)	Pocan	Watson Coleman
Kamlager-Dove	Porter	Wexton
Kaptur	Pressley	Wild
Keating	Quigley	Williams (GA)
Khanna	Ramirez	Wilson (FL)
Kildee	Raskin	

NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer	Costa	Moskowitz
Bucshon	Cuellar	Mullin
Castro (TX)	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Cohen	Leger Fernandez	Salazar

□ 1803

Mrs. BEATTY, Messrs. CARSON, PAYNE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PERRY and Ms. VAN DUYN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the joint resolution are referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PARENTS BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 241 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY) kindly take the chair.

□ 1807

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation’s public schools, with Mr. MURPHY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 8 printed in House report 118–12 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CRANE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 118–12 offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 223, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—203

Adams	Brown	Chefilus-
Aguilar	Brownley	McCormick
Allred	Budzinski	Chu
Auchincloss	Bush	Cicilline
Balint	Caraveo	Clark (MA)
Barragán	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Cárdenas	Clyburn
Bera	Carson	Connolly
Beyer	Carter (LA)	Correa
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Courtney
Blunt Rochester	Casar	Craig
Bonamici	Case	Crockett
Bowman	Casten	Crow
Boyle (PA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (IL)

Davis (NC)	Kuster	Ruiz
Dean (PA)	Landsman	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Sablan
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Salinas
Deluzio	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Lee (PA)	Sarbanes
Dingell	Levin	Scanlon
Doggett	Lieu	Schakowsky
Escobar	Lofgren	Schiff
Eshoo	Lynch	Schneider
Espallat	Magaziner	Scholten
Evans	Manning	Schrier
Fletcher	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Foster	McBath	Scott, David
Foushee	McClellan	Sewell
Frankel, Lois	McColum	Sherman
Frost	McGarvey	Sherrill
Galleo	McGovern	Slotkin
Garamendi	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Garcia (IL)	Menendez	Sorensen
Garcia (TX)	Meng	Soto
Garcia, Robert	Mfume	Spanberger
Golden (ME)	Moore (WI)	Stansbury
Goldman (NY)	Morelle	Stanton
Gomez	Moulton	Stevens
Gonzalez,	Mrvan	Strickland
Vicente	Napolitano	Swailwell
Gottheimer	Neal	Sykes
Green, Al (TX)	Neguse	Takano
Grijalva	Nickel	Thanedar
Harder (CA)	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Hayes	Norton	Thompson (MS)
Higgins (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Titus
Himes	Omar	Tlaib
Horsford	Pallone	Tokuda
Houlahan	Panetta	Tonko
Hoyer	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Hoyle (OR)	Pascrell	Torres (NY)
Huffman	Payne	Trahan
Ivey	Pelosi	Trone
Jackson (NC)	Peltola	Underwood
Jackson Lee	Perez	Vargas
Jacobs	Peters	Vasquez
Jayapal	Pettersen	Veasey
Jeffries	Phillips	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Wasserman
Kamlager-Dove	Plaskett	Schultz
Kaptur	Pocan	Waters
Keating	Porter	Watson Coleman
Khanna	Pressley	Wexton
Kildee	Quigley	Wild
	Ramirez	Williams (GA)
	Raskin	Wilson (FL)
	Krishnamoorthi	

NOES—223

Aderholt	Crawford	Granger
Alford	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Allen	Curtis	Graves (MO)
Amodei	D’Esposito	Green (TN)
Armstrong	Davids (KS)	Greene (GA)
Arrington	Davidson	Griffith
Babin	De La Cruz	Grothman
Bacon	DesJarlais	Guest
Baird	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Balderson	Donalds	Hageman
Banks	Duarte	Harris
Barr	Duncan	Harshbarger
Bean (FL)	Dunn (FL)	Hern
Bentz	Edwards	Higgins (LA)
Bergman	Ellzey	Hill
Bice	Emmer	Hinson
Biggs	Estes	Houchin
Bilirakis	Ezell	Hudson
Bishop (NC)	Fallon	Huizenga
Boebert	Feenstra	Hunt
Bost	Ferguson	Issa
Brecheen	Finstad	Jackson (TX)
Buchanan	Fischbach	James
Buck	Fitzgerald	Johnson (LA)
Burchett	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Burlison	Flood	Jordan
Calvert	Foxx	Joyce (OH)
Cammack	Franklin, C.	Joyce (PA)
Carey	Scott	Kean (NJ)
Carl	Fry	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	Kiggans (VA)
Chavez-DeRemer	Gallagher	Kiley
Ciscomani	Garbarino	Kim (CA)
Cline	Garcia, Mike	Kustoff
Cloud	Gimenez	LaHood
Clyde	Gonzales, Tony	LaLota
Cole	González-Colón	LaMalfa
Collins	Good (VA)	Lamborn
Comer	Gooden (TX)	Langworthy
Crane	Gosar	Latta

Table listing members of the House of Representatives and their districts, including names like LaTurner, Murphy, Smucker, Steube, Van Drew, Zinke, Rouzer, Smith (WA), and Trone.

NOES—365

NOT VOTING—14

NOT VOTING—14

Table listing members of the House of Representatives who did not vote, including Blumenauer, Bucshon, Castro (TX), Cleaver, and Cohen.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1809

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 365, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

AYES—61

Table listing members of the House of Representatives who voted 'aye', including Banks, Biggs, Bishop (NC), Boebert, Brecheen, Burchett, Burlison, Cammack, Cline, Cloud, Clyde, Collins, Crane, Davidson, DesJarlais, Donalds, Duncan, and Fry.

Table listing members of the House of Representatives who voted 'no' or did not vote, including Steube, Tenney, Tiffany, Adams, Aderholt, Aguilar, Alford, Allen, Allred, Amodei, Armstrong, Arrington, Auchincloss, Babin, Bacon, Baird, Balderson, Balint, Barr, Barragan, Bean (FL), Beatty, Bentz, Bera, Bergman, Beyer, Bice, Bilirakis, Bishop (GA), Blunt, Rochester, Bonamici, Bost, Bowman, Boyle (PA), Brown, Brownley, Buchanan, Buck, Budzinski, Burgess, Bush, Calvert, Caraveo, Carbajal, Cárdenas, Carey, Carl, Carson, Carter (GA), Carter (LA), Carter (TX), Cartwright, Casar, Case, Casten, Castor (FL), Chavez-DeRemer, Cherfilus-McCormick, Chu, Cicilline, Ciscomani, Clark (MA), Clarke (NY), Clyburn, Cole, Comer, Connolly, Correa, Courtney, Craig, Crawford, Crenshaw, Crockett, Crow, Curtis, D'Esposito, Davids (KS), Davis (IL), Davis (NC), De La Cruz, Dean (PA), DeGette, DeLauro, DelBene, Deluzio, DeSaulnier, Diaz-Balart, Dingell, Doggett, Duarte, Dunn (FL), Dunn (GA), Edwards, Ellzue, Emmer, Escobar, Eshoo, Espallat, Estes, Evans, Ezell, Fallon, Feenstra, Ferguson, Finstad, Fischbach, Fitzgerald, Fitzpatrick, Bean (FL), Fleischmann, Fletcher, Flood, Foster, Foushee, Foxx, Frankel, Lois, Franklin, C. Scott, Frost, Fulcher, Gaetz, Gallagher, Gallego, Garamendi, Garbarino, Garcia (IL), Garcia (TX), Garcia, Mike, Garcia, Robert, Gimenez, Golden (ME), Goldman (NY), Gomez, Gonzales, Tony, Gonzalez, Vicente, González-Colón, Gooden (TX), Gottheimer, Granger, Graves (LA), Graves (MO), Green (TN), Green, Al (TX), Grijalva, Grothman, Guest, Guthrie, Harder (CA), Hayes, Hern, Higgins (NY), Hill, Himes, Hinson, Horsford, Houchin, Houlihan, Hoyer, Hoyle (OR), Huffman, Huizenga, Issa, Ivey, Jackson (IL), Jackson (NC), Jackson (TX), Jackson Lee, Jacobs, James, Jayapal, Jeffries, Johnson (GA), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson (SD), Joyce (OH), Joyce (PA), Kamlager-Dove, Kaptur, Kean (NJ), Keating, Kelly (PA), Khanna, Kiggans (VA), Kildee, Kiley, Kilmer, Kim (CA), Kim (NJ), Krishnamoorthi, Kuster, Kustoff, LaHood, LaMalfa, Landsman, Langworthy, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Latta, LaTurner, Lawler, Lee (CA), Lee (FL), Lee (NV), Lee (PA), Letlow, Levin, Lieu, Lofgren, Loudermilk, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lynch, Mace, Magaziner, Malliotakis, Mann, Manning, Massie, Matsui, McBeth, McCaul, McClain, McClellan, McCollum, McGarvey, McGovern, McHenry, Meeks, Menendez, Meng, Meuser, Mfume, Miller (OH), Miller (WV), Miller-Meeks, Molinaro, Moolenaar, Moore (UT), Moore (WI), Morelle, Moulton, Moylan, Mrvan, Murphy, Napolitano, Neal, Neguse, Newhouse, Nickel, Norcross, Norton, Nunn (IA), Obernolte, Ocasio-Cortez, Ogles, Omar, Owens, Pallone, Panetta, Pappas, Pascrell, Payne, Pelosi, Peltola, Pence, Perez, Perry, Peters, Petterson, Pfluger, Phillips, Pingree, Plaskett, Pocan, Porter, Pressley, Quigley, Ramirez, Raskin, Rodgers (WA), Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rose, Ross, Ruzier, Roy, Ruiz, Ruppertsberger, Rutherford, Ryan, Sablan, Salazar, Salinas, Sánchez, Sarbanes, Scanlon, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schneider, Schwab, Scholten, Schrier, Schweikert, Scott (VA), Scott, David, Scott, David, Self, Sessions, Sewell, Sherman, Sherrill, Simpson, Slotkin, Smith (MO), Smith (NJ), Soto, Stansbury, Stanton, Stauber, Steel, Stefanik, Velázquez, Stevens, Stewart, Strickland, Strong, Swalwell, Sykes, Takano, Thanedar, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Thompson (PA), Timmons, Titus, Tlaib, Tokuda, Tonko, Torres (CA), Torres (NY), Trahan, Mullin, Nadler, Radewagen, Spartz, Yaskym

NOT VOTING—14

Table listing members of the House of Representatives who did not vote, including Blumenauer, Bucshon, Castro (TX), Cleaver, and Cohen.

□ 1813

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FULCHER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 338, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

AYES—89

Table listing members of the House of Representatives who voted 'aye', including Arrington, Banks, Biggs, Bilirakis, Bishop (NC), Boebert, Brecheen, Burchett, Burgess, Burlison, Cammack, Cline, Cloud, Clyde, Collins, Crane, Davidson, DesJarlais, Donalds, Duncan, and Fry.

Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Mills
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moran
Nehls
Norman
Ogles

NOES—338

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodi
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Budzinski
Bush
Calvert
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Edwards

Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Rosendale
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Self
Smucker
Spartz

Steube
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)

LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeeks
Molinaro
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Moylan
Mrvan
Murphy
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Petersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross

Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Stansbury
Ryan
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Blumenauer
Buchon
Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cohen

Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)

NOT VOTING—13

Costa
Cuellar
Kelly (IL)
Leger Fernandez
Moskowitz

□ 1818

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PFLUGER changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR.

FITZPATRICK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
FITZPATRICK) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 386, noes 39,
not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

AYES—386

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodi
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bean (FL)

Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Budzinski
Bush
Calvert

Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline

Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foushee
Fouxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
García (TX)
García, Mike
García, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
González-Colón
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson

Horsford
Houchin
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyler (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
LaLota
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moulton

Moylan
Mrvan
Murphy
Napolitano
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Petersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sablan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tokuda

Tonko	Vasquez	Westerman
Torres (CA)	Veasey	Wexton
Torres (NY)	Velázquez	Wild
Trahan	Wagner	Williams (GA)
Trone	Walberg	Williams (NY)
Turner	Wasserman	Williams (TX)
Underwood	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Valadao	Waters	Wilson (SC)
Van Drew	Watson Coleman	Wittman
Van Duyne	Weber (TX)	Womack
Van Orden	Webster (FL)	Yakym
Vargas	Wenstrup	Zinke

NOES—39

Biggs	Gaetz	Neal
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Norman
Boebert	Gosar	Ogles
Brecheen	Greene (GA)	Payne
Buck	Griffith	Pelosi
Burchett	Harris	Perry
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Burlison	Johnson (GA)	Rosendale
Cárdenas	Kiggans (VA)	Roy
Cline	Lesko	Santos
Cloud	Loudermilk	Stansbury
Crane	Luna	Steube
Davidson	Lynch	Tlaib

NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer	Costa	Moskowitz
Bucshon	Cuellar	Mullin
Castro (TX)	Grothman	Nadler
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Radewagen
Cohen	Leger Fernandez	Waltz

□ 1822

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GARBARINO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE VII—RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON STUDENT ACCESS TO BOOKS AND OTHER READING MATERIALS

SEC. 701. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON STUDENT ACCESS TO BOOKS AND OTHER READING MATERIALS.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed as authorizing or granting parents the right or ability to deny any student who is not their child from accessing any books or other reading materials that are otherwise available in the library of their child's school.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, every parent has the inherent right and responsibility to decide what is best for their child, how to raise them, how to care for them, and what information to expose them to or to protect them from.

My amendment protects the ability of parents to participate in the education of their own child by reaffirm-

ing parental choice and ensuring that children are not subject to the censorship of adults who are not their parents.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exposes a problem with the underlying bill.

You should not be able to ban books for other parents' children. In fact, this amendment exposes the bill as actually doing exactly that. That is why this amendment is appropriate, and I would hope that it would be adopted.

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

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's words and his support of this. I also appreciate the chairwoman's support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 4, strike "and".

Page 9, line 9, strike the punctuation after "event" and insert ";; and".

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(O) the right to timely notice of any major cyberattack against their child's school that may have compromised student or parent information."

Page 11, line 4, strike the punctuation after "school" and insert a period.

Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new clause:

"(v) CYBERATTACKS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under this part shall ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by such agency provides the parents of each child who is a student in such school notifications described in paragraph (1)(O)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, our Nation's critical infrastructure and cybersecurity are increasingly under attack by malicious actors who seek to extort and do harm to the American people.

Hospitals, financial institutions, utilities, and government agencies are all popular targets, but cyberattacks are now targeting the next generation of Americans, K-12 students.

While the total number of cyberattacks on K-12 schools is unknown, recent reports have indicated that ransomware attacks on K-12 schools increased between 2020 and 2022.

Local and State officials report that loss of learning following a cyberattack can range from 3 days to 3 weeks, and recovery time can take anywhere from 2 to 9 months. Officials also reported monetary losses to school districts ranging from \$50,000 to \$1 million due to expenses from a cyber incident.

Cyberattacks often result in the disclosure and theft of students' personal information. In a 2020 report, the GAO found that such information compromised included students grades, their Social Security numbers, and medical information.

In December 2021, a vendor for Chicago Public Schools was a victim of a ransomware attack in which more than 500,000 students' and staff members' personal information was disclosed. The data included the students' names, schools, dates of birth, gender, school identification numbers, State student identification numbers, and course information from previous school years. One study found that between 2018 and 2021, roughly 3 million students were impacted by ransomware attacks.

Parents who entrust their students' information to public institutions have the right to know when that information is compromised. We must do the work to ensure these attacks are not successful and that malicious actors are brought to justice.

Parents need to know when their students' personal information has been compromised so they can take the necessary steps to protect them. Transparency is essential to protecting the privacy of students.

We need schools that are both transparent and accountable to parents. Parents shouldn't be stonewalled when asking for information about their child's personal records. The FBI should focus on investigating these cyber incidents and informing parents on the irreparable harm done to their children's cybersecurity rather than monitoring their parents' free speech and shutting down parent involvement.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to put parents before politics and support this amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have some concern with some of the terms in the amendment, like what constitutes a major cyberattack or who determines whether an attack has been made, or if notice is required if it may have compromised information and exactly what is concerned there.

Generally speaking, if information is exposed during a cyberattack, people expect to be notified so that they can take appropriate action to protect themselves. These schools should be no exception. I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 11 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACOBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 118-12.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I have amendment No. 12 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 14, strike “, at no cost.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to fight for kids, parents and guardians, and educators in San Diego and across the country.

All parents and guardians want for their kids is for them to grow up safe, healthy, and happy, and have the tools needed to confidently and successfully go out into the world. Obviously, they should be involved in their kids' education and shaping their minds and lives, but H.R. 5 is not the solution.

I think we can all agree that educators can be some of the most influential people in our kids' lives. They have the power to inspire lifelong learning. They can help foster creativity and curiosity and teach children new information and perspectives, but H.R. 5 fails to value educators.

It fails to acknowledge or even address that teachers are overworked and underpaid, fueling the burnout that has created a nationwide teacher shortage that was exponentially worsened by the pandemic.

H.R. 5 fails to address school safety. There have been 322 school shootings this year alone. Just yesterday, there was a shooting at a Denver high school. By failing to act on gun violence in schools, we are allowing an entire generation to grow up with so much trauma: The trauma of school shooting drills, of growing up watching school shootings on the news, wearing bullet-proof backpacks to school and knowing that one day it could save your life.

However, H.R. 5 does not even attempt to proactively end the gun violence epidemic at schools. It only permits parents and guardians the right to a notification when violence at a school occurs.

My colleagues glaze over the causes of real violence at our Nation's schools, like proper investments in school-based mental health programs, social, emotional, and cultural competency professional development for educators and administrators, disciplinary measures that eradicate the cradle-to-prison pipeline, and, more importantly, gun control measures to ensure that our youth are safe from school shootings.

We need parents and guardians to be involved in the classroom because too often it is all on teachers to make up for emotional support, learning, and care in the classroom that should also be provided at home.

H.R. 5 doesn't give all parents and guardians the tools for constructive involvement and unfairly empowers a very narrow set to dictate what all students learn about.

It will open the door to book bans and censorship to control what students learn and read about, neglecting important parts of history like the civil rights movement and learning about people's identities.

It would also mandate schools to out LGBTQ+ students to their parents, violating students' privacy and potentially exposing them to harm in the process.

While I am thankful that the Rules Committee supported two of my amendments, it is shameful that they rejected my amendment to ensure that teaching about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism in schools should be taught with the acknowledgement that those actions were immoral.

Amid skyrocketing anti-Semitic rhetoric, especially from some of my colleagues in this body, and growing violence targeting the Jewish community, Congress needs to use its power to end hatred and discrimination against Jews.

That work starts with our actions and ensuring that “Never Again” is a reality by teaching about the Holocaust and the lingering hate that still exists today.

In the height of irony, this bill even includes a sense of Congress that all

public elementary and secondary schools should have opportunities to learn the history of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism, but that means very little if we are unwilling to mandate how wrong and immoral those actions were.

This bill is a disservice to our kids, parents and guardians, teachers, and to our future by not providing kids the tools to be engaged, thoughtful citizens. So we should take the opportunity to improve this bill.

Mr. Chair, my amendment eliminates the “at no cost” unfunded mandate embedded within the bill that would require schools—that are already underfunded and under-resourced—to be burdened with printing out professional development and curriculum materials at zero cost.

I agree that parents should have access to school curriculums, most of which are already published online.

However, if my colleagues believe parents should have this right so strongly, then they should provide additional funding for school systems to be able to comply. We want all parents and guardians to be involved in the classroom.

This is a simple, commonsense solution that removes a potentially costly barrier for school systems that are already struggling to maintain their budgets.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to remove the “at no cost” provisions in H.R. 5 to bring all parents and guardians to the table for their kids' learning.

Parents and guardians should be active participants in kids' education, but that doesn't mean we should lose sight of school safety, ending discrimination, supporting teachers, and ensuring a well-rounded curriculum that prepares kids for the future.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, parents have a fundamental right to know what their children are being taught, and it should not depend on how rich or poor they are.

The amendment under consideration would strike the phrase “at no cost” from the clause stating that parents have the right to review and make copies of curricula. In other words, this amendment would allow schools to charge parents for copies of what their children are being taught.

On principle, that is a terrible idea. Republicans believe that every parent, no matter how much money they have, should be free to know what their child is being taught.

This amendment is also terrible policy. Under the provision, schools could charge every parent exorbitant

amounts for copying curricula and effectively make it impossible for parents to access the curriculum of their children. We know that schools can use cost as a weapon to keep curriculum a secret.

I spoke earlier about a Rhode Island mother of two, Nicole Solas, who became concerned that her child's school was teaching radical leftist ideology. She asked for the school's curriculum but was persistently stonewalled and told to file public records requests. She did, and the school hit her with a \$75,000 bill.

That kind of conduct is outrageous. No parent should have to pay \$75,000 to learn what their child is being taught. Just the threat of this kind of a bill has a chilling effect on other parents.

That is why it is essential we defeat this amendment. Parents should be able to see their child's curriculum without worrying the school will slam them with an exorbitant bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and in favor of the underlying bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1845

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I completely agree that parents should have access to curriculum and know what their kids are learning. Schools publish curriculums online already. Most of the information that they would need is already publicly available.

Frankly, if we want to make sure that parents are able to access this with no cost, we shouldn't be burdening the parents, and we also shouldn't be burdening the already overburdened school districts. We should be funding it. Right now, this is an unfunded mandate, which I urge my colleagues not to support.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, we should defeat this amendment that would encourage schools to throw up roadblocks in front of parents.

We should defeat this amendment that would make money a barrier to parental engagement. We should defeat this amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. JACOBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 118-12.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, beginning line 22, strike subparagraph (J) and redesignate the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly.

Page 18, strike line 1 and all that follows through the end of line 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we all know that our educators and school districts are overburdened and overworked, as well as undervalued and underpaid. H.R. 5 worsens these systemic problems.

My amendment removes an unnecessary and burdensome provision permitting parents and guardians to review professional development materials for educators. This would impact educators' and school districts' already limited time and resources without any positive gain for parents, guardians, and students.

My colleagues have failed to define what constitutes professional development, which ultimately may limit the types of professional development available to educators.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that we can ensure that educators' time is directed at enriching our kids' education and not fulfilling onerous requirements.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all know the impact that a good teacher can have. A good teacher can be motivating, challenging, and life changing for young students. We all want to have good teachers.

I spent my career in education. I have met countless teachers over the years who care deeply about students and want to do the right thing.

Unfortunately, too many in the education bureaucracy are working against teachers with professional development materials that seek to push radical ideologies meant to be passed on to students. Furthermore, there are numerous professional development groups that want to supply teachers with these talking points.

That is why it is essential we know exactly what teachers themselves are being taught, what kind of professional development they are receiving, and who is providing it.

We Republicans believe that parents have a fundamental right to know these answers. Parents need to know who is teaching the teachers, and taxpayers have a right to know what kind of professional development they are paying for.

Frankly, opposition to giving parents access to this information and these materials is evidence of the need for this bill. What is it that proponents of this amendment are trying to hide?

During the Rules Committee hearing, one of the Democrat Members even recognized that reviewing professional development materials is a fundamental right. He told me: "I agree with you. These are really important, vital rights every parent in the country ought to have. . . . I would think that the best place to start would be . . . to ask the local school board and make sure that the right to review, for example, any professional development material is secured."

I agree with the Democratic Congressman. Reviewing professional development material is a vital right of every parent.

His mistake, however, is to think that every local school board will voluntarily allow such. Many do not. That is why we need the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and in favor of the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I agree that parents deserve to see some professional development. That is why I want the majority to define "professional development" so we can make sure that we are actually doing what we intend to do.

As the bill is written, it includes specialized instructional support personnel such as speech-language pathologists and audiologists who have specific continuing education requirements that are sometimes accessed through continuing education courses that have copyright restrictions that limit use and distribution of materials and content.

My amendment would ensure that all teachers and specialized instructional support personnel are able to access the professional development courses they need to maintain their skills and even their licenses and certifications, which this bill, as written, would get in the way of.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to remove information about the education children are receiving from parents. We should defeat this amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. LAWLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I have amendment No. 14 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE VII—INAPPLICABILITY TO NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SEC. 701. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to impose any requirements on non-public elementary or secondary schools.

SEC. 702. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that local educational agencies do not have the authority to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of non-public elementary or secondary schools.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

In my district and in districts across the country, our education system is a balance of public schools, private schools, charter schools, parochial schools, vocational schools, and home schools.

My amendment would make clear this bill only applies to schools that take funds from the Department of Education and would ensure that non-public schools are able to determine their own curriculum and not have curriculum imposed on them by local school boards and States that disregard that right.

In New York, for instance, this is of great concern as the current Governor and her administration have attempted to impose severe restrictions on private schools, including Catholic schools and yeshivas in school districts across the State. A key provision of this new State regulation was actually thrown out in court today.

Parents choose to send their children to the school they feel best fits their needs and beliefs. It is not the role of any government to dictate to parents and children what they should believe or practice, and in my district, that certainly is a concern held by many parents.

I have parents contact my office every day with concerns about their children's education and the State trying to force itself into the relationship between educators and students.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment, which protects non-public schools from being forced to adopt questionable practices forced on them by school boards and States.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in the first part of the bill, it says nothing is actually to be construed to oppose any requirements of non-public elementary and secondary schools. I am unaware of anything the bill does to impose requirements on non-public elementary or secondary schools, so it seems to me to be unnecessary.

Second, it is the sense of Congress that says local agencies do not have the authority to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over curriculum or program of instruction of non-public elementary and secondary schools. Again, I am unaware of local school boards' authority to exercise such supervision, direction, or control, so that seems also to be unnecessary.

I am not sure what the amendment speaks to that is relevant, so I oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE VII—SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO TERMINATION OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SEC. 701. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO TERMINATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the authority of the Department of Education and the Secretary of Education to operate or administer any office or program related to elementary or secondary education should be terminated on or before December 31, 2023.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is quite simple. It expresses the sense of Congress that the Department of Education and the Secretary of Education should no longer have any authority to administer any program related to elementary or secondary education in the United States.

Some people may confuse the purpose of my amendment, and let me be clear: It is to strengthen public education in the United States.

I am a product of public education, K-12. I attended public schools, as did my wife and all of our children.

We are proud of our schools in this country, but it is time to turn in the grade card for the Department of Education. They have been at it for 40 years, and they get an F. Education has not improved, but spending has doubled per pupil.

It is time to return the power back to the States, back to the people, and back to the school boards to allow them to make these decisions locally.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN).

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Chair, September 24, 1981, in his address to the Nation on the program for economic recovery, President Ronald Reagan made the following comment: "As a third step, we propose to dismantle two Cabinet Departments, Energy and Education. Both Secretaries are wholly in accord with this. Some of the activities in both of these Departments will, of course, be continued either independently or in other areas of government. There is only one way to shrink the size and cost of Big Government, and that is by eliminating agencies that are not needed and are getting in the way of a solution. . . . By eliminating the Department of Education less than 2 years after it was created, we cannot only reduce the budget but ensure that local needs and preferences, rather than wishes of Washington, determine the education of our children."

The Federal Department of Education was created in 1979. Many people can't even remember a time when it was not a creation, but there was such a time.

Mr. Chair, for 200 years, our Nation flourished and had rigorous education absent the Federal Department of Education.

I, too, am a product of public education, but I contend if we want to empower parents in the hypersexualized, woke culture that is invading our classrooms, we need to give school board members and parents the ability to determine the education of their children and empower them by returning to the brilliance of our Founding Fathers.

In the 18 enumerated powers that list those things that the Federal Government should do, education is not mentioned. That is why Thomas Jefferson made the comment that in order for the Federal Government to be involved in education, you have to have a constitutional amendment.

We need to follow the advice of our Founding Fathers and put this back in the hands of our States. They can determine what is happening in the classroom. That is a success for our children and this country.

□ 1900

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, whenever we encounter an attempt to dismantle the Department of Education, it is clear that we are undermining public education. Yet, even the Founders of our great Nation were committed to education.

Moreover, without a Federal role in education, when States were left to their own devices, we lacked a common set of standards for high-quality education, high-quality teachers, and high expectations for student outcomes. Many students were left behind, such as racial minorities, low income, those with disabilities, those with English as a second language.

The Federal role in education ensures a level playing field for all of our students and especially provides funding to help the most needy students.

Moreover, the Federal role in education is still striving to live up to the promise of *Brown v. Board of Education*, the 1954 decision. In that decision, the Supreme Court said that education is a right, which must be made available to all on equal terms, and further, that racially segregated so-called separate but equal education was inherently unequal.

The GAO first revealed in 2016 that public schools, unfortunately, are still segregated—as a matter of fact, more segregated now than the late 1960s.

In July 2022, GAO found that more than one in three public K–12 students attend essentially racially segregated schools, so we still have work to do in that area. We still have work to do to fulfill the promise of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We are not fulfilling that promise.

So we still have a lot of work to do on the Federal level. There is a Federal role for education. The Department of Education is working on fulfilling that responsibility.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, as my colleague from Oklahoma pointed out, Congress lacks the constitutional authority to create what amounts to a national school board of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats.

How many are there; 4,000 bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.?

My colleague on the other side of the aisle said that basically every school would like to have more money.

How could we do that without raising taxes?

Quit wasting it in Washington, D.C., on 4,000 bureaucrats who cost us about \$100,000 apiece.

These bureaucrats make more than the teachers. Yet, they don't teach a single class. They don't write books. They don't help with that.

In fact, the Federal Government is responsible for about 90 percent of the red tape that local schools have to deal

with and only about 10 percent of the funding. It is time to change that equation.

Imagine if we could hire 4,000 more teachers in this country using that money and pay them each \$100,000, pay them what the bureaucrats get in Washington, D.C.

How many more kids would get a better education?

I suspect a lot more kids would get a better education.

This was a reelection ploy that was foisted on America by Jimmy Carter and Congress at the time in 1979. It did not work. He did not get reelected. It was not a good idea, but here we are. We are stuck with it.

It is time, as I said before, to reevaluate this.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to show that we support public education. We support the rights of parents to determine through their school boards the rights of teachers. The teachers know what to teach and how to teach. They don't need the Federal Government telling them.

What your child learns or how your child learns shouldn't be dependent on who won the Presidential election and who became Secretary of Education. It is too important to leave it up to that. You need to leave it up to your community, to the teachers and the parents.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is not a complicated amendment. It just asks whether you want a Department of Education. I think we should have a Department of Education, therefore, I ask for a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FALLON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 118–12.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to H.R. 5.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, line 23, insert “and on any violations of the rights specified in paragraph (1)” after “agency”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss my amendment to H.R. 5, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.

I speak to all of you as a father of seven, an educator for 4 years, both in public and private schools, and a youth minister for over 20 years.

It is important to note that as we discuss this legislation, we are not guaranteed just local control in our Constitution, but we are also guaranteed inalienable, individual rights even when inconvenient to the local government, because the ultimate minority we need to protect is the individual.

For amendment No. 16, it clarifies H.R. 5's language to ensure parents have the guaranteed opportunity to address the school board regarding any violation of their parental rights. This right is implied within the bill but deserves stronger language.

As we have seen too frequently across the country, including two counties within my district, concerned moms and dads have been silenced, thrown out, and threatened when standing up for their children. This is simply unacceptable.

Amendment No. 16 serves as a form of accountability. We must ensure parents should be able to provide school boards with feedback to make necessary changes when the rights of the parents or the children are infringed upon.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, parents already have the right to address their local school board. It should be done, unfortunately, within reason, but a reasonable amendment was rejected in committee. You don't need a Federal law to instruct school board members who are elected to be polite to the public. The voters can take care of that.

This bill grants a Federal right of action to each and every person who shows up for the school board, no matter how obnoxious, extreme, irrelevant, or repetitive that person may be.

This amendment is unnecessary because it doesn't do anything to the underlying bill. The underlying bill gives you that so-called right, but we have heard that some parents have been arrested. As I have said before, they were arrested because the police believed they were committing a crime.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, the attitude that only some parents should be considered, that only some parents

should be heard, and that some parents should be arrested is not what we are talking about.

We are not talking about the parents who were arrested for doing violent things, and that is a very rare exception. We keep on using these rare exceptions to make a rule.

Clearly, there is a need for us to step up and represent these parents that are unheard, because when parents are told they cannot come before a school board, there is a reason for us to step up and take action.

I think it is simply untrue to say that we already have laws that cover this and you already have access to your school board when clearly, just in my district alone, that right has been denied.

That is what we are fighting over right now, a parent's right to address a school board when a school board says: Nope, I don't want to listen to you. That is what we are arguing about right now.

If it weren't happening, I wouldn't be standing in front of you right now. In fact, I probably wouldn't have been elected, because this is one of the main things that parents want, are their rights back for them and their children.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on the amendment and in strong opposition to H.R. 5.

Today, I spoke with teachers, principals, and superintendents who have all gone to school to learn how to educate, manage, and supervise the education of our young people. They oppose this bill and the usurping of their expertise in their field and their ability to teach.

H.R. 5 declares that we have now decided that we don't trust our teachers.

I have to say the title of this bill is a lie. It is a Trojan horse when it comes to what is best for educating our children. It is really about the evisceration of public education.

I am a parent. I know what is best for my child, but that doesn't mean I know what is best for your child. This bill will take the participation of parents out of the decisionmaking process and truly create anarchy in our education system.

Earlier today, I was in a committee hearing listening to Republicans talk about China, and this is what I heard them say:

They said, shame on China. China is bashing access to education, stifling access to free thought, and banning access to information. The hypocrisy in that talking about bashing China, this

bill does exactly what they say they don't want to see happen.

The poison pill in this bill will actually promote violence and bullying in our schools and of our young kids who are finding themselves and trying to learn who they are.

If you support mob rule, then you support H.R. 5. If you support autocracy, then you support H.R. 5.

The Americans that I know, the constituents in my district, support democracy, and that is not H.R. 5.

Democracy is about everyone having a voice. Hypocrisy is about silencing people.

No one is suggesting that parents can't and shouldn't be involved in the education of their children and in the activities that are going on in schools.

Absolutely.

In fact, if more parents were engaged, teachers would feel supported, principals would feel empowered, and communities would thrive. But that is not what H.R. 5 is about.

So I am here to defend our education system and ensure that our students and our teachers go to school unencumbered by political agendas so that they can live and learn freely about who they are and the history of this country and the world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, I take offense in thinking that mob rule is a parent standing up for their child.

I take offense in thinking that teachers and school systems are the only ones that can say so.

I take offense that just given the opportunity for a parent to give feedback to a school board is something other than the most representative sort of government that we have.

The First Amendment allows us to speak openly against our government, against our elected officials, and to express our opinions freely, and that is what my amendment is about.

There couldn't be any more constitutional amendment. There couldn't be any more freedom and democratic process. There couldn't be any more representative thing for your child than you.

I am empowering you as a woman, as a mother; me as a father—all of us. This isn't just for Democrats or Republicans. This is for every parent to be able to speak freely to their representative body of governance for their schools. That is what this amendment is about.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK). The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 4, strike "and".

Page 9, line 9, strike all punctuation after "event" and insert "; and".

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(O) the right to be informed of any non-curriculum-based celebratory initiatives or non-curriculum-based events for students (other than initiatives or events related to birthdays or Federal legal public holidays) that are organized by the school and that will be made available to their child."

Page 5, line 9, strike "and".

Page 5, line 18, strike all punctuation after "speaker" and insert "; and".

Page 5, after line 18, insert the following new paragraph:

"(12) ensure that each elementary school and secondary school served by the local educational agency provides to the parents of students enrolled at such school, before any non-curriculum-based celebratory initiative or non-curriculum-based event described in subsection (e)(1)(O)—

"(A) timely notice and a description of such initiative or event; and

"(B) timely notice that a parent of a student is required to grant permission, in written or electronic form, in order for the child to participate or attend such an initiative or event, and the procedure required for the parent to provide such permission."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, my amendment No. 17 is a simple addition to H.R. 5 that states that parents have the right to be informed of any non-curriculum-based initiatives or events, and parents have the right to opt-in their child to such events, excluding birthday celebrations and Federal holidays.

Examples of these events that my amendment seeks to address include: National French Week, Firefighter Appreciation Day, Democracy Day, or any other politically motivated or controversial extracurricular activities.

Some of these activities are great. However, it is important that parents aren't simply aware of the activities their children are participating in, we also want to give parents the ability to be proactive in their child's education and especially their extracurricular activities. This is their right.

This amendment has nothing to do with technical careers or college prep. It only applies to initiatives and events outside of the curriculum.

The American Psychological Association has confirmed what common sense already tells us, which is that parental involvement in education is vital. Students with parents who are involved

have a higher chance to get better grades and test scores, have better school attendance, and even better social outcomes.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am having a little trouble understanding the amendment. As I understand it, a student couldn't participate in a non-curriculum-based activity, event, or initiative unless the parents have affirmatively opted in. Otherwise, the students would be prevented from participating in that event.

If that is my understanding, if the parents don't get the paperwork in, the students can't participate in the event.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. I think that is an excellent point. What do we require opt-in for right now?

Right now, for free and reduced lunch, you have to opt in. For a field trip, you have to opt in. For lots of activities you have to opt in. Things that are good for the children.

If the child wants to go, I guarantee, as a father of seven, they are going to come to me and say, Dad, I want to go to this, and I am going to opt in if it is something that I want them to participate in.

This is not unprecedented. This is something that gives you power, once again, control of what you want your children to be exposed to, that has nothing to do with academics. Nothing to do with academics.

This could be used in positive ways or negative ways, depending on you how view your children's education.

There are already plenty of measures to make the content and the curriculum accountable to parental oversight, but the non-curriculum-based events and initiatives don't have these measures.

Further, this amendment doesn't state how schools have to get consent from parents; one event at a time. The language is drafted so that the school can determine how to best inform and receive a parent's consent. It can be done for the entire year all at once. That is up to the school.

Once again, it empowers parents to have control of things that are outside of academics, which we already have a precedent for.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised that in some Montgomery County, Maryland schools, they have a celebration on Halloween with a costume parade and a Valentine's Day with a class party. If the parents didn't get the paperwork in on time, the children can't participate.

I don't know if recess is a non-curriculum-based initiative, but my guess is, until you get your paperwork in, you can't go out and play in recess.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chair, clearly, I am not talking about recess. Let's not get crazy about what kind of things we are claiming right now.

I am talking about—you're right, it could be anything from let me dress up as something vulgar, or let me—it could be anything controversial or non-controversial. It doesn't really matter.

Once again, we get back to the content of something we already do. You are right, your kids might benefit greatly from going down to the power station for a field trip, but you already have to opt them in. You are doing that already.

I am talking about things that have nothing to do with academics. This has to do with empowering parents, just like they already are on several occasions, to have control of what their children are exposed to. That is what parental rights are all about. That is empowering each individual, as a parent, and each student, to be exposed to only what they think is pertinent to their education in a way that they want to be presented.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we understand that now we need a Federal law to determine how schools will handle recess and Halloween or Valentine's Day parties. We need a Federal law to tell them how to handle it.

I don't think so. I hope we oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 118-12.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title I, insert "(including secondary career and technical education schools)" after "secondary school" each place such term appears.

Page 13, after line 21, add the following new section:

SEC. 106. DEFINITION OF SECONDARY CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.

Section 8101 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (45) through (52) as paragraphs (46) through (53), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (44) the following new paragraph:

"(45) SECONDARY CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.—The term 'secondary career and technical education school' means a secondary school that is an area career and technical education school described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) of section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2032(3)(A); (B))."

Page 29, line 13, insert "(including public secondary career and technical education school)" after "secondary school".

Page 29, line 18, insert "(including public secondary career and technical education school)" after "secondary school".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 241, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I believe that kids do better in school and better in life when their parents are involved in their education.

Parents have a right to know what their children are being taught. They have a right to be heard by teachers, by administrators, and certainly by their school board members and other policymakers. They have a right to protect their children's privacy and to keep them safe, and they have a right to know how schools are spending their tax dollars.

These rights are being threatened because some people believe that the government knows better than parents about what their kids need to succeed. They may be comfortable with bureaucracies standing between students and parents, but I am not.

For these reasons and others, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Parents Bill of Rights Act to enshrine these principles into law. I thank Chairwoman FOXX and Congresswoman LETLOW for their leadership in bringing this important legislation forward.

Today, I am offering an amendment to further strengthen this bill. My amendment is simple. It includes language to ensure that the rights defined in the Parents Bill of Rights extend to families of students who choose to pursue career and technical education.

One of the great challenges facing our economy is meeting the needs of a changing labor market in the United States. Specifically, we must address the skills gap. CTE achieves this goal.

In my home State of Ohio, 54 percent of jobs require skills training. During the 2020-2021 school year, Ohio had over 127,000 secondary CTE participants, and the Class of 2021 earned over 51,000 industry-recognized credentials while graduating high school.

These are among the hardest working students that you will find, regardless

of educational route, and these students matter just as much as those who go to college.

My amendment ensures that families of CTE students are protected by the law in the same way that students on the traditional route are protected.

A vote in support of this amendment sends the message that career and technical education is not only good for students, but it is great for students. It is great for business, and it is great for our communities.

I urge our colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, you actually would assume that this was part of the bill to begin with. Since it is a bad bill, making sure that this is in it is just another bad idea.

For example, it brings in the provision that you have to notify the parents in advance of all the speakers that may be participating, so if you are in a career in technical education and you have a Career Day, you have got to identify all the speakers that are coming to Career Day so the parents—if you can get that list, all of them—they have to be notified.

It would limit the use of employers as speakers because you would have to know exactly which one is going to show up, and that would limit the students' ability to learn the high-wage, in-demand jobs available at a Career Day.

Basically, this just makes sure that the career and technical education is part of the bill, and insofar it is a bad bill, I would hope the amendment would be rejected.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I fundamentally believe that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle mean well, but I am shocked and appalled that we don't support technical education. This is a solid amendment.

What I just heard, Mr. Chair, is that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like our union counterparts, who don't like our carpenters, who don't like our pipe fitters, who don't like our welders, and who don't like our steelworkers that we support.

That is what I am hearing. I am disturbed by the fact that we cannot support the silent majority within this country, the backbone of our Nation in technical education throughout this country really is tough for me to swallow right now. I am glad that the American people can see this for what it is.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly not what I said. There is nothing wrong with carpenters or other careers.

It said that if you have a Career Day you may not be able to have the Career Day unless you can get all the speakers lined up well in advance and notify all of the parents in advance who they are going to be.

If you have a plumbing firm wanting to participate, you have to figure out which plumber is going to actually show up so you can notify the parents of the right one.

This adds too much confusion to it. You may not even be able to have a Career Day. To suggest that I am not in favor of career and technical education is ridiculous.

If you want a reasonable program, you have to allow for the participation of people to come in and speak, talk about the high-wage, in-demand jobs that are available. Forcing the school to outline each and every speaker, know each and every person that is going to show up at a Career Day, before the Career Day, in time to notify the parents is absurd.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1930

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FALLON) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation's public schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM CLARK

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor my good friend Dr. William Clark on his birthday.

Bill is a resident of Waycross, Georgia, where he practices as an ophthalmologist at the Clark Eye Clinic.

He followed in his father's footsteps, returning to southeast Georgia after graduating from the Medical College of Georgia at Augusta University. He has since been one of the most highly sought-after ophthalmologists in the entire State.

Bill is more than just a physician. He is a leader in our community and our district. He has served as the chair of the Okefenokee Swamp Park Board of Trustees, chair of the Waycross-Ware County Industrial Development Authority, chair of the Waycross Convention and Visitors Bureau, and executive committee member of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Clark's impact on ophthalmology in the First District will be felt for generations to come.

I won't embarrass Dr. Clark and mention his age, but I will say he is much older than I am.

Happy birthday, Bill. Thank you for all you do for our district.

RECOGNIZING LESTER GIBBS UPON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor firefighter Les Gibbs on his retirement. Les is one of the best friends I have in the world, Mr. Speaker.

When I was a single man, I would always enjoy going honky-tonking with Les because he didn't drink. Neither did I, and I knew I wasn't going to have to do anything. When we would go to the Cotton Eyed Joe, the ladies would be tripping over me and pushing me out of way to get in line to dance with Les.

Les has always been a good friend to me, and my parents loved him, too. When I would ask him to go eat pizza with me, he would always ask: "Are Charlie and Joyce going?" It was always clear to me that they ranked a little bit higher than me on his list, and that was okay because I had very cool parents. He loved them right up until the end, and he was the man who actually carried my momma out of the nursing home when she died.

You could always count on his motorcycle to run, and you could always count on mine to break down. When I got a new bike, which was actually a new bike for me but old for anybody else, he would say, "Oh, I got a new rope," because he knew he was going to have to pull it. That was a true statement.

I was there on the day he was sworn in as a firefighter in the city of Knoxville, and I wish I could be in Tennessee instead of Washington when he retires. I am hoping that my beautiful wife, Kelly, and daughter, Isabel, will be there. They love Lester. He has always been good to me and my folks and the community around him. I can't thank him enough for that.

He has been a great friend to me, and he has been a better firefighter. He has been a great friend to hundreds, if not thousands, of other people. I wish him nothing but good times in retirement.

Thank you for everything, Lester, you have done for me and my family, brother. You are very much loved.

CONGRATULATING THE ARCHBISHOP HOBAN BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Archbishop Hoban boys' basketball team from Ohio's 13th Congressional District and the city of Akron for winning the Division I boys basketball championship for the year 2023.

On Sunday, the Archbishop Hoban Knights defeated Pickerington Central 53-47 in the Division I championship, marking the team's first title in 34 years. This was Archbishop Hoban's first appearance at the State championship since they last won the title in 1989.

These student athletes have made the entire Akron community proud and continue to display their excellence, determination, and work ethic both on the court and in the classroom.

I also congratulate head coach T.K. Griffith, who has led the Hoban boys' basketball program for 30 years, as well as the staff, trainers, parents, cheerleaders, and everyone who helped carry these student athletes over the finish line.

They are, in fact, the reason why Ohio 13 is the birthplace of champions.

Congratulations one more time to Ohio 13's Champions of the Week, the fearless Knights, for bringing the Division I trophy back home to Akron.

WE USED TO TRUST OUR EDUCATORS

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

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are begging for a compromise, asking for our trust.

We trusted that our children would be safeguarded from lewd content such as this book. I can't quote a page nor show a page from this book because it is against the decorum for this body. Why is this appropriate in our schools?

Here is the reality. We used to trust our educators. We trusted that our educators respected the boundaries of the home. We trusted that they would leave the rearing of our children to the parents. We trusted that the curriculum was not formulated by bureaucrats and that classrooms would not be transformed into indoctrination camps. We trusted that our school boards would respect children's parents and not refer to them as domestic terrorists when they voiced their concerns.

We were let down.

The Parents Bill of Rights Act will put the power back in the hands of parents and provide them with the information they need to ensure their children receive the best education.

Parents have a right to know what their children are taught. Parents have

a right to see the school budget and spending. Parents have the right to keep their children safe.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to be joined this evening by women members of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

The chairwoman, LOIS FRANKEL, is here with us this evening. Vice Chairs AYANNA PRESSLEY and KATHY MANNING and other members of the Democratic Women's Caucus, Representatives SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE and EMILIA SYKES, are with us here this evening, as well.

We are celebrating Women's History Month. What we thought we would do today is talk about many of the women who have come to Congress and made history and a big difference in this very male-oriented institution.

We call your attention to this chart. It starts here at about 1917, quite frankly, when Jeannette Rankin was the first woman elected to Congress, all the way back to 1789. We finally elected a woman in 1917. She served 1 year, not even one term, because she voted against the war.

Here we are today. Within 1 hour, Mr. Speaker, we won't have a chance to talk about all of these women, but I think that the women we have chosen to speak about are women who found that they had the same profound challenges in this institution. They were highly educated and very intelligent, yet they faced tremendous hurdles. They overcame them and made a big difference in our institution.

We are going to talk about Bella Abzug from New York tonight. We are going to talk about now-Senator TAMMY BALDWIN from Wisconsin, who was a Member of this body. We are going to talk about Patsy Mink and now-Secretary Marcia Fudge from Ohio, who was Representative Fudge. We are going to talk about Shirley Chisholm. We may mention a thing or two about NANCY PELOSI from California, who is our Speaker Emerita.

We are going to talk about Barbara Jordan; LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD; Stephanie Tubbs Jones; Senator MAZIE HIRONO, who was a Member of this body before she went over to the Senate; Pat Schroeder, who just recently passed; and Geraldine Ferraro.

We are going to talk about now-Secretary Deb Haaland, who was a former House Member, as the first Native American Cabinet Secretary but also one of the two first Native Americans to be elected to this body, along with Representative SHARICE DAVIDS.

We are going to talk about the first Muslim women to join our body, Rep-

resentatives RASHIDA TLAIB and ILHAN OMAR.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), the chairwoman of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for yielding and for organizing this session tonight. I am happy to be with all of my colleagues who are here tonight, also.

I am very proud to be a Congresswoman in one of the most diverse Congresses in our history. It is the most diverse. We now have 94 Democratic women. We even have quite a few Republican women, which is great.

Listen, I am here as a mother and grandmother as we celebrate Women's History Month. It is a time to reflect on the historic gains women have made and reclaim our efforts as we march to equity.

This is a time that we pay tribute, sister—I will call you sister; I feel like you are my sister—to the strong, fearless, and selfless women who paved the way for us all.

When I think about it, just about every one of us here was first at something, but we know we are not going to be last. We are first but not last. In that regard, I am going to do a couple of shout-outs.

I want to shout out to our Vice President, KAMALA HARRIS, the first woman Vice President of the United States, who, of course, graced our Senate.

I want to shout out to the first woman of color ever elected to this Congress, Patsy Mink, who was the first Asian American and also the author of Title IX, which has meant so much for women to advance in education.

I am also going to do a shout-out to someone who was one of my very good friends, who I miss already as she retired last year, and that is LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, a very proud California Member, the first Mexican-American woman to be in Congress.

It is not really their ethnic identity that I think about. Because I got to serve with LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, I remember her grit, her determination, the first woman of color cardinal in charge of an Appropriations Committee subcommittee and a lot of battles as chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

I want to tell you what she left. She left a quote: "One thing that I hope is that the people that I have represented over the years know that I have worked as hard as I possibly could on their behalf and that I served them honorably and that, hopefully, I made a positive difference in their life."

I will tell you this, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, if you are listening to this: You made a positive difference in many, many people's lives.

□ 1945

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about someone who is a personal heroine of

mine, Bella Abzug. Bella Abzug, what a trailblazer. We know her for her hats. She always wore a hat. She was a giant of the women's rights movement, whose shoulders we all stand on today. "Battling Bella" as she was affectionately known, was on the front line of every issue of her time.

She was born to Russian immigrants in the Bronx, and even as a young girl working in her father's butcher shop, she knew she wanted to be a lawyer. She went to Hunter College where she was on the student council, and then set her sights on Harvard, but the school had other thoughts. They ultimately rejected her because of her gender.

Columbia University was much more astute and she earned her law degree there. She became a lawyer at a time when very, very few women were practicing law. She defended Black clients in the South. She dedicated her time to fighting labor rights, tenant's rights, and civil liberties. She worked with the ACLU and the Civil Rights Congress.

She marched for equal rights, feminism, environmentalism, and the LGBTQ+ community. She organized the Women's Strike for Peace in the 1960s. She brought together tens of thousands of women across America to protest nuclear testing and the Vietnam war.

In 1970, decades into her career, she was elected to the Congress where she served until 1976. In these Halls, she introduced bills to remove troops in Vietnam, she fought for the equal rights amendment, access to abortion care, funding for childcare, and gay rights.

She led the charge to make it illegal for credit companies to discriminate against applicants based on the basis of sex, race, religion, and marital status or age. Believe it or not, sister, there was a time that women couldn't even get credit in their own name.

Outside of Congress, Bella founded the National Women's Political Caucus with other feminist icons: Betty Friedan, Shirley Chisholm, and Gloria Steinem.

Bella Abzug was a true force to be reckoned with, a passionate and compassionate leader who wore many hats—literally and figuratively—and fearlessly stood up for her values regardless of political consequences.

She once said of herself, sister—and I think her description probably describes a lot of the women in this room tonight. She said: I have been described as a tough and noisy woman, a prizefighter, a man hater, you name it. They call me "Battling Bella," mother of courage.

There are those who say I am impatient, impetuous, uppity, rude, profane, brash, and overbearing. Whether I am any of these things or all of them, you can decide for yourself. But whatever I am, and this must be made very clear at the outset, I am a very serious woman.

She was a woman to be taken seriously, and she did not back down from

the biggest fights of her generation. She did not give up creating a better world for her children or her children's children. As women Members of Congress, looking back on her legacy, we take courage from her actions, and we will continue to fight, to build the equitable world that she dreamed of.

Bella never backed down and neither will we.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that was great. I thank Representative FRANKEL so much for that. I must say that from afar Bella Abzug influenced me. I knew who she was. I knew about her helping to create the feminist movement, and it empowered me as a woman.

With regard to Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, let me just say, not only was she—it was pointed out, of course, she was the first Mexican woman to enter this institution, but it is not enough to just be the first. She came here and she led the way on things like the Violence Against Women Act. She fought and used her post as a cardinal to protect the interests of children, all children. We will truly miss her.

She mentioned Senator TAMMY BALDWIN—no, she didn't mention her. She mentioned Senator MAZIE HIRONO. She was a former House Member, now in the Senate. She went to the Senate and was the first Asian woman elected to the Senate. She is also the first Buddhist who entered this body.

Diversity is important so that all voices are heard in this body. I thank LOIS FRANKEL for lifting up these women.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased at this time to introduce one of the people who is younger than me, but that I get so much—much younger than me. I guess people are laughing because that is really not hard to tell. She is someone who inspires, someone who has already made her mark in this body, and she is one of our vice chairwomen of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for my sister in service here, my indefatigable colleague from Wisconsin, who leads on so many issues of consequence, especially in the space of anti-poverty, the stabilization of family, and women's health. I appreciate her.

I am so glad that we could take the time to pay tribute to the women who have come before us who have kicked open doors, broken ceilings, powered movements, blazed a trail, been role models, mentored us by their example, and more intentionally poured into us, if we had the privilege to serve alongside them. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. MOORE as well for her sisterhood and her mentorship.

Mr. Speaker, neither my mother, Sandy, or my father, Martin, raised me to ask permission to lead. I do believe that a parent is a child's first and best

teacher. Instead of traditional bedtime stories of princes and knights in shining armor, my mother read me the powerful speeches of Black Congresswomen like Barbara Jordan and Shirley Chisholm.

Since my formative years, I have felt this soul tie to Shirley Chisholm, long before my work led me to this Chamber. In fact, my first office here as a freshman in the 116th Congress was formerly Shirley Chisholm's office.

Not only was Shirley—and I don't say that to be anyway disrespectful by not referring to her as a Congresswoman—but she is, in fact, so iconic that you can just say her first name and it is clear who you are talking about. Not only was Shirley a first, the first Black woman elected to the House of Representatives, she was disruptive, she was brave, she was a trailblazer, in fighting injustice she was an inspiration.

Very often, iconic leaders can be singularly defined by one great speech and some powerful quotes. I think it is tempting to do that with Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, but it would be a disservice to do so.

While certainly she was the first Black woman elected to Congress, the first Black woman to pursue the U.S. Presidency, let the record reflect that Shirley Chisholm was an effective legislator in her own right, serving here for seven terms.

She was the daughter of immigrants from Barbados and Guiana. She has blazed the trail for every Black woman in this body, including myself today, as the first person of color and the first Black woman to ever represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Everyone, including Vice President KAMALA HARRIS, owes her a debt of gratitude. Her contributions go well beyond that. During her time in these sacred Halls of power, Shirley played a critical role in advancing policies that support our most vulnerable and marginalized communities.

As a member of the Agricultural Committee, Shirley was pivotal in enacting the SNAP program, which helps feed over 42 million people each year. She was also one of 13 founding members in 1971 of the Congressional Black Caucus, which today boasts its largest membership in history. She was also a founding member of the National Women's Political Caucus.

Everyone wants to be a part of something when it is already established, but it takes a certain kind of grit, vision, and determination to be the founder of something. Shirley was both a visionary and a doer, and tenacious in the actualization of these caucuses, which live on today.

Shirley Chisholm was a forceful champion for the equal rights amendment, a cause I am honored to lead, in partnership with my colleagues and movement allies in the House today.

In her words, in the words of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, spoken

right here in the people's House, she said of the ERA: "It provides a legal basis for attack on the most subtle, most pervasive, and most institutionalized form of prejudice that exists. Discrimination against women, solely on the bases of their sex, is so widespread that it seems to many persons normal, natural, and right."

Mr. Speaker, Black women like Shirley Chisholm have done the work of preserving and defending our democracy for centuries, but for far too often our contributions are ignored, erased, or rendered a footnote in history. It is not lost on me that the first time the ERA was put forward, women of color were not even part of the conversation.

Today, there will be no erasure. We stand on the shoulders of folks like Shirley Chisholm, leading a multiracial, intergenerational coalition to advance this priority.

Mr. Speaker, when asked how she wanted to be remembered, Shirley Chisholm said she wanted to be remembered as a Black woman who lived in the 20th century and dared to be herself—a catalyst for change.

Today, during Women's History Month and every month, we honor women like Shirley, we follow in their footsteps, and we continue running, winning, leading, legislating, and taking up all the space with our full authentic selves, just as Shirley taught us.

May she rest in peace and power. Happy Women's History Month.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PRESSLEY so much, what a great tribute to a great woman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am so happy to welcome to the podium another woman who is fairly new, but I tell you, she's a powerhouse and full of energy and ideas, here ready to do the work from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING), one of our vice chairs of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

□ 2000

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman MOORE for leading this Special Order hour. I want to thank our Democratic Women's Caucus chair, Representative FRANKEL, and my co-chair of the policy committee, Representative PRESSLEY, for being with us tonight to celebrate this important moment.

I rise today to celebrate Women's History Month and to recognize three courageous women from North Carolina who broke the glass ceiling and paved the way for future women in politics.

First, I want to honor a true trailblazer from North Carolina, Gertrude Weil, a Jewish woman from Goldsboro, North Carolina. She was the daughter of immigrants who dedicated her life for fighting for women's equality, labor reforms, and civil rights. Gertrude led the tireless fight for women's right to

vote through an organization she led, the North Carolina Equal Suffragette Association.

In 1920, following years of suffragette advocacy, the 19th Amendment was finally ratified giving women the right to vote. Following the ratification, Gertrude called a meeting at the Guilford County Courthouse to announce that her organization would no longer be the suffragettes but would not become the North Carolina League of Women Voters.

It was at that courthouse in downtown Greensboro where Gertrude famously said: "It is so obvious that to treat people equally is the right thing to do."

I recently had the pleasure of attending the unveiling of a monument in her honor and a mile marker at the Guilford County Courthouse 102 years after Gertrude formed the North Carolina League of Women Voters.

I also want to honor Eliza Jane Pratt. In 1946 she became the first woman elected to the U.S. Congress from North Carolina, breaking down the centuries' old barrier women had to overcome in politics. Prior to her election to Congress, Congresswoman Pratt served as a legislative aide to the four Congressmen who preceded her in representing the district. She was known for having an impressive understanding of her constituents' needs and the district.

Finally, I want to recognize Congresswoman Eva Clayton, the first Black woman elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from North Carolina. Congresswoman Clayton put the interests of her rural communities above all else as she fiercely advocated for the Black farmers that her district and the State relied upon.

These women were firsts in North Carolina politics, but they were certainly not lasts. Today, I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, as one of the five women representing North Carolina in the House of Representatives. The legacies of the women who came before us cleared a path for other women to legislate, represent, and advocate for their communities in Congress.

This Women's History Month, let's honor the legacies of those who came before us by committing to build a better and more equitable future for the next generation of girls and women.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I thank Representative MANNING so much for that eloquent presentation, and I just want to thank the gentlewoman for sticking around and believing that someday we would get around to her.

Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to introduce a new Member from California. She has succeeded our former colleague, Karen Bass, who is now the mayor of Los Angeles. When Karen Bass left, she told us: Don't worry, don't bother trying to miss me, because I am sending in the best and the brightest from my community, and she is going to hit the ground running.

She certainly has been a great colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. I thank Representative MOORE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with all of these other fabulous women in Congress to celebrate female trailblazers in Congress. I am going to speak to many of those trailblazers who hail from California. This is a shout-out to some bad sisters.

I am here to honor former Representative Karen Bass, the now-mayor of Los Angeles. Mr. Speaker, you have to love the people if you want to lead people, and Mayor Karen Bass loves Los Angeles. Stepping into her shoes in Congress has been an incredibly humbling journey.

Ms. Bass has a long history of public service working in the California State Assembly before coming here to Congress. In fact, she was the first female speaker—let alone the first Black woman—but the first female speaker of the California State Assembly—an incredibly powerful body. California, after all, is the fifth largest economy in the world.

When she was first elected to the assembly, she was the only Black woman in the entire State legislature. She then came to Congress and eventually served as the chair of the mighty, moral Congressional Black Caucus from 2019 to 2021 before launching her mayoral campaign.

Mayor Karen Bass is a champion for the people in every single way, leading the charge on foreign diplomacy, criminal justice reform, foster youth, and environmental justice. Karen Bass worked and works in a quiet, forceful, and bipartisan way, and Ms. Bass found results for the people while she was here in Congress.

Following in her footsteps, I support the same issues that matter to Angelenos and Americans across the country.

It is important to note that her work ethic stems from her own journey. She was a caretaker, she was a nurse, she was a nurturer, and she was a problem solver. She started her journey, actually, as a nurse. She eventually became a social worker. She got her degree in that. Then she started Community Coalition, a nonprofit organization that rose from the ashes of the 1992 riots focused on equity, access, and opportunity.

Karen Bass is now the first female mayor of Los Angeles, and she is the second African American to hold the position since the founding of the city. She continues to break boundaries and passionately serve the people addressing critical issues now with laser-like focus, issues like homelessness, affordable housing, and increasing opportunity for all.

Mayor Karen Bass is bringing a new direction to Los Angeles with a vision that advances equity and progress for the people. So I am proud not just to

call her my mayor, but a friend, a mentor, and a guiding light in the fight for justice.

I would be remiss as a Californian if I also didn't pay homage to fellow trailblazers like former Congresswoman Yvonne Brathwaite Burke. She was a Congresswoman who dared to be the first woman in Congress to have and raise a child while in Congress.

Former Congresswoman Diane Watson also served in this very seat and was a staunch advocate for education. She fought against xenophobia, and she was a vocal leader on issues related to reparations for descendants of African-American slaves.

I have to say that I come from a lineage of Black women in this seat, Black women who can't be beat.

They are heroes mostly because they are ordinary women who dared and continue to dare to do extraordinary things sometimes just by showing up, standing tall, leading with constitution, and not taking "no" for an answer.

I am proud to be part of this group of women that celebrates the power—the female power—that comes to us in Congress in these hallowed Halls.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative Congresswoman KAMLAGER-DOVE. Let me just say I knew all of those women from California, and they were California dreams, all of them. I remember when Ambassador Diane Watson became an ambassador, wherever she would take you, she would never ever, ever meet a stranger.

She could stay up all night and all day. I don't know where she got the energy from, but she was a people person. When she left, she told us: Don't worry, I am sending you someone great, and she gave us Karen Bass. Just like Karen Bass said: Don't worry, I am sending you someone great, and we got Representative KAMLAGER-DOVE. We are very, very pleased.

I am so delighted to introduce our next speaker. I met her when she was a candidate. I knew immediately that she would win her race in Ohio because of her determination and her resolve to do it. She didn't have a lot of people at that time who were saying: Oh, yeah, come on. She didn't have a big fundraising base. But I knew that she was resolute to get here. Already she is speaking up, asking questions, and taking names.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the last time you will see Representative EMLIA SYKES, so let me be the first to introduce you to her.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MOORE for organizing this Special Order hour so that we can recognize women who have led the way who are trailblazers, history makers, glass breakers, and overall fantastic human beings.

You may know or you may not know, Mr. Speaker, that Ohio has elected 13

women to Congress. These women have been incredible role models and leaders for girls and women as well as boys and men across this country, but particularly for us in Ohio.

I am going to take a few moments today just to talk about a few of those women, just about eight of them, starting in 1977 with the first Democratic woman elected to Congress from Ohio. Her name was Mary Rose Oakar. She, at the age of 36, was one of the youngest women ever elected to Congress and the first Arab-American woman ever elected to Congress in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the next Democratic woman elected to Congress, you know her, we all serve with her, she is the dean of the Ohio delegation and the longest-serving woman in Congress, MARCY KAPTUR. She has been called the queen of the Great Lakes because of her advocacy. But there is nothing you can mistake about Congresswoman KAPTUR that would make you think that she did not believe strongly in the people of Toledo and the people of northwest Ohio.

Our third Democratic woman from Ohio was none other than Stephanie Tubbs Jones, the first Black woman elected from the State of Ohio.

Unfortunately, Congresswoman Tubbs Jones lost her life in 2008, but I got to know her and my family got to know her very well. Her spirit and her passion were unmatched. The people of Cleveland were the people whom she always, always championed.

Something that she said stuck out to me. I want to read it to you here, Mr. Speaker, because this is a great reminder for all of us who serve in this hallowed institution. She said that if they—our constituents—are willing to stand at the polls for countless hours in the rain, then I should surely stand up for them here in Congress.

The fourth woman from Ohio I would like to acknowledge is Congresswoman—now judge of the Ninth District Court of Appeals—Betty Sutton. She was the youngest woman elected, and I am honored to take her seat, Ohio's 13th District in Congress. Betty Sutton was not only a Member of Congress, now the judiciary, but also local city, county, and State elected office.

□ 2015

Following Betty Sutton, I am going to acknowledge Marcia Fudge, a woman who certainly needs no introduction, who now serves as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Congresswoman, now Secretary, Fudge served the House from northeast Ohio honorably for seven terms, and we are grateful for her new position where she leads this Nation in affordable housing for all people, no matter where they may reside across the country.

Mary Jo Kilroy, the Congresswoman from central Ohio served one term, and she was a vocal supporter of the Affordable Care Act. It is a fitting tribute to talk about her today, considering it is

the 13th anniversary of that bill passing. She was instrumental in a very important vote ensuring healthcare for people across this Nation.

The first Democratic minority leader in the Ohio House you may not know, Mr. Speaker, was none other than JOYCE BEATTY. She was the former CBC chair, most recently serving, and someone who I was able to follow in the Ohio legislature. She is a towering figure here in Congress, and we are so excited to have her as a leader in central Ohio.

SHONTEL BROWN, who won not one, not two, but three elections in a very short amount of time to make sure that folks knew how serious she was about representing the people of northeast Ohio. She came from Warrensville Heights City Council to the Cuyahoga County Council to becoming the first Black woman to lead the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am number 13, EMLIA SYKES, representing the 13th Congressional District of Ohio and Ohio's 13th female Member elected to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as I close my remarks, I remind those who may be watching that none of us would be here, none of the women that we have talked about, without the gracious and tenacious activities of the suffragettes who made sure that we even had the right to vote so we could stand here in Congress to advocate for our communities.

I always like to talk about Sojourner Truth. Although she was not a Member of Congress and although she was not a person from Ohio, she gave a very important speech in my district, Ohio 13, called Ain't I a Woman. At the end of that speech, she reminded us that if the first woman that God ever made was strong enough to turn this world upside down, then all these women together ought to be able to get it right side up again.

That is the legacy of the women from Ohio and throughout the Nation who have served in this Congress have done, get this world right side up again.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SYKES for that very enlightening presentation of the 13 women who have been elected to Congress from the great State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, we have spoken about most of the women that we have on this poster board here. We named this little session "A Dozen Women and Then Some" because, as you have heard this evening, there are many, many, many more women that we could have talked about but we could not squeeze it all into one hour.

I would be remiss if I did not mention a couple of other women. Senator TAMMY BALDWIN from Wisconsin. Senator TAMMY BALDWIN served in this body before she was elected to the State senate. She was the first openly LGBTQ person to be elected to Congress. Being her authentic self, not shying away from who she was, and still she was elected to the United States Senate, to the U.S. Congress.

Before then, ladies and gentlemen, TAMMY BALDWIN served on the county board in Madison, Wisconsin, and before that she was appointed to the Common Council to fill an aldermanic vacancy because of someone's absence, and didn't have to face the voters because that is just how much they trusted TAMMY BALDWIN.

TAMMY BALDWIN has a resume that is too long to share with you this evening, but let me tell you some of the things that I rejoice about. TAMMY BALDWIN was the key legislator that put the provision into the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, to allow parents to keep their children on their insurance plan until they were age 26.

She did that because of her own lived experience as a person who was in the custody of her grandparents, and her grandparents were unable to put her on their insurance. They had to pay out of pocket thousands and thousands of dollars while TAMMY BALDWIN was in the hospital for months. It is that lived experience that gave TAMMY BALDWIN a passion for healthcare that she brought here to this body.

Now millions of young people who are struggling to get an education, to go to college, who perhaps don't have careers that have come together yet, can have health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. We can thank TAMMY BALDWIN for that.

TAMMY BALDWIN was also able just recently to pass a bill that was signed into law to provide for same-sex marriage, something that has been a controversial issue in Congress for years, but TAMMY BALDWIN with her very soft demeanor and very understated presentation was able to bring together. I thank TAMMY BALDWIN for being who she is.

Another person who was not an openly gay person was Barbara Jordan, but Barbara Jordan really spoke truth to power during the Nixon administration. Unlike what we have gone through recently, her service on the Judiciary Committee at that time was one of the most powerful voices that enabled the country to realize that they needed to end this Presidency on a bipartisan basis. Mr. Speaker, I thank Barbara Jordan for speaking truth to power.

A person who just passed away recently was Pat Schroeder. I mean, she was Ms. Feminist. She was someone who kept things on boiling hot all the time in this body. She was very antiwar, and she ran on an antiwar platform. She ran on a platform of providing childcare for women, and far before it was talked about, she spoke out on the environment.

She was one of the first people to actually have very small children when she was elected, and someone asked her, "Pat, how can you raise children and be a Congresswoman?" She said, "Well, you know, I have got a uterus and a brain, and I use them both."

She spent 24 years in the House from Colorado. She was the first person to

help get family and medical leave passed, and I think that that was probably her signature achievement in this body. After she left, she wrote a book, "24 Years of House Work . . . and the Place Is Still a Mess." We ought to lean into Pat Schroeder and get busy cleaning up the House.

Geraldine Ferraro was another Member of this body; and, of course, she was the first woman who was a Vice Presidential nominee. She was yet another woman who dared to step into spaces where women had never tread. I thank Geraldine Ferraro for her fierce belief in women.

I would be remiss if I did not mention a few women who are still serving in this body. One is Representative SHARICE DAVIDS. SHARICE DAVIDS is one of the first Native American women, alongside Deb Haaland, elected to this body. When I met Deb Haaland when she was running for Congress, after I hugged her, I looked at her and said: Why the heck did it take you so long to get here?

The voices of native people were desperately needed in this space. Deb Haaland, who is now our Secretary of the Interior and the first native person who has been a Secretary of the Interior, is one of the people who has filled a huge void with regard to protecting the sovereignty of the first peoples of these United States, and I am grateful for their presence.

I also am very grateful for our finally electing Muslims to this body. RASHIDA TLAIB of Michigan and ILHAN OMAR of Minnesota are important voices, particularly since there is so much debate around the world about Muslims and their trustworthiness, reliability, and religious beliefs.

They have shown us that Muslims care very, very deeply about America. There are no two people in this body who care more about America than RASHIDA TLAIB and ILHAN OMAR. ILHAN OMAR was not only an immigrant, she was a refugee to this country. She is someone who loves America because we opened the door of opportunity for her, and she has insights that none of us can see because of the space that she has occupied.

Mr. Speaker, I give honor to all of these women, and of course I adore MARCY KAPTUR. I think Representative SYKES made a great tribute to MARCY KAPTUR, but I would be remiss if I did not tell you how she has influenced me. I love Lake Michigan, which I represent in Wisconsin, and no one is more adamant about protecting this great resource, our Great Lakes, than MARCY KAPTUR.

We have 20 percent of the world's freshwater, more valuable than oil and gas, which people spend so much time protecting, but we have got MARCY KAPTUR to protect the greatest resource that this country has.

Before I close, I just want to mention one other person on here that we have not talked about today, and that is NANCY D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI. As you

know, Nancy was the first woman Speaker of the House of Representatives, and I would argue that history will designate her as the best Speaker ever. I was elected to Congress the term before she became Speaker.

By the time Barack Obama was elected, the first Black President of the United States, I still couldn't pick myself up off the floor, I was just so overwhelmed by what it meant to have this mother and grandmother be able to deal with all of the different factions in the Democratic Caucus and to bring them all together to accomplish our purposes here. I mean, we had the Blue Dogs, the progressives, and the New Dems, and NANCY D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI was the person who could get the vote. You don't bring bills to the floor unless you have got the vote, and NANCY was able to do it.

□ 2030

One of her greatest achievements was the Affordable Care Act, the so-called ObamaCare. The Affordable Care Act has provided 20 million people who were formerly uninsured with affordable, comprehensive healthcare.

I know President Barack Obama gets credit for that, but NANCY is the one that got the votes. NANCY D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI got the votes for the ACA. It was difficult.

This signature accomplishment is right up there with the passage of Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security. This safety net program will be NANCY PELOSI's greatest legacy. After she accomplished her greatest legacy, she wouldn't stop. She kept going.

She shepherded the American Rescue Plan, which got many people shots in arms during a pandemic. She shepherded the American Rescue Plan that kept people from being evicted from their homes, saved small businesses, and saved our economy.

Thank you, NANCY PELOSI.

It was such a great accomplishment, but she didn't stop then. She got the bipartisan infrastructure bill passed in a hugely divided Congress. This bill provided the greatest investment in clean energy that the world has ever seen. It put us on track for meeting our climate goals by 2030. NANCY D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI presided over that accomplishment.

The Inflation Reduction Act supports our environment, but not only that. It provides billions of dollars of relief by finally allowing this Congress to negotiate drug prices for Medicare. One of the biggest expenses this country has is Medicare, a signature program that supports our seniors. While everyone is complaining about how we are going to continue to fund Medicare, this Inflation Reduction Act gives the ability to do what you do in capitalist countries.

If this were IBM, Dell, Starbucks, Amazon, or any other large corporation that purchased as much healthcare for their employees as the United States of America does through Medicare, the VA, and Medicaid, they

would be able to sit down and negotiate drug prices based on the critical mass of people they are serving.

We have lost billions of dollars protecting a rich pharmaceutical industry where Americans have paid five or six times as much for the same drug as people in Canada, France, or other places pay because we were unwilling to deny the fat cats and the shareholders of that company undue remittance.

NANCY D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI, Speaker Emerita—I ran into NANCY in the bathroom right after she had given up the gavel and yielded to HAKEEM JEFFRIES to be our new leader, and I said, “How are you doing, Nancy?” She said: I am free.

She didn't leave. She is still a Member of this body, still providing advice and counsel to our leadership. She didn't leave here in disgrace. She is leaving with a storied legacy of being a great leader.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all the staff who has been here to listen to the powerful story of women.

When women lead, America is great.

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

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LALOTA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to go after a handful of things, but we are actually going to try something that is somewhat unique for this body. We are actually going to use math. We are going to use facts. We are actually going to get to the way the system actually works instead of doing what seems to be a moniker around here as we make public policy by virtue signaling, by feelings.

Let's actually go over something that has been just grating on me. I am going to try to minimize being a jerk tonight, but if I get one more Democrat running around here screaming at us, “We are going to default,” da, da, da, da. Remember, we got downgraded. That is not what happened.

The language S&P did in 2011 wasn't because of the debt ceiling fight. If you actually read it, “U.S. loses AAA credit rating after S&P downgrade,” it was because S&P cut the long-term U.S. rating by one notch to AA-plus with negative outlook, citing concerns about budget deficits.

It wasn't the debt ceiling. It was the failure of this body to take our demographics and our spending seriously.

This was a decade ago. I believe it was today or yesterday that I heard one of my colleagues on the other side walk behind one of these microphones and lie—excuse me; I take that back—forget what actually happened.

It wasn't because of a fight over the debt ceiling. It was because we didn't

do enough to demonstrate to the debt markets around the world—our own pension systems, your own retirement, others around the world—we didn't communicate to them that we were going to take the debt seriously. This is—what?—a dozen years ago.

The agency said the deficit reduction plan passed by the U.S. Congress on Tuesday did not go far enough. This is from 2011.

We still have Members running around here going: Oh, you are going to default. You are going to do this. Oh, no. Just do a clean debt ceiling.

My argument is very simple. Do you not think the debt markets will punish the United States if we walk in and say we are just going to keep borrowing?

Just raise the damn debt ceiling. Just raise it. Do not take the seriousness of the trouble we are in, the demographic curve we have.

Do you understand? Nine budget years from now, according to the Congressional Budget Office from 3 weeks ago, you can get rid of all of defense; you can get rid of the White House; you can get rid of Congress; you can get rid of the Supreme Court; you can get rid of all of government; the FBI is gone; the Park Service is gone; the Foreign Service is gone; all foreign aid is gone; money to Ukraine is all gone; every dime is gone; there is no discretionary, but you still have to borrow a couple hundred billion dollars. The next year, it is dramatically worse because the Social Security trust fund is gone.

The highway and transportation trust funds are gone. Medicare part A trust fund has long been gone.

This place is an economic fraud. Yet, if you listen to the speeches around here, we do beautiful virtual signaling—my feelings. Screw our feelings. Let's hold out a calculator.

The cruelty that will happen around here if we don't take this seriously—why is this place so terrified to buy a calculator and actually read budget documents?

I want to make sure I get this one right. It was S&P. It wasn't Moody's. I take that back.

S&P downgraded U.S. debt in 2011. The number of times I get from reporters outside: Aren't you fearful you are going to get downgraded like you did a dozen years ago?

That is not what happened. We got downgraded because we didn't take the debt seriously. The numbers today are dramatically worse than in 2011.

Are those the discussions you have around here? Are our brothers and sisters on the left saying: Hey, I care about it.

We have to fix Social Security because, in 9 some years, we are going to double senior poverty if we don't fix it because of that 23, 25 percent cut seniors are going to take.

Do they have a soul? Do they care? If you cared, when the President gave his State of the Union speech, it would not have been you promising not to touch Social Security and Medicare. It would be that we are going to save them.

In the President's budget, a number of my colleagues on the left have been running around saying, oh, they put in all this taxing to raise money for Social Security part A.

Remember, that is only 25 percent of the spending. Three-quarters of Medicare comes out of the general fund. Over 30 years, Medicare is responsible for 75 percent of all the borrowing.

When we get up to close to \$130 billion of borrowed money in 10 years, remember 75 percent of that is just the shortfall for Medicare.

We got old, and we haven't taken on healthcare costs. We are going to finish on that, but it just grates me that this place just makes up stories. We misinterpret because it would require reading and owning a calculator.

We are going to have to deal with the debt ceiling in a serious, adult fashion. I also believe if we do not communicate to the debt markets that we are taking our debt seriously, that they are going to get paid back—just raising the debt ceiling. Hey, it is a clean debt ceiling. Just go borrow more money.

Don't you think the markets are going to not punish the United States? We need to communicate. We need to demonstrate that we are adults, that we understand how ugly our demographics are, how ugly the borrowing is.

Remember, last year, I think, we were borrowing \$48,000 a second. I get the clown show that says: David, if you just didn't have salaries for Members of Congress, that would balance the budget.

I know that is just stupidity. They know it is stupid, but we calculated it. It was like 28 minutes of borrowing over an entire year. A decade from now, it is like 19 minutes of borrowing. I think all foreign aid is like 14 days of borrowing in an entire year.

Remember, in 9 years, you can wipe out almost everything you know as government, and to have enough cash flow to cover all Medicare, all Social Security, all the veterans' benefits, all the things that we have on autopilot we call mandatory spending, we still have to borrow a couple hundred billion dollars.

□ 2045

Getting the math right is moral.

The avoidance and the theater that has gone on around here, where they are saying: We are going to get re-elected because we are going to vilify Republicans for even being willing to take on the discussion of how much trouble we are in. We are going to beat them up because they are talking about these things.

That is absolutely immoral because they are letting it fester, and every single day the math gets harder.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to show some charts.

This isn't what I wanted to talk about tonight but I am finding I am having to react to all the just crazy propaganda out there as my brothers

and sisters on the left do everything they can to avoid the responsibility for what they did with causing inflation and the cascading inflation.

Do you understand the banking difficulties we have today are derivative of inflation?

You go, huh?

Okay. Inflation goes up. What do we have to do to knock down inflation?

Well, we have two things we could do. We could really step up productivity, so we make more goods and services to sop up all the excess cash and spending that is out there.

Or we do what this lazy body has been doing for the last couple years, and that is: We will just let the Federal Reserve raise interest rates and raise rates and roll off their books so we could pull liquidity out of the economy.

Oh, by the way, when you do that—I am going to show some charts here—when you do that, what happens if you buy a bond today at 1 percent and 6 months from now interest rates are at 3 percent?

Do you understand, functionally, you lost two-thirds of the value of that bond?

What do you think happened to Silicon Valley Bank?

The banking crisis is absolutely derivative of crappy Fed policy keeping interest rates to zero and substantially this place spending like crazy in the previous years setting off inflation, forcing the raising of interest rates. Now interest rates, when they go up in inflation, create distortions in the economy.

I think it was last week or the week before that I came here and showed how much poorer Americans are and they don't even know they have been taxed.

I think I brought some charts that said, do you understand if you made \$60,000 a year and you are in the mean of the country—not my community. When you are in Phoenix and Scottsdale, I have had substantially higher inflation than the rest of the continental United States. But the mean was what, 8, 9 percent.

Take your \$60,000; 1 year. If you are still making that \$60,000, you are actually now only making about \$52,000 or 52,000-something.

Do you understand you got taxed and you didn't even realize?

You knew you were paying more for your groceries and your rent and your electricity, but you also have to understand, where did that money go? You were taxed.

Inflation goes up. Your income, your savings become worth less.

Who is the biggest debtor in the world? The United States.

Guess what you did? We get to pay back the U.S. sovereign debt with inflated dollars. Meaning, basically, we took your money, put it towards the debt.

Now where we get screwed is, we get to do that for a little while. You actu-

ally see that funny calculation where debt-to-GDP moves, and then the fact that we have to constantly roll our debt, roll our debt, this insatiable appetite of keep spending and keep borrowing when you are close to 30 cents on every dollar that is borrowed. Now you have to sell the bonds at the new higher interest rates. That is when it, functionally, eats your lunch.

I have shown over and over and over that not that long from now interest will be the number two expense in the country. It will be more than the defense.

Here is that point once again. So let's just pretend, the inflation caused by reckless monetary policy and spending, so you take a bond. Let's take a long-term bond. It is \$100. It is a 30-year bond; you bought it in August 2020.

Today, that same bond is, functionally, worth almost two-thirds less money, and this is just the interest rate differential because on that 30-year bond, it is annuity. Its value is the interest it throws off. The problem is you could take that same money today and get interest three times higher.

You want to know about stresses in financial markets?

This is it. This is a derivative of inflation. This is a derivative of our spending policies. This is a derivative of the Fed's policies.

I will do a much better job in coming weeks sort of walking through some of the policy options out there.

You see this red line here?

This is functionally what the CBO is telling us. And this is the moment where it is not partisan. It is us.

We get gray hair. We have 76 million baby boomers moving into their benefit years. This red line is almost all healthcare costs for our brothers and sisters who move into their benefits. There are proposals where you can at least flatten it out.

I am going to throw out a couple things that are just not often considered. I have done so many presentations here about, if it is healthcare costs, disrupt the price of healthcare. One of the things that you do is you cure people. You also legalize technology. But you have to understand how steep the curve is.

If I get one more person that says: Oh, if we just got rid of waste and fraud, foreign aid, we will be fine. No.

I know it is hard seeing 14 zeros in your head but that is the reality. I know these numbers are crushing. I know so many of us in the political class, we have gone up and given speeches of, "if we just got rid of this," or "isn't this outrageous spending."

They are all outrageous spending. Okay, fine. It doesn't actually fix the problem.

So I am going to go over some of this again because I have a new punch line. I did this a week or so ago and got all sorts of crap about it, except I have reconfirmation that my math was good.

So let's actually take a look at the left's Inflation Reduction Act. It is the most Orwellian name in modern history.

The cost estimates for the battery production credits in the Inflation Reduction Act, it was supposed to cost \$30.6 billion. That is what they told us. That is what they told the American people.

So we had the economist break it down, looking at the numbers. They are coming back saying, hey, that is not actually what the language in the legislation says. It is not \$30.6 billion for the batteries. It is \$196.5 billion.

Okay. So maybe one of the first things we need to do around here as a body is say: Brothers and sisters on the left, we are going to help you. We are going to hold you to your own promise. When we do our next budget, we are going to at least make sure these things are frozen where you told the American people they were going to be.

Maybe this explains why so much of the lobbying class was absolutely giddy around here with the design of the Democrats' language in the legislation. Because they knew they were going to get multiple to the multiple to the multiple of actual cash in their clients' pockets.

You want to understand why the American people are so upset with us?

It is scams like this.

Let's actually take it a little further—and there is a punch line coming.

Cost estimates on the wind. Okay, fine. You may love wind. You were told in the Inflation Reduction Act that the budget in there, the spending in there was going to be \$11.2 billion.

Economists are coming back saying that is not what the language actually says. If you actually model it, it is \$68.4 billion.

Are my brothers and sisters on the left willing to say, "hey, hold us to the 11.2"? Because if we start having this type of spending—remember that curve? It continues to just blow off the charts and it will create more inflation and you will be poor.

Now we have Ethers out there that have been scoring. When I did this a week or two ago, I got some lovely, lovely inbound from a number of leftist folks out there that think they are economists.

Well, it turns out Credit Suisse—God bless their souls—actually came back and said, hey, CBO told us the actual total cost was going to be well under \$300 billion in total spending on all these clean energy, some of the tax credits—they are actually grants and other things, refundables.

Credit Suisse comes back and says, no, it is actually closer to \$700 billion. In the latest update, Goldman did a complete workup, and they are at \$1.2 trillion.

You are getting the punch line here.

When the Inflation Reduction Act was passed, we were told this was going to be well under \$300 billion over a 10-year cycle of spending on all this green energy.

Great—well, actually not great.

I voted against it. It was absurd the way it was being laid out. You give someone a tax credit for something they are already going to do. That is the way this place works when you hand people cash. Because let's be honest, they are big contributors.

Now we are finding out about the language and what is really going on in the marketplace. You are going from under \$300 billion to possibly \$1.2 trillion—twelve hundred billion, \$1.2 trillion.

Okay. Would the Democrats work with us to keep their own words and their own commitments, saying we need to cap this, we need to put this back to at least what they committed to the brothers and sisters, the Members here, and also the American people?

This sort of stuff, as you wonder why you wake up the next day and the numbers are just running amuck. We get scammed. These just happens to be scams that are now well over a trillion dollars.

This one is a little harder to explain. I will do it fairly quickly.

There is this concept of nominal GDP. Hey, here is where we can be at, we can grow, we don't set off inflation. I tried to explain this multiple times.

Here is where the Democrats went and spent that \$1.9 trillion a couple years ago. You can almost see within the next day the actual nominal GDP explodes. This difference isn't economic expansion, it is inflation.

A dollar goes up by 5 percent because of inflation doesn't make a 5-percent dollar more valuable. You have lost 5 percent of your purchasing power.

I have had Members here go: Well, look at how much bigger the economy is.

No, it is not. It is not nominal. You have to adjust it back for how much devastation has happened in the economy called inflation.

Now, think about what you are doing to people at the higher interest rates.

So let's actually talk a little bit more about the Biden budget and some of the baselines we were given by the administration. So even with the tax hikes, remember, there are substantial tax hikes in the Biden budget.

Remember, "we are going to cut the deficit"?

No, they are not. Even with the tax hikes, Biden's budget would still cause the national debt to skyrocket \$44 trillion over their 10-year window. That is their cut, there is no cut.

And now what we are finding out is when you actually dig into the math, there are all sorts of just—what is the best term? Fraud in that math.

This is debt held by the public, and we need to explain this.

You will have many of us come on the mike saying, there is \$31 trillion or \$32 trillion of debt. There are offsets that economists say, well, it is the trillion dollars that are left in the Social Security Trust Fund. We don't count

that as a stressor to the markets and society because we are just taking the trust fund over here and we are buying Treasury bills and then when Social Security needs it, they cash in their Treasury bills. So think of it as internal financing.

These numbers are where you have to go to the market. You have to find people here in this country or around the world who are saving their productivity, saving their cash to buy our debt.

□ 2100

You are heading toward \$44 trillion in that 10-year window.

An interesting thing I was sort of working through today, so we made a slide, the Tax Foundation tried to work through the Biden budget on what would it mean, because you had people come here and give speeches about how wonderful they thought the Biden budgets was.

Well, now we have got some scoring. Some of the cruelty in it, long-run GDP, long-run growth of the economy, actually shrinks by like 1.3 percent in the Biden budget. Wages, your salaries go down about a percent, and we lose about 335,000 jobs.

This isn't us. This isn't the Republicans. This isn't the Congressional Budget Office. This is the Tax Foundation, which is nonpartisan, and they have some of the best modeling in the country. Look.

Stop making crap up. This is what their version, their vision of compassion—remember, we used to get the former Speaker, show us your budget and we will see your priorities, your ethics, your values.

Okay, so losing 335,000 jobs and having workers lose 1 percent of their wages, is that the Democrats' compassion?

This is what crappy economics do. President Biden's proposed budget comes nowhere close to solving long-term—remember how they were just so excited. We are going to have \$3 trillion. If every dime of the almost \$5 trillion of new taxes comes in—and I asked even Janet Yellen this and she was very polite, completely avoided giving me an honest answer.

Did you score what you do to the economy's growth?

You just saw on the Tax Foundation slide what happens to the economy's growth with all their almost \$5 trillion in new taxes. But we are reducing the deficit. No, you are not. They just reduced how much more spending they were going to cause. They still raised the deficit by another \$20 trillion.

Once again, it is games with virtue signaling around here. This is their vision.

When does it break? When do we break the back of this economy, the American taxpayers, the working middle class?

How much more debt can we stack up on them?

If we do this, will we have any capacity to follow the Constitution, defend

this country, and also keep the commitments to those who are on Medicare and Social Security.

Do you understand—remember the comment before, 9 budget years. You can wipe out all what you consider government. All defense is gone, all discretionary is gone, and you have still got to borrow hundreds of billions of dollars just to cover Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits.

President Biden's tax hikes would place significant burden on the American people. They acted like—and I should have actually labeled this even better.

You remember, in the President's speech, when, hey, here is my budget. Some of the talking heads that were supporting it, total revenues. We are going to get this.

What they forgot to tell you is half those revenues ultimately come in income tax hikes. When you work them out, it is small businesses, it is individuals. It is not the big corporations. Half that revenue is just coming, functionally, from people's incomes, from their salaries. It is income tax hikes.

The Federal Government Reserve's outlook for 2024 growth has worsened significantly. All right. What does that mean?

Okay. Think of this. You remember, way, way back when, last December—so how many months ago, you know, 3, 4 months ago—you remember way back then, Congressional Budget Office, others, we were saying, hey, we are going to have 1.6 percent GDP growth, completely anemic, dramatically lower than the long-term average, which we need to grow.

You will be happy to know, as of this month, it has gone from 1.6 economic growth, when you adjust away inflation, to we are down to 1.2.

To anyone listening, do you understand how screwed we are if we don't get this up dramatically?

I am sorry, my language—I don't mean to potty mouth. I am just frustrated because I don't know how to break through to people mentally because you are going to have this brain trust saying, yes, but if you got rid of this or if you didn't do that—Look, I understand many of the comments we get are just bots, or people who actually are off their meds, but take this seriously.

A couple of weeks ago I had my 8-month old here and I kept trying to ask the moral question: Do you have the right, as an American, to be securing your retirement?

My 8-month old, my 7-year old, do they have the right to have prosperity in their future?

That 8-month old, wonderful little boy, we are blessed to be able to adopt him. In 24 years, the taxes he pays will have to be 100 percent more, double what you pay, what I pay just to maintain baseline services; not expansion, not all this other crazy spending, just the baseline.

That is every corporate tax, that is every individual tax, that is every—I

had this crazy idea, and I want to see if anyone else out there is willing to discuss this with me because every time I have discussed this, I look up and the room is running toward the exit.

If you are a publicly traded corporation, you must actually, now, according to the SEC and the Democrats, you have to disclose global warming or whatever we call it today—we call it climate change—and the stresses that could put on your book of business.

Okay, fine. Disclose it. Should you have to also disclose the fact that over the next 24 years, your corporate taxes will double?

What does that mean to your investment portfolios? What does that mean to your long-term capital outlook? What does that mean to your corporate risk?

We are talking about, hey, shareholders deserve to have all sorts of disclosures, environmental climate change. Fine. Should there also have to be disclosures that explain what U.S. fiscal policy means to the future investments of that company? Why isn't it fair?

Why does the left get to have climate change forced on corporations' disclosures? Which I think, fine. I am not going to fight that.

Why shouldn't they also have to disclose the actual math that the Congressional Budget Office has put out, that their taxes will double over the next 24 years? Why isn't that a disclosable item?

It is worth thinking about. Fair is fair. If you want investors to know what the risks are of their investments—it is like the brain trust here.

I am going to go buy a 30-year bond. Understand, by the time you get the final day of that bond, your taxes have doubled. What rate of return do you actually need?

This is reality. It is math. Even confiscating—

Now, let's get this one straight because I keep getting leftist—excuse me—my Democratic colleagues who come and say well, rich people just need to pay more. Okay. Let's just pretend that is the way it works.

Even confiscating all income over \$500,000 would fail to eliminate the Fiscal Year 2024 budget deficit. Get the punch line with me right now.

This is the fiscal budget we are working on right now, and remember, in a decade that number is doubled. We are going to go from about a trillion and a half borrowing here to the end of the decade, investment number was like 2.7, \$2.8 trillion of borrowing.

Just the budget we are working on right now, if we took—hey, you make \$500,001, we get that dollar. We take every single dime of people over \$500,000. You don't even get near paying off the deficit. You get it?

Yet, I promise you, tomorrow, I will have Members of the other side who are going to walk behind these microphones and just say, if we just taxed rich people more we would be fine.

It is not the math. I have come here multiple times and showed the entire list if you confiscated every dime of the wealthy, yeah, you would get another year or two paid off on the borrowing, and then boom, it is all back.

□ 2110

It is demographics. Unless we as a nation have a revolution—excuse me. Is “disruption” too uncomfortable a word for so many people? How about an alternative way to change the price of delivering healthcare to our brothers and sisters? That is three-quarters of all the debt over the next 30 years.

If we can do that, if we could have a disruption in the cost of healthcare—and it is not tomorrow; it is over the next decade—you are not going to pay off the debt, but what you do is stabilize the size of the economy and the size of the borrowing. The problem right now is the debt grows dramatically faster than the growth of the economy. That is what crushes you.

I am going to end on something I am incredibly optimistic on. I have been mocked for talking about this, but it looks like it is heading toward its phase 1. There is a company out there. They have been chasing this for like 15 years. Stunning amounts of money and efforts have been put into it. They just got permission to start the next phase of a phase 1 trial.

The punch line here is that this is joyful; this is optimistic; and it is moral. It also would do amazing things for U.S. debt and actually for the entire world.

The concept here is a type of stem cell that has been tagged, I guess, with CRISPR. I am not a synthetic biologist. This is not my specialty, but I am fascinated by it. Because of the way they tagged it, you can get a stem cell treatment that gets your body to start producing islet cells, start producing insulin again, and you don't need antirejection drugs. It would be universal.

There is this concept I have been reading about for a decade called a bio-foundry. Yes, I am geeking out, but this is important. It turns out “for every complex problem, there is a simple solution” is absolutely wrong. It is a complex solution that if we would actually do everything over the next decade to knock down prediabetic populations and then work with our brothers and sisters that have it with the offer that, in the decade, if you improve your healthy lifestyle, we might get your body producing insulin again.

Could you imagine the economic benefit, the crushing of income inequality to poor families that actually have someone who is severely diabetic and who is losing their feet or their eyesight? What is the morality for my Tribal communities in Arizona?

Also, it is the single biggest thing you could do for U.S. sovereign debt.

Yes, this is just the beginning of the next phase of a phase 1 trial. Maybe it doesn't work. There have been so many

heartbreaks on this over the last couple of decades, but so far, the early data to get to this point is they have been given the green light about 5 days ago to start.

This is the type of things we as Members of Congress, on the left and the right, should be bringing to people saying: Is this a path? How do we help it? How do we do it safely?

We need to be starting to think through what if it works. What have we done to change the way we deliver nutrition in this country? What have we done technology-wise? That watch, the things you can wear on your body that help you understand your blood glucose, what could we do to actually—I am going to screw up the proper name, but these new pharmaceuticals that help some people suppress their appetite. Apparently, they are safe, and apparently, they come off patent very soon.

What could we do to say if this works, maybe by the end of the decade, we have a societal agreement that this is a deal because it would make the population so much healthier?

Yes, there are dozens of ideas like this, but it is an example. It doesn't all have to be dystopian misery around here. What is the chance we are going to hold a single hearing or have a single conversation around here about something that is actually a potential solution? Or do we just continue to say the debt's going to bury us, so let's just keep spending because that is what gets us reelected, and God forbid that we tell our voters the truth?

Mr. Speaker pro tempore, I am going to yield back because if I keep going, I might hurt someone's feelings, and we wouldn't want to do that.

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

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 15, 2023, the following joint resolution was presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.J. Res. 26.—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 24, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-602. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Yabora Industria Aeronautica S.A.; Embraer S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1243; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00674-T; Amendment 39-22344; AD 2023-03-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-603. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0168; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00553-T; Amendment 39-22350; AD 2023-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-604. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1253; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00698-T; Amendment 39-22349; AD 2023-04-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-605. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH and Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1406; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00590-G; Amendment 39-22347; AD 2023-03-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-606. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1484; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00897-G; Amendment 39-22339; AD 2023-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-607. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0174; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00063-T; Amendment 39-22359; AD 2023-04-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-608. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1152; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00260-T; Amendment 39-22323; AD 2023-02-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-609. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1245; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00503-T; Amendment 39-22334; AD 2023-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-610. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1480; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00548-T; Amendment 39-22343; AD 2023-03-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-611. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1485; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00522-T; Amendment 39-22333; AD 2023-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-612. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1297; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00570-T; Amendment 39-22336; AD 2023-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-613. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Aerospace Technologies, Inc. Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0172; Project Identifier AD-2023-00265-E; Amendment 39-22355; AD 2023-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-614. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1577; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00860-T; Amendment 39-22330; AD 2023-03-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-615. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1407; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01043-T; Amendment 39-22321; AD 2023-02-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-616. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1408; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00857-T; Amendment 39-22325; AD 2023-02-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-617. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. (Type Certificate Previously Held by WALTER Engines a.s., Walter a.s., and MOTORLET a.s.) Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1302; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00062-E; Amendment 39-22301; AD 2023-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-618. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0810; Project Identifier 2021-01238-T; Amendment 39-22329; AD 2023-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-619. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1419; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01002-R; Amendment 39-22328; AD 2023-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-620. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1477; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00632-E; Amendment 39-22327; AD 2023-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-621. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1487; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00688-T; Amendment 39-22332; AD 2023-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-622. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31472; Amdt. No. 4047] received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-623. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31473; Amdt. No. 4048] received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-624. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1490; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-001177-

R; Amendment 39-22338; AD 2023-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-625. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selma, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0922; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ASO-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-626. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-0161; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01434-T; Amendment 39-22331; AD 2023-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-627. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1478; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00668-E; Amendment 39-22337; AD 2023-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1155. A bill to prohibit the phase out of gasoline and prevent higher prices for consumers, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1158. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act with respect to new critical energy resources, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1141. A bill to repeal the natural gas tax (Rept. 118-15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1140. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to waive application of certain requirements with respect to processing and refining a critical energy resource at a critical energy resource facility, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1131. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to authorize the use of flexible air permitting with respect to certain critical energy resource facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1130. A bill to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas; with an amendment (Rept. 118-18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1121. A bill to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing (Rept. 118-19 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1085. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to direct the National Petroleum Council to issue a report with respect to petrochemical refineries in the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1070. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide the owner or operator of a critical energy resource facility an interim permit under subtitle C that is subject to final approval by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1068. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1115. A bill to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1058. A bill to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity; with an amendment (Rept. 118-24 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Concurrent Resolution 14. A resolution expressing disapproval of the revocation by President Biden of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline (Rept. 118-25 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1023. A bill to repeal section 134 of the Clean Air Act, relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund (Rept. 118-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Concurrent Resolution 17. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not impose any restrictions on the export of crude oil or other petroleum products; with an amendment (Rept. 118-27). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1335. A bill to restart on-shore and offshore oil, gas, and coal leasing, streamline permitting for energy infrastructure, ensure transparency in energy development on Federal lands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-28 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1058 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture and the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1335 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1733. A bill to establish an alternative use of certain Federal education funds when in-person instruction is not available; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Ms.

CARAVEO, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mrs. McCLELLAN, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROSS, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. STRONG):

H.R. 1734. A bill to require coordinated National Institute of Standards and Technology science and research activities regarding illicit drugs containing xylazine, novel synthetic opioids, and other substances of concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 1735. A bill to coordinate Federal research and development efforts focused on modernizing mathematics in STEM education through mathematical and statistical modeling, including data-driven and computational thinking, problem, project, and performance-based learning and assessment, interdisciplinary exploration, and career connections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 1736. A bill to prohibit the availability of funds to provide assistance to foreign countries that criminalize or discriminate based on sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CAREY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MOLINARO, and Ms. PEREZ):

H.R. 1737. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Grant Program through which the Secretary may make grants to qualified applicants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make a technical correction to the water rights settlement for the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen the disclosure requirements for institutions of higher

education related to foreign gifts and contracts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 to establish payment and performance security requirements for projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOWMAN (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. BROWN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. CASAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1741. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to decrease the frequency of standardized tests administered to students in grades 3 through 12, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. JACOBS, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1742. A bill to index the maximum value of Federal Pell Grants to inflation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. MCCLELLAN):

H.R. 1743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal fossil fuel subsidies for oil companies, to establish gas price rebates to individuals for 2022, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIEU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BROWN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1744. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to disaggregate data on Federal contracts awarded to small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals in certain reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen health care waste, fraud, and abuse provisions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements for the provision of certain high-cost durable medical equipment and laboratory testing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1747. A bill to provide a safe harbor from licensing and registration for certain non-controlling blockchain developers and providers of blockchain services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. MACE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina):

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend the National Quantum Initiative Act to make certain additions relating to quantum modeling and simulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. FALLON, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 1749. A bill to impose additional requirements for covered agencies in regulatory flexibility analysis; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 1750. A bill to modify the minimum required weight of orange juice soluble solids; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to include certain communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mrs. GONZALEZ-COLON, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 1752. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for a high-speed broadband deployment initiative; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. CROW, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 1753. A bill to ensure that certain members of the Armed Forces who served in female cultural support teams receive proper credit for such service; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Com-

mittee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1754. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the disclosure and analysis of certain health-related ownership information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. BACON, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 1755. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to products of Uzbekistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY (for himself, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 1756. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate hearings to review Federal milk marketing orders relating to pricing of Class I skim milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. TRONE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 1757. A bill to provide enhanced student loan relief to educators; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. EZELL):

H.R. 1758. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS (for herself and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 1759. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from implementing a congestion pricing program until an economic impact analysis is completed and made available to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 1760. A bill to extend the admission to Guam or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for certain nonimmigrant H-2B workers; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. FALLON, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. MILLS):

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to raise the retirement age for pilots engaged in commercial aviation operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1762. A bill to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to exclude from income for purposes of eligibility for the supplemental nutrition assistance program the basic allowance for housing received by members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. BACON, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1764. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to exclude the basic allowance for housing from the calculation of gross household income for purposes of the basic needs allowance for eligible members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal the limitation on the maximum deduction for shelter expenses allowable for determination of benefits under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CASTEN):

H.R. 1766. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish a procedure for the siting of certain interstate electric transmission facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. RAMIREZ (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that educational assistance paid under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs to an individual who pursued a program or course of education that was suspended or terminated for certain reasons shall not be charged against the entitlement of the individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. BOEBERT,

Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.R. 1768. A bill to replace the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases with 3 separate national research institutes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. ROSENDALE, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create health freedom accounts available to all individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide pharmacy payment of certain services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 1771. A bill to amend section 248 of title 18, United States Code, to provide adequate penalties and remedies for attacks on facilities providing counseling about abortion alternatives and attacks on places of religious worship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. STANTON):

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prevent discrimination against airline passengers with disabilities who use lithium-ion-powered wheelchairs and mobility aids that are safe for air travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1773. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to provide a timetable for the collection of medical debt by debt collectors, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from issuing consumer reports containing information about debts related to medically necessary procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. QUILLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution condemning Russia's unjust and arbitrary detention of Russian opposition leader Vladimir Kara-Murza who has stood up in defense of democracy, the rule of law, and free and fair elections in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. MILLER of West

Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STEEL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Ms. SEWELL):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MACE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. PORTER, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Mr. GRUJALVA):

H. Res. 246. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN:

H. Res. 247. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 23, 2023, as "Pakistan Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CROW, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PETERSEN, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H. Res. 248. A resolution recognizing the contributions of Clela Rorex, pioneering county clerk who advanced civil rights for all couples seeking to be married in 1975; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. PORTER, and Ms. SEWELL):

H. Res. 249. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 23, 2023, as "Tuskegee Airmen Commemoration Day", and calling on each State, the District of Columbia, and each territory to recognize the Tuskegee Airmen for their heroism, valor, and exemplary service to the Nation; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Mr. CARSON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CASAR, and Mr. FROST):

H. Res. 250. A resolution honoring the victims of the March 15, 2019, shootings at mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND
SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XIII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal education funds

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

“The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the National Institute of Standards and Technology to advance science and research activities regarding illicit drugs containing xylazine, novel synthetic opioids, and other substances of concern.

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 1735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legislating

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 1736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution, Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the availability of funds to provide assistance to foreign countries that criminalize or discriminate based on sexual orientation, and for other purposes.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 1737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to authorize appropriations under Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill will authorize they payment of interest on trust funds established under settlement to the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation.

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 1739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in

the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

The single subject of this legislation is:

National Security

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 1740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

WIFIA projects

By Mr. BOWMAN:

H.R. 1741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Statewide summative assessments

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 1742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

College affordability

By Mr. CASTEIN:

H.R. 1743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Repealing oil industry subsidies and providing reimbursement to Americans.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 1744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Transparency in Government Contracts Act requires the Small Business Administration to disaggregate data on Federal contracts awarded to small businesses owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prevent repeat Medicare fraud.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To telehealth-related Medicare fraud.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 1747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill concerns money transmission laws as they are applied to specific blockchain entities.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 1748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the National Quantum Initiative Act to make additions relating to quantum modeling and simulation.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 1749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would require the CFPB to presume that size and sophistication-based tailoring of regulations are needed in SBREFA panel reviews. If tailoring is not undertaken by the panel, they must issue a justification.

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:

H.R. 1750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is granted the authority to introduce and enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To modify the minimum required weight of orange juice soluble solids.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide compensation for downwinders that were excluded due to error.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for a high-speed broadband deployment initiative.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure that certain members of the Armed Forces who served in female cultural support teams receive proper credit for such service.

By Ms. JAYAPAI:

H.R. 1754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Healthcare

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 1755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

trade relations.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY:

H.R. 1756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Dairy

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ:

H.R. 1757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Educators
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 1758.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To Amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances.
By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:
H.R. 1759.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:
Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from implementing a congestion pricing program until an economic impact analysis is completed and made available to the public.
By Mr. MOYLAN:
H.R. 1760.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article one of the United States Constitution Congress has the power to enact this legislation.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To extend the admission to Guam or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for certain nonimmigrant H-2B workers.
By Mr. NEHLS:
H.R. 1761.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend title 49, United States Code, to raise the retirement age for pilots engaged in commercial aviation operations, and for other purposes.
By Mr. NEWHOUSE:
H.R. 1762.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time.
By Mr. PANETTA:
H.R. 1763.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 Clause 14
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is nutrition.
By Mr. PANETTA:
H.R. 1764.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 Clause 14
The single subject of this legislation is:
Military Hunger
By Mr. PAYNE:
H.R. 1765.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is,
Nutrition
By Mr. QUIGLEY:
H.R. 1766.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend the Federal Power Act to establish a procedure for the siting of certain interstate electric transmission facilities, and for other purposes.
By Mrs. RAMIREZ:
H.R. 1767.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States
The single subject of this legislation is:
Restoring educational benefits to student veterans
By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 1768.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Composition of Executive Agencies
By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 1769.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Healthcare
By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 1770.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Health care
By Ms. TENNEY:
H.R. 1771.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
This bill increases penalties for attacks against abortion-alternative providers and places of worship
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 1772.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
The single subject of this legislation is:
Transportation
By Ms. TLAIB:
H.R. 1773.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Consumer medical debt

H.R. 32: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 34: Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BUSH, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 537: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 589: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 697: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 724: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 804: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 807: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 825: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 856: Mr. TRONE and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 882: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NORCROSS, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 884: Mr. RYAN and Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 885: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 953: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 964: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 970: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 983: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1050: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1062: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 1083: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1118: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 1147: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1191: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1199: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1200: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 1204: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1208: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1228: Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. HERN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. MACE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1229: Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. HERN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Ms. MACE.
H.R. 1238: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1246: Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1267: Ms. STANSBURY and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1294: Mr. BOWMAN and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1325: Mr. BOWMAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1375: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1408: Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 1422: Ms. TOKUDA and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 1447: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1484: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1503: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1532: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1555: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1581: Mr. DONALDS and Mr. CISCOMANI.
H.R. 1602: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1624: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1627: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1643: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1654: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1705: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1708: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1716: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1730: Mr. ALLEN.
H.J. Res. 11: Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. PEREZ.
H. Res. 100: Mr. LUTTRELL.
H. Res. 185: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. BROWN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 207: Mr. FALLON and Mr. CRANE.
H. Res. 219: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CORREA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. BROWNLEY.
H. Res. 243: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 1: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 17: Mr. CASE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. MCCARTHY

I do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, the provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 2023

No. 53

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our refuge and strength, we thank You that You have set the star of hope in our life's sky; that in the darkness, we can see Your brightness; that in times of shadow, we can enjoy Your guidance.

Lord, we confess today our deep inner need for a fresh inflow of Your spirit. Remind us daily that human flesh is as fleeting as fading flowers. Teach our lawmakers to number their days, to labor not simply for time but for eternity. Lord, give them the wisdom to believe that nothing can separate them from Your love.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK,

a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 316, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 316) to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 15, to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

S. 316

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the AUMF, negotiations to reach a deal on AUMF passage continue here in the Senate. We had a number of votes yesterday evening on Republican amendments, and I expect we are going to see a few more later today.

Senate passage of the AUMF is now a matter of when, not if, and today we

are going to continue working to make sure it happens as soon as we can. Americans want to see an end to endless Middle East wars. Passing this AUMF is a necessary step to putting these bitter conflicts squarely behind us.

I thank my colleagues for their work. I look forward to this bill's passage very soon. We are allowing amendments, but we shouldn't just be dilatory. We should move forward.

EXTREMISM

At the start of this Congress, I urged Republicans in both the Senate and the House to rid themselves of MAGA extremism and work with Democrats for the good of the country and even for the good of their own party. We believe MAGA Republicanism hurts their party, because so many Americans on both sides of the aisle reject it.

Well, over 3 months later, Republicans have failed in so many ways to abandon MAGA extremism. If anything, they have doubled down and embraced it even more tightly—again, to the detriment of their country and to the detriment of their party.

If you just want to know how extreme the GOP has become in the majority, look no further than what is happening on the House floor today and tomorrow. As early as this afternoon, House Republicans will try resurrecting their doomed attempt to protect retirement investors from considering governance ESG factors when making investment decisions.

Republicans talk a lot about their love of free markets and letting the private sector do its work, but their obsession—obsession—with eliminating ESG would do the opposite. By turning "ESG" into a dirty new little acronym, Republicans are trying to force their own views down the throats of every company and every investor.

President Biden has already vetoed this nakedly partisan measure, and it is clear the votes do not exist to override this veto in the House. It won't even come close.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S917

So it is bad enough that House Republicans are wasting time on show votes, but it is even more astonishing that this show vote, of all things, is designed to restrict the private sector on purely ideological grounds. It is a sad sign of how radicalized and divisive the GOP has become over the past few years.

But that is not all. Today's potential vote on the ESG override is the appetizer. Tomorrow's main course is even more horrifying.

As we speak, House Republicans are considering a sweeping piece of legislation that would nationalize school policy, endanger billions in nutrition funding, and accelerate the trend of book bans across the Nation. The House Republicans' school control bill is Orwellian to the core, and it will not see the light of day here in the Senate. If passed, schools across the Nation would be forced to adhere to a panoply of Federal regulations that take power away from parents and school districts.

Again, let me repeat that. It would take power away from parents and school districts, away from educators, and put it in the hands of elected politicians. Again, the GOP that treasured small government and local control is long since gone, replaced once again by hard-right MAGA ideologues.

The bill could be devastating to our communities. According to one report from CBO, schools that fail to comply with these MAGA mandates would be excluded from Child Nutrition Programs, impacting over 9 million kids who rely on schools for their meals.

That is it. Punish the poor kids. Make sure they don't have a meal if the school board doesn't comply with these extreme provisions.

The GOP would also expose school districts to even greater risks of book banning, censorship, and intimidation. Last year alone, there were over 2,500 book bans across the country on titles that oftentimes aren't remotely offensive but would still draw the ire of the hard right.

One school librarian in Pennsylvania—listen to this; it is crushing—was reportedly forced to remove a poster quoting Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel for violating district policy—Elie Wiesel, violating district policy.

What was the quote in question?

I swore never to be silent whenever and wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation. We must always take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented.

That was removed.

What is going on here with the extreme right? They are just losing it. There is something deeply malicious going on within the hard right when even the quotes of Holocaust survivors are seen as too "woke" or "offensive."

Again, rather than abandon the MAGA hard right, the Republican Party as a whole seems to be doubling down.

Legislation like the GOP's radical school control bill would only make

matters worse, and I will assure the American people and school children that if this bill is passed, it will meet a dead end when it comes to the Senate.

BUDGET

Mr. President, finally, on the budget, in the aftermath of major bank collapses, House Republicans have spent this week not calling for calm but sowing chaos. Chaos seems to be their calling card.

Earlier this week, House GOP Members, including the chairman of the House Budget Committee, said now is "the best time" to double down on debt ceiling brinkmanship and hostage-taking.

They suggest, absurdly, that Democrats and Democratic policies are somehow to blame for what went wrong with Silicon Valley Bank, and they are trying to link the bank's collapse with the debt ceiling debate.

This is a stupendously bad idea. This is an idea that has no logic. It has no linear thinking in it at all. It is just throwing things together, throwing spaghetti on the wall. Threatening the full faith and credit of the United States is never appropriate, but, at a time when markets require stability, it is supremely reckless.

Republicans should remember that poor management and deregulation under President Trump made these bank collapses possible. It wasn't Democratic policies.

And I would remind my Republican colleagues of this very important and telling fact: Inflation and interest rates are impacting institutions everywhere, but the vast majority of banks that have been properly managed are not in crisis.

So the Republican convoluted argument falls very, very flat. If this environment is so bad for the banks, why aren't all banks affected? No, it is the few that are mismanaged. It is the few that were not regulated properly by the regulators.

So to link the collapses with the debt ceiling—to suggest that these incidents should justify even more brinkmanship and hostage-taking—is stunningly reckless.

Instead of trying to promote financial catastrophe, Republican leaders should stop hiding from the American people, stop coming up with diversions and subterfuges, and finally show us your plan.

Today is March 23. It has been long enough.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this morning, the U.S. Trade Representa-

tive is testifying before the Senate Finance Committee on President Biden's 2023 trade policy agenda, and I look forward to asking her about the details of the Biden administration's plans—or lack thereof—to boost trade opportunities for American workers, farmers and ranchers, and businesses.

Trade has been a very low priority on the President's list throughout the first 2 years of his administration. To name just one example, it took the President a year and a half to nominate a confirmable chief agricultural negotiator at the U.S. Trade Representative's office even though agriculture is a U.S. industry that depends upon trade.

If the President has deemphasized trade, he has really deemphasized trade—that is, removing trade and tariff barriers and increasing market access for American producers. The administration is currently negotiating exactly zero comprehensive free trade agreements; and its so-called trade initiative frameworks are, largely, flowery rhetoric with little to nothing in the way of tangible and durable benefits for American workers.

Tariff reduction and increased market access—the hallmarks of free trade agreements—are notably missing in action from the Biden administration's trade initiatives. In fact, President Biden's Trade Representative has openly said that the Indo-Pacific economic framework—perhaps the President's signature trade initiative—was designed not—not—to include tariff reduction.

So why is this a problem?

Well, first of all, it is a problem because trade is essential to our economy. More than 41 million U.S. jobs depend on trade, and that includes a lot of jobs at small businesses. In fact, 98 percent of U.S. exporters are small businesses—a stat that includes many farmers and ranchers in South Dakota and around the country—and ignoring or deemphasizing trade puts those jobs in jeopardy.

But it is not just that our economy already depends on trade, it is that trade, specifically free trade—trade characterized by low or no tariffs and fewer market barriers—is a powerful engine of prosperity and economic growth. To name just one example, U.S. farm and food product exports grew from \$46.1 billion in 1994 to more than \$177 billion in 2021, largely due to greater market access opportunities for American exporters.

Free trade helps create economic prosperity. It opens new jobs and opportunities for American workers. It helps grow U.S. businesses and, by extension, our economy. President Biden has tended to deemphasize the benefits of trade for our economy and for American workers and has suggested that trade and a robust U.S. manufacturing footprint are somehow in competition. But increased trade actually helps domestic manufacturing. Sixty percent of U.S. imports are intermediary goods or

materials for use in American manufacturing. Removing unnecessary barriers to trade in those goods would generally lower the prices for those materials, which would help and not hurt manufacturing.

And while we are talking about lowering prices, I should note that expanding U.S. free trade would promote lower prices for a lot of the goods that Americans buy and would help ease some of the supply chain problems we have been experiencing. That could help alleviate the historic inflation crisis that the President and Democrats have helped to create and improve the economic outlook for Americans. But while economic benefits are a leading reason to prioritize increased trade, they are far from the only reason.

Free trade agreements don't just provide an opportunity for economic growth; they also provide an opportunity to develop important strategic relationships and foster ties with our allies. Free trade agreements don't just cement economic ties between countries; they cement friendships. They also provide an opportunity to advance U.S. priorities abroad—security priorities, economic priorities, diplomatic priorities, and more.

As I said, the President has deemphasized trade during the first 2 years of his administration; but while the U.S. has been inactive in the trade space, the rest of the world has not. For example, China recently joined the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership—a trade agreement that eventually will eliminate more than 90 percent of tariffs on commerce in 15 member countries. China is also negotiating or implementing a number of new trade agreements to add to those of which it is currently a part.

And China is far from the only country pushing ahead with free trade agreements while the United States is sitting on the sidelines. We may be a world superpower, but we have just 14 free trade agreements currently in effect with 20 countries, meaning that many of our goods and services face significant tariff barriers in most places around the globe. Now, by comparison, the European Union has 46 trade agreements with 78 countries, meaning that European goods often have a leg up on the global stage.

Under the Biden administration, the United States is getting left behind when it comes to global trade, and if we don't meaningfully reenter the trade arena, we are going to slip further and further behind. I believe that an excellent way to reenter the trade arena would be to conclude a free trade agreement with one of our closest friends and allies, the United Kingdom—something that is long overdue.

Earlier this month, I introduced a bipartisan bill with Senator CHRIS COONS. It is called the Undertaking Negotiations on Investment and Trade for Economic Dynamism Act, or the UNITED Act—the acronym. The legislation is designed to advance a free

trade agreement with the United Kingdom. Our legislation would authorize the administration to negotiate and conclude a trade agreement with the United Kingdom to open export opportunities for businesses of all sizes, increase the resilience of critical supply chains, and advance economic prosperity for people in both of our countries.

At a time of financial and geopolitical turbulence, cementing our relationships with our allies should be a top priority; and an agreement with the United Kingdom—our Nation's fifth largest export market and our largest services trading partner in the entire world—would further strengthen the ties that bind our two nations while resulting in economic gains for both British and American citizens.

Important groundwork toward a comprehensive free trade agreement has already been laid, including the bilateral negotiations initiated by President Trump's and President Biden's attempts to strengthen economic cooperation through the U.S./UK Dialogue on the Future of Atlantic Trade; and with the recently announced Windsor Framework, which provides a pathway on post-Brexit trading arrangements in Northern Ireland, the timing is right to kick-start negotiations.

An agreement with the United Kingdom would further strengthen the ties that bind our two nations while resulting in economic gains for both American and British citizens.

While the administration may have put trade at the bottom of its priority list over the past 2 years, the President's Trade Representative, Katherine Tai, seems to have at least kept the door open to working on increased market access—that is, tariff reduction—and real trade agreements. For the sake of our country, I hope the administration will follow through.

The Biden administration may have gotten off to a very slow start on the trade front, but it is not too late to turn things around. I strongly urge the President to turn his focus to a more ambitious trade agenda, one that will provide durable economic and security benefits to American workers and businesses and advance American leadership in the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 316

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to urge my colleagues to support S. 316. I congratulate and thank Senators Kaine and Young for their leadership on this issue. It will give us an opportunity to finally repeal the

1991 and the 2002 authorizations for the use of military force in regard to Iraq.

We are not at war with Iraq, and we have seen—particularly with the use of the 2001 authorization for the use of military force, which was centered on Afghanistan—that it can be used by administrations well beyond the intent of Congress. So it is our congressional responsibility to remove these authorizations and to finally repeal them.

I want to make it clear: I voted against both of the Iraq authorizations when I was in the House of Representatives in 1991 and 2002. The 2002, particularly, was passed by false pretenses. It was passed because of the belief that Iraq was involved in the attack on our country on September 11 when, in fact, they were not. It was based on the fact that they had weapons of mass destruction that could be used against U.S. interests, and that was also false.

Today, the U.S. forces in Iraq are there by the invitation of the government. There is no need for Congress to authorize the use of military force in regard to Iraq. If there are any issues in regard to protecting U.S. interests that may fall within Iraq that would require the use by the President of the military, he has that authority under article II of the Constitution, and he also has the authority given to him by the War Powers Act to utilize that process if, in fact, it is needed.

It is Congress's responsibility to declare war, clearly, in the Constitution of the United States. It is our responsibility to authorize when our men and women should be put in harm's way. We have a responsibility to make sure that the authorizations for the use of that force are in compliance with our security needs. And, clearly, we need to eliminate the authorizations that we passed in 1991 and 2002, and we are going to have the opportunity to do that.

It is very important that we pass those bills. As I said earlier, it could be used by a future administration, by a President, to go well beyond the intent of Congress. Maybe 5 or 10 years from now, a creative use of that authorization could be used to introduce troops clearly against the intent of Congress.

Now, why do I say that? Because it has happened before. Let me give you a case in point. The 2001 authorization for the use of military force, which was passed shortly after the attack on our country on September 11, 2001, was aimed at going after the organizations in Afghanistan that were partly responsible for the attack on our country.

Let me, if I might, read into the RECORD the 2001 authorization for use of military force because I think Members of the Senate and certainly the public would be very surprised to see the specific language that was used in 2001 and how it has been misused by four administrations.

It states "That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines

planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.”

That is the language of the AUMF. Yet we have seen that being used now by four Presidents far beyond the intent of Congress. They are using them in countries and against organizations that didn't even exist in 2001. It has been used in Yemen and Somalia, far from Afghanistan. Presidents have used the 2001 authorization in places and against organizations that we never imagined 22 years ago.

Now, I have heard some of my colleagues say: Well, these are affiliates of organizations that existed in 2001. Well, the concept of affiliate is nowhere in the authorization for use of military force that Congress passed. It was used by legal counsel and administrations to justify the use of force.

It is our responsibility to give that authority, and we didn't. Yet Presidents are using this to justify the use of force. Presidents have used the 2001 authorization in places and against organizations never imagined by Congress. The notice under the War Powers Act has been given to over 20 countries using the 2001 authorization, and military activities have been used well beyond Afghanistan under that authority—in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Niger—never intended by Congress.

Congress needs to pass S. 316. Let me make that clear. We need to get this bill passed to take off the books the Iraq authorizations that we have, and then we need to repeal and replace the 2001 AUMF. It is our responsibility.

President Biden agrees. Let me just quote from the President's statement in support of S. 316. He says:

Furthermore, President Biden remains committed to working with Congress to ensure that the outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework more appropriate to protecting Americans from modern terrorist threats. Toward that end, the Administration will ensure that Congress has a clear and thorough understanding of the effect of any such action and of the threats facing U.S. forces, personnel, and interests around the world.

Chairman MENENDEZ has also indicated and Senator KAINE has also indicated and understand that we first must pass S. 316, and then we need to take up the 2001 authorization for a repeal and replacement. I will introduce legislation in the very near future that does exactly that, that gives us the opportunity to carry out our responsibilities. I have done this in previous Congresses. It will sunset the 2001 authorization with enough lead time for the administration and Congress to pass, as President Biden has said, a narrow and specific framework more appropriate to protecting Americans from modern terrorist threats. That is our responsibility to do that.

We must take action on all fronts: Repeal the authorization that was passed in 1991 and 2002 related to Iraq and then move with dispatch to repeal

and replace the 2001 authorization that was aimed mainly toward Afghanistan.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, later today, we are going to vote on an amendment offered by my colleague Senator LEE, and this is a really important amendment. And this is a really important debate for us to have: the question of how long authorizations of military force should last.

We are able to have this amendment vote because of the great work that Senator KAINE and Senator MENENDEZ have done to bring to an end authorizations of military force that have been on the books for decades, authorizations of military force that most Americans didn't even know existed. So, first, I am grateful to my colleagues and to Senator YOUNG as well for having brought us to this moment where we can make the collective decision, Republicans and Democrats, to take off of the books these expired authorizations of military force that are dangerous so long as they allow a President of the United States to pervert the original meaning of the authorization of force—to go to war against Saddam Hussein in Iraq—for other means and mechanisms.

I think this is really important, both spiritually to show that Congress is still in the game of setting foreign policy alongside the executive branch but, practically, because we have seen these authorizations occasionally be sort of picked up, unearthed from the grave, and used to justify military action that can't find a justification in article II power or in other AUMFs. So I couldn't be more supportive of the underlying measure.

But Senator LEE is asking us to look prospectively and to take a step to not repeat the mistakes of the past. His amendment would suggest that every future authorization of military force—and we pass very few of them on this floor—would be limited to 2 years.

Full disclosure: I have introduced that legislation with Senator LEE as part of a broader piece of legislation that he and I have introduced to reform the War Powers Act, to reform our arms sales processes, and to reform a President's emergency powers to try to right-size the balance of authority between an outsized executive branch and, I think, an underwhelming legislative authority.

I think Senator LEE's amendment is a good idea. The only reason I wouldn't support it is if it jeopardizes the underlying bill; but if it doesn't, then I am going to support Senator LEE's amendment, in part, because I have intro-

duced legislation to do the same thing alongside him, but because I think it is time that we started putting this Congress in the position to flex that muscle that is given to us in article I, which is to be codeterminants of American foreign policy alongside the executive branch.

Notwithstanding the good work of Senator MENENDEZ and Senator KAINE, we have, over the course of the last several decades, completely outsourced that responsibility to set the national security policy to an executive branch and a national security apparatus inside the executive branch that has become bigger than the Founding Fathers' wildest dreams.

There is a wonderful book by Walter Isaacson called “The Wise Men.” It is about the individuals who set up the post-World War II order, but it is also an interesting examination of how things used to be when Congress was doing its job: regularly passing legislation, setting the parameters of American foreign policy.

One of the most extraordinary stories that is told in “The Wise Men” is the story of Robert Lovett, who at the time, I believe, was the Deputy Secretary or an Under Secretary at the Department of Defense. He eventually went on to become Secretary of Defense. And on a regular basis—I believe it was multiple times a week—Robert Lovett, on his way home from work, would stop and have a drink or dinner with Arthur Vandenberg, the then-Senate chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Every single week, multiple times, the administration would send one of their most important policymakers to sit down with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to work together on setting American national security policy in the wake of World War II.

Senator MENENDEZ is a very powerful chairman, but I don't think he gets that kind of deference from the administration because the administration knows that they can make national security policy largely without or around the U.S. Congress because we have made a collective decision to outsource that responsibility.

Now, that has become convenient in a world in which our enemies are a lot harder to define. They are shadowy. They are diffuse. They change names.

It is an era where victory is just as hard to define. We don't have peace treaties any longer with our enemies—our nonstate-actor enemies, at the very least. So we have been content to just let the administration decide whom we fight, when we fight them.

We have let the Department of Defense get so big that we can barely track what they do. We don't even demand much information from them.

I learned last week that the Department of Defense sees very little responsibility to engage Members of Congress when it comes to briefing us on contract award decisions, despite the statute mandating that Congress receive information when requested.

There is just an imbalance of power, and it is created by our decision to only have debates on national security policy every long, random, infrequent “once in a while.”

Senator LEE’s amendment says this. If you are going to pass an authorization of military force, every Congress, you have to come back and debate that authorization of military force.

When you are talking about our most sacred responsibility—putting the men and women who protect us in harm’s way—I think we owe it to them, I think we owe it to our voters, to make sure that those authorizations of military force are not being expanded or perverted beyond their initial scope.

The 2001 AUMF is still on the books. It is important because it is our sole authorization of military force against extremist groups.

Let me tell you, I cover the Middle East on the Foreign Relations Committee. There are still groups there that are thinking about plotting attacks against the United States. We need to chase them. We need to keep them on the run. But the 2001 AUMF has a scope and a size today that would be shocking to most Americans. The 2001 AUMF, which everybody at the time knew was about fighting al-Qaida and those that harbored al-Qaida, which at the time was a fight in Afghanistan, has been used to justify airstrikes, operation, and support for counterterrorism in Afghanistan, Iraq, Djibouti, Libya, Pakistan, Somalia, Syria, Yemen, Cuba, Cameroon, Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Kenya, Kosovo, Jordan, Lebanon, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, and Turkey.

I don’t think anybody who voted for the 2001 AUMF believed, at the time, that it was an authorization for military force and counterterrorism operations in that many countries. And if we were required to come back and have the debate on the 2001 AUMF, or other AUMFs, we would be able to check with our public, to check with the people we represent, and see if they still believe that it is necessary to send American forces that far and wide.

Maybe some of the most disastrous military engagements of our history, like the war in Iraq, would have come to an earlier close had this Congress been required to debate those measures on a regular basis, instead of just allowing those AUMFs to persist.

And so I come to the floor to, frankly, thank Senator LEE for bringing this piece of our bigger bill before the Senate. I am going to certainly consider voting for it. I want to make sure it doesn’t compromise the underlying legislation. These amendments are moving fast.

But my last hope for our body is this: that this isn’t the last time that we have a debate on this floor about the scope of American military operations abroad. We should repeal and rewrite the 2001 AUMF. It is way too broad and cuts Congress out of some the most important decisions about where our troops fight.

That is a complicated endeavor, but I know Senator MENENDEZ is committed to it. I know there are many Republican colleagues committed to it.

But I think history has shown that without a forcing mechanism, it is unlikely that Congress is going to make those very difficult decisions, which is why a sunset on AUMFs is a worthy idea of consideration.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we are abdicating our constitutional duty. Sometimes we do this when we delegate law-making power to the executive branch. Sometimes we do this when we shirk in our responsibility to declare war.

Today, I want to focus on the latter. By passing my amendment, we have the opportunity to ensure that all Americans have a voice in matters of war and peace.

For decades, Presidents of both parties have used authorizations for use of military force to conduct military operations without meaningful oversight or accountability to Congress.

The Founders jealously guarded war powers and the power to authorize military force. They understood what it meant to be subjected to an executive with unfettered military authority. And, indeed, this is one of the essential distinguishing characteristics between our system of government and that of England.

Prior to the American Revolution, our Founders became very familiar with the British system, under which one person, the Monarch, could take the entire country to war. It was up to Parliament, at that point, to fund it and up to the people to fight it. But one person could take the country to war.

The Founders understood this, and they understood that unchecked and unaccountable wielding of military force is, in fact, the stuff of Monarchs, of dictators and tyrants, which is exactly why the Founders entrusted this authority only to the people’s representatives, in the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

Throughout history, when Kings waged war, it was the people who fought and died. One of the many things that makes our system of government unique is this principle our Founders enshrined into our Constitution, which gave every American a voice when they were faced with the prospect of sending their sons and daughters to war. Unfortunately, we have strayed from our founding principles.

My amendment, which can pass today, is a recognition that we, as elected representatives, have a duty and an obligation to reclaim the authority to declare war that rightfully belongs to the American people. My amendment does precisely that. It implements a 2-year sunset for all future authorizations for use of military force, absent renewal by Congress.

In no way would my amendment hinder military planning or weaken our national security posture. To the contrary, it would induce a proactive approach rooted in the present day and time. It would reaffirm our resolve and strengthen our military planning. It would show that we, as representatives of the American people, are committed to conducting military operations with oversight and accountability.

It accomplishes this by requiring a joint resolution of extension to renew future AUMFs each Congress. Under this process, Congress may choose to let an AUMF expire or renew it under a joint resolution of extension with expedited procedures. This is a fast-track process, requiring only a simple majority in the Senate, designed to make AUMF renewals as easy and seamless as possible, so as not to hinder military planning.

My amendment gives Congress the ability to review and reevaluate our involvement in the wars and adjust them, if necessary, to better meet the specific objectives of the conflict or engagement. This flexibility and agility is nearly impossible under the current system, which has opened the door for overly broad applications and interpretations of existing AUMFs, sometimes past decades before the moment of a particular conflict or engagement, which in turn leads to endless wars. It would be a way for Congress to rein in this abuse without hindering our ability to adequately respond to present-day national security threats.

Now, some have argued that we don’t enter into wars to withdraw; when we must fight, we must win. But this argument has it exactly backward. What could be stronger than a resolution reaffirming our commitment to a given conflict?

And given that every Member of the House of Representatives is up for reelection every 2 years and one-third of the Members of this body in the Senate are up for election every 2 years, we resolve some of the uncertainty that our partners and our adversaries might see, might fear, might wonder about if, in fact, we are not regularly renewing each AUMF in each Congress.

This is about accountability to the public. It is about the republican form of government as a whole. It is about restoring Congress’s article I authority to declare war and authorize the use of military force.

Let us do what we were elected to do: ensure that all Americans have a voice in matters of great importance, especially when it comes to matters of war and peace, and that no President has

the power historically reserved for Monarchs, despots, and tyrants.

I implore my colleagues to pass this amendment and thus restore the balance of powers mandated by the U.S. Constitution.

AMENDMENT NO. 22

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 22 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 22.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the termination of authorizations for use of military force after two years)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. TWO-YEAR TIME LIMIT FOR AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any law authorizing the use of military force that is enacted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act shall terminate two years after the date of the enactment of such law unless a joint resolution of extension is enacted pursuant to subsection (b) extending such authority prior to such termination date.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF EXTENSION.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF EXTENSION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “joint resolution of extension” means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

(A) the title of which is as follows: “A joint resolution extending the [] for a two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.”, with the blank being filled with the title of the law authorizing the use of military force that is being extended pursuant to subsection (a); and

(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: “Congress extends the authority for the use of military force provided under [] for a two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.”, with the blank being filled with the title of the law authorizing the use of military force that is being extended pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) INTRODUCTION.—A joint resolution of extension may be introduced by any member of Congress.

(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of extension has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of extension introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee of Foreign Rela-

tions reports a joint resolution of extension to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of extension shall be decided without debate.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of extension, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(5) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) TREATMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION IN HOUSE.—In the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply to a joint resolution of extension received from the Senate (unless the House has already passed a joint resolution relating to the same proposed action):

(i) The joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committees.

(ii) If a committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 2 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

(iii) Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(iv) The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(B) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

(i) If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of extension, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

(I) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(II) With respect to that joint resolution—(aa) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

(bb) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

(ii) If, following passage of a joint resolution of extension in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

(iii) If a joint resolution of extension is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 22

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 76, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Blackburn	Lummis	Schmitt
Braun	Markey	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	Merkley	Vance
Gillibrand	Murphy	Welch
Hawley	Paul	
Lee	Sanders	

NAYS—76

Baldwin	Daines	Lujan
Barrasso	Duckworth	Manchin
Bennet	Ernst	Menendez
Blumenthal	Fischer	Moran
Booker	Graham	Mullin
Boozman	Grassley	Murkowski
Britt	Hagerty	Murray
Brown	Hassan	Ossoff
Budd	Heinrich	Padilla
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Peters
Capito	Hirono	Reed
Carper	Hoeben	Ricketts
Casey	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cassidy	Johnson	Romney
Collins	Kaine	Rosen
Coons	Kelly	Rounds
Cornyn	Kennedy	Rubio
Cortez Masto	King	Schatz
Cotton	Klobuchar	Schumer
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (SC)

Shaheen	Thune	Whitehouse
Sinema	Tillis	Wicker
Smith	Van Hollen	Wyden
Stabenow	Warner	Young
Sullivan	Warnock	
Tester	Warren	

NOT VOTING—5

Cramer	Feinstein	McConnell
Durbin	Fetterman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). On this vote, the yeas are 19, the nays are 76. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 22) was rejected. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—AMENDMENT NO. 4

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider Rubio Amendment No. 4; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to the amendment and 60 affirmative votes will be required for adoption, all without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I call up Senate amendment No. 4 on behalf of Senator RUBIO and ask that it be reported by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], for Mr. RUBIO, proposes an amendment numbered 4.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a certification)

On page 2, line 10, insert “30 days after the President certifies to Congress that Iran has stopped providing financial, technical, and material support to terrorist organizations and other violent groups in Iraq and Syria” after “hereby repealed”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I want to take a minute to speak against this amendment.

This underlying bill is to repeal two war authorizations—one is 32 years old, and one is 20 years old. This amendment would turn 20- and 30-year-old wars into endless wars.

The amendment would say that no repeal could become effective until the President certifies that Iran is no longer providing any material or technical or financial support for bad activities in either Iraq or Syria. So even if they are doing nothing in Iraq, the Iraq war still isn't over as long as they are doing something in Syria.

Let's not turn 20- and 32-year-old wars into forever wars. The American Legion opposes this amendment. I would urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for all time to be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KAINE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Barrasso	Graham	Rounds
Blackburn	Hagerty	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Britt	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kennedy	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Mullin	Thune
Crapo	Ricketts	Tillis
Cruz	Risch	Tuberville
Ernst	Romney	Wicker
Fischer	Rosen	

NAYS—63

Baldwin	Heinrich	Padilla
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Paul
Blumenthal	Hirono	Peters
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Reed
Braun	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Budd	King	Schmitt
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Lee	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Lummis	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Marshall	Vance
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Daines	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Welch
Grassley	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hassan	Murray	Wyden
Hawley	Ossoff	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Cramer	Feinstein	McConnell
Durbin	Fetterman	

(Mr. PADILLA assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). On this vote, the yeas are 32, the nays are 63.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the Risch amendment, No. 43, and that the Senate vote in relation to the amendment at 1:45 p.m. without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. I object, and I will give the reasons why. I am happy to explain all of the holds on my nominations, and I am glad to see my colleague, the Senator from Ohio, who will be here in just a moment to support these efforts.

My friend from Colorado says this hold is unprecedented. It is not unprecedented at all. In fact, there is very recent precedent. Just a couple of years ago, the junior Senator from Illinois, a Democrat, held more than 1,000 military nominations. The reason she held them was over one single officer she wanted promoted.

My colleague from Colorado threatened to do the same thing just a few weeks ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news article from January 24.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From defenseneews.com]

COLORADO DEM THREATENS TO HOLD PENTAGON NOMINEES OVER SPACE COMMAND HQ

(By Bryant Harris)

WASHINGTON.—Republican lawmakers spent the last year stalling President Joe Biden's defense nominees, but the latest threat to filling the Pentagon's top jobs is coming from the president's own party.

Sen. Michael Bennet, D-Colo., said he's threatening to delay the six remaining Pentagon nominees because Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin refuses to meet with him over the Trump administration's decision to move U.S. Space Command from its current location in Colorado Springs to Huntsville, Alabama.

The potential roadblock comes after the Senate made significant progress on its Pentagon confirmation backlog, confirming at least four long-stalled Defense Department nominees in December. Then on Monday, the Senate voted 60-35 to confirm Brendan Owens as assistant secretary of defense for energy and installations in its first floor vote of the year.

Bennet and fellow Colorado Democrat Sen. John Hickenlooper joined Republicans in voting “no” on Owens because their letters to Austin have gone unanswered.

“We simply have received no response,” Bennet told Defense News Tuesday. “When the stakes are as high as they are, when our national security is at risk, when [former

President] Donald Trump made a political decision that overruled the best advice of the Air Force's generals who examined the question of where Space Command should be, I think we should hear from the secretary of defense."

Two years ago, during the final days of the Trump administration, the Air Force announced Huntsville, Alabama—the site of the Army's Redstone Arsenal and home to the Missile Defense Agency—would serve as the new location for Space Command headquarters, moving it from Colorado Springs.

The decision infuriated Colorado's congressional delegation, who asked the Air Force to review the decision. Several Colorado Democrats argued it was an act of political retaliation because Biden won the swing state in the 2020 election.

A Defense Department Inspector General report in May found the Air Force followed all relevant laws and Policies when selecting Huntsville. But the report also found the rules themselves may have been flawed, resulting in a less than optimal decision.

A separate June report from the Government Accountability Office found the Air Force did not follow best Practices when making the basing decision.

Air Force Secretary Frank Kendall is reviewing both reports' findings and will make a determination about whether to revisit the basing process. SPACECOM Commander Gen. James Dickinson said in early December he expects that decision "shortly," but the service declined to provide a more specific timeline to Defense News.

"We are engaging the senator on this," a senior defense official told Defense News, speaking on the condition of anonymity to discuss Bennet's threat on Pentagon nominations. "More broadly, we continue to have conversations with senators from both parties as we work to confirm our nominees."

'PREROGATIVE OF SENATORS'

Senate Armed Services Chairman Jack Reed, D-R.I., told Defense News "we can and we should rapidly resolve [Bennet's and Hickenlooper's] desire for a meeting" with Austin.

"And then I think they'll withdraw the holds," he added.

Any senator can block the expedited procedures generally used to confirm Pentagon nominees with broad bipartisan support. This forces Senate leaders to devote scarce hours of floor time on the numerous procedural votes needed to confirm these nominees.

Sen. Josh Hawley, R-Mo., placed a blanket hold on all Pentagon nominees in 2021 over Biden's hasty Afghanistan withdrawal. Hawley had initially demanded Austin and other top Biden administration officials resign, but ultimately agreed to allow up-or-down votes on nominees such as Owens after Congress passed Hawley's legislation banning TikTok on federal devices.

Reed repeatedly denounced Hawley's blanket hold on the chamber's floor last year, but drew a distinction between Bennet's tactic and that of the Missouri Republican.

"That's a prerogative of senators," he said. "Continuous holds, I think, are just self-destructive because they take away the talent the Department of Defense needs."

Sen. Roger Wicker of Mississippi, the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee, also defended the increasing instances of individual senators holding up nominees as leverage over the executive branch.

"It's a tool we have at our disposal," Wicker told Defense News. "It's part of our oversight abilities, and sometimes it's important to get the attention of unelected officials."

Sen. Dan Sullivan, R-Alaska, also has holds on two Pentagon nominees over a separate dispute with the Interior Department regarding a mine project in his state. Those nominees are Laura Taylor-Kale, tapped to serve as assistant secretary of defense for industrial-base policy, and Radha Plumb, nominated to be deputy undersecretary of defense for acquisition and sustainment.

Ravi Chaudhary and Lester Martinez-Lopez are also awaiting floor votes to respectively serve as assistant Air Force secretary for energy, installations and the environment and assistant secretary of defense for health affairs.

The Senate Armed Services Committee must also hold nomination hearings for Nickolas Guertin to be assistant Navy secretary for research, development and acquisition as well as for Ronald Keohane to be assistant defense secretary for manpower and reserve affairs before voting to advance them to the floor.

Joe Gould and Courtney Albon contributed to this report.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. The headline reads: "Colorado [Democrat] threatens to hold Pentagon nominees over Space Command [Headquarters]." That Colorado Democrat happens to be my colleague opposite me as we speak.

He has given us emotion and opinion. Let's talk about the facts.

Last summer, the Supreme Court returned the decision to regulate abortion to the States. In response, the Department of Defense claimed that this was a threat to the readiness of our Armed Forces. They said this without any evidence at all.

On July 15 of last year, Republican members of the Armed Services Committee asked Secretary Austin how the Department came to this conclusion. It wasn't until November that the Department scheduled a briefing with Senate offices to give us some answers. However, minutes before the briefing was scheduled to begin, the Department canceled.

On December 5, 2022, I sent a letter to Secretary Austin letting him know I would hold all civilian and general and flag officer nominees until we got some answers. Less than 24 hours later, we got answers. The answers were disturbing.

We learned the Pentagon intended to go well beyond what has been authorized by Congress. Federal law only allows the military to provide abortions in three very narrow circumstances: rape, incest, and threat to the life of the mother. Yet the Biden administration has turned the DOD into an abortion travel agency. They did it by using just a memo.

The Biden administration wants abortion-on-demand for not just those enlisted in our military but their family members as well. This would expand the policy to millions of people. Now, the American taxpayers are on the hook to cover nonchargeable paid time off and travel costs for abortions for our military and their families. Again, nobody voted for this. This goes beyond the law.

We still have a Constitution in this country to go by, and the Constitution is clear: Congress makes the laws. The executive branch enforces the laws.

Secretary Austin seems to think he can make a change in the law without going through Congress. It would be irresponsible for the U.S. Senate to allow an administration to walk all over the legislative branch. Secretary Austin cannot change the law by memo. Congress cannot be replaced by a post on the Department of Defense website.

In December, I warned the Department that I would hold their nominees if they tried to force abortion-on-demand on our military, and they did it anyway. The Department knew what the consequences would be. It was clear. This was their choice.

I will continue to hold these nominees until the Department of Defense follows the law or Congress changes the law. In the meantime, we should do our job and vote. If these nominees are so important to the Democrats, then the Democratic leader can find time to get them on the floor.

Frankly, I wish Democrats were this concerned about our enlisted servicemembers. We have a recruiting crisis in this country. The Army missed its recruiting goal by 15,000 last year. That is an entire division. One of the causes of this crisis is the policies of the Biden administration.

At yesterday's Armed Services hearing, I talked about the Navy's training materials. Many of these materials denigrate religious Americans, who are the majority in this country.

Democrats seem a lot more worried about these nominations than about our recruitment, the people who actually fight wars.

If Democrats are so worried about the nominations, then they can bring them up for a vote. We have more than enough time to vote on nominees. We have voted on plenty of nominees this year. That is about the only thing the leader has let us do so far.

I will continue to come down here and lay out the facts for as long as my colleague from Colorado wants to. We talked about this less than a month ago. The facts have not changed. My position has not changed. So I reserve the right to object.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator from Alabama coming back down here, and I am sorry for inconveniencing him, but I think that we have had a difference of opinion about this that really matters and is real.

First of all, I appreciate the fact that he read a rare headline about my work here, but he mischaracterized what I did, which is to hold only two civilian nominees at the Defense Department—two civilian nominees. He has held every single—all flag officers, promotions of uniformed flag officers from the Department of Defense. That has not happened in the history of the U.S. Senate since 1789. And certainly my hold of two civilians is not precedent for what he is doing.

He talks about how the Defense Department can't change the rules on its own. Nobody said the Defense Department changed the rules on its own. I didn't see him come down here when the Defense Department said they would pay for travel for LASIK. I didn't see him come down here and complain when they said they would pay for travel for bunions. That is not in the statute either. That is not our responsibility; that is DOD's responsibility.

DOD, with a set of reasonable rules, is trying to deal with the aftermath of Dodd, trying to help women in uniform access care. And I believe the aftermath of Dodd created a real threat to our national security and to our readiness. Women are the fastest growing population in the military.

The Senator from Alabama said it exactly right: They are having huge recruiting challenges. It is very hard for me to see how American women who have had access for 50 years to a fundamental constitutional right and have now had it stripped away by the Supreme Court of the United States are going to enlist if they have no way to know whether or not they are going to have access to reproductive care. And that is not me saying it; the last time the Senator from Alabama and I, my friend, were on the floor, he said there would be thousands and thousands of people who would be affected by this—thousands and thousands. That is a readiness issue.

As the Senator from Alabama knows very well, when people volunteer to serve in our Armed Forces, they don't get to decide where they are going to serve, but before Dodd, they had at least some assurance that their fundamental rights would be protected, that their right to reproductive health care or to abortion would be protected—not anymore because the Supreme Court has ripped that right away. After Dodd, we have seen the effect of that.

Eighteen States have banned abortion. Eighteen States have banned abortion; 9, even in cases of rape and incest.

They passed or they have introduced restrictions to travel.

Alabama doesn't have exceptions for rape and incest, and a doctor can go to prison in Alabama for 99 years if they perform an abortion.

There are even State legislatures down there that are trying to use chemical endangerment statutes that are meant to deal with methamphetamines to charge women who have accessed abortion.

In Texas—my friends in Texas—there are \$10,000 bounties that are being put out there to try to stop friends and neighbors from driving their loved ones to the clinic.

Florida is trying to ban abortion at 6 weeks. One in three women in this country who are pregnant don't know they are pregnant in 6 weeks. I don't know if the Governor of Florida understands that—or maybe he does understand it. I don't know which is worse.

After Dodd, it is not hard to see why women might think twice about signing up.

Rand has said that there is going to be more attrition, that it is going to hurt readiness. To help address these challenges, the Pentagon announced three policies: a travel allowance so that people could actually have help being paid to go from a State they hadn't asked to go to, to one where they could have access to care; absence without leave so they wouldn't be charged—you know, they are paid leave to be able to address something that other people in the military don't have to address; and more time to notify their commanding officers of what happened. That is it. Those are the three things.

Those policies are so unreasonable in the mind of the Senator from Alabama that he has done something that no Senator has ever done, which is to put a blanket hold on all flag officers and their promotion in the Department of Defense. And that is just the three modest things. That has nothing to do with basing. It has nothing to do with how DOD is going to address Dobbs in the future.

I don't think that people in these States who have not volunteered to be in these States should have to be subject to the draconian laws of these States and not have the opportunity, if they want to have the opportunity, to travel and have their travel paid for, just as we do with LASIK surgery. That is what he calls an "abortion travel agency"—the Senator from Alabama.

Again, we didn't hear about this when it was about LASIK. We didn't hear about it when it was about bunions. We heard about it when it was about a 50-year fundamental right on behalf of the American people.

This hurts our security. It hurts our readiness at a time when Russia and China are combining together.

So I beg the Senator from Alabama to relent. We can have a disagreement about—we will have a disagreement. I come from a State that was one of the first States—the first State in America—to codify a woman's right to choose before Roe v. Wade was decided. I come from a State that was the first State in America to ratify a woman's right to choose in the wake of the Dobbs decision. And he comes from a State that views it very differently.

I respect his position on this, just like I do everybody in America who disagrees with my position on this. What I don't respect is the idea that we can't move past this blanket hold on every single flag officer that is up for promotion just because the Senator doesn't agree with the majority position that is reflected in the Department of Defense's modest rules.

I know that the vote is coming, and, at this point, I will relent and yield the floor.

I will just say to my friend from Alabama: I wish him luck, and I wish Ala-

bama luck tomorrow night. I look forward to the next time that we are here addressing this fundamental disagreement because I believe the American people are staggered by what the Dobbs Court has done. I believe the American people are staggered by what has happened because an originalist majority of the Supreme Court—something that was unimaginable when I was graduating from law school, not that many years ago—has now decided, if it was not a right in 1848, it is not a right in the United States of America today.

I don't believe that is where the American people are, and I don't believe that is where the Department of Defense is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am speaking about Social Security.

Secretary Yellen spoke before the Senate Finance Committee last week, and, to me, it was incredibly frustrating. When asked if the President would be willing to work with Congress, she held up a piece of paper and read that he stands ready to work with Congress, to meet with Senators to find a solution to Social Security. We are speaking about the President personally meeting with us. There is no evidence that is true. That has not been our experience.

It has been well reported in the press that there is a bipartisan—bipartisan, bipartisan—group of Senators working to find a solution to save Social Security. The President knows this. We have been unable to get an appointment with the President.

The reason we keep requesting a meeting with him is because we are told that no deal will be made without his personal signoff. He has to be the one who tells those who work for him that this is the deal he wants. So if the President chooses to do nothing, that choice guarantees that someone currently receiving Social Security will get a 24-percent cut in the benefits she receives.

Let me just emphasize that. I was on talk radio with KEEL in Shreveport, LA. Erin McCarty says: Well, I will be OK.

I don't know how old she is, but she thinks that, because she is of a certain age, she will not be affected.

No, current law is, if the President chooses to do nothing, Erin and everyone else who would be currently receiving Social Security would get a 24-percent cut in their current benefits. Someone who is depending upon this income to pay her bills and buy her groceries, she gets a 24-percent cut in the amount she is receiving.

There needs to be a choice between a massive, by law, 24-percent benefit cut—again, current law—and a real plan, a real choice to strengthen, to save, and to secure Social Security.

To reference President Reagan, this is a time for choosing. We can't wait

because the longer we wait, the more expensive and the more drastic the solution becomes. And we shouldn't allow politicians to use Social Security as a political weapon to beat people into submission to claim that one side wishes to do something and they are going to rescue it while offering nothing to stop this scheduled 24-percent cut. It may be good politics, but it is irresponsible.

I will point out that President Biden's two Democratic predecessors, Obama and Clinton, both offered serious plans to address this looming Social Security fiscal cliff; President Biden, no plan, not in his budget. In fact, when I asked Secretary Yellen if they had modeled any of the things she was referencing as a solution, they have not modeled it, which tells me they have not worked on it.

There should absolutely be a sense of urgency. He should feel it the way that I feel it. I used to work in a hospital for the uninsured. Many of my poor patients depended upon Social Security to pay their rent, to buy their groceries, to pay their utilities. I know what a 24-percent cut would mean to them.

By the way, on the solutions that we have been trying to come up with—an approach, if you will, certainly not a final plan—there is a lot of partial and inaccurate information. By the way, we did that on purpose. The President has a right to have an imprint upon the final thing that we come up with. So we have things which are, yes, we could do it this way, but maybe do something else.

We do add something to it, though. We think it is a novel solution that helps Social Security bridge the solvency and protects the Americans that rely upon it.

We have added some things. One thing we have spoken about, perhaps locally but not nationally, is that those who are most cut by a 24-percent cut will be the police officers, firefighters, teachers, and many other State and local government officials who are unfairly penalized by two provisions in current law known as WEP and GPO. From my perspective, repealing WEP and GPO should be part of any conversation we have with the President, if he agrees to meet, and should be part of any final proposal.

But Americans of all generations—the Silent Generation, baby boomers, Gen X, Gen Z—they want to know that the program they paid into their entire lives will be there when they need it.

It is a political truth that some issues are seen as a “political third rail.” I say choosing to do nothing, which means choosing that Social Security benefits will be cut by 24 percent, should be the third rail. We can't be guided by the fear of politics. We should be guided by the courage of our commitment to the American people and, particularly, that American senior—that he or she will not get this 24-percent cut.

I ask once more: President Biden, please personally meet with a bipartisan group of Senators. If I said something I shouldn't have to Secretary Yellen, I will, at that point, apologize.

President Biden has a reputation as a dealmaker. Let's make a deal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

TRIBUTE TO JEFF SANCHEZ

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a topic I have been dreading for months, the departure from my office of my senior adviser and close friend, Jeff Sanchez.

After 4 years of dedicated, tireless, outstanding service to me, the people of Delaware, my family, and our country, Jeff is moving on to an exciting new adventure.

He didn't want a big farewell party, but he is going to have to endure, before he goes, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the U.S. Senate reflecting the contributions of this remarkable public servant.

Jeff is from California, a graduate from Chapman University. He spent a decade on the Hill working for STENY HOYER, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ.

In my office, he has risen quickly, four promotions in 4 years. He became a central part of my senior team, giving me valued, strategic advice on a whole range of issues, from policy and politics to operations and communications. My team in DC and Delaware quickly came to rely on Jeff.

While I have a lot of very positive and humorous input from them, given the press of time, I will read just a few.

One staffer said:

[Jeff] was the air traffic officer for the office but also [at times] the pilot guiding all staff to a smooth departure with our member and a safe, comfortable landing.

Another staffer said:

Jeff is a Swiss Army knife. There is nothing this guy can't do. Tireless worker. Great writer. Strategic thinker. Gets the policy and the politics.

And my favorite:

When Jeff walks in[to] a room, everything just starts working better.

His first role in my office was moving me. I mean, physically moving me. I quickly became respectful of his skills. We have driven the streets of DC and Delaware, from Georgetown to Capitol Hill. And while he mostly stayed under the limit and obeyed traffic laws, when it came to getting me to Union Station and getting me home, he was more Mario Andretti than Uber. Sometimes my blood pressure was elevated, but we always arrived safely and on time.

From the snows of Davos to the hills of San Francisco and from the streets of Madrid, we traveled to remarkable places together. One of the most striking things about Jeff is the more time you spend with him, the more time you want to spend with him. As we got to know each other better and spent time talking, during our drives, about our families and our hopes for the future,

we became closer, and I am so grateful. Jeff has allowed me to offer what I hope has been meaningful advice on life's challenges and opportunities.

I have lots of things to poke fun at Jeff. He has a mischievous wit, his own share of quirky habits, and charming preferences. Like a hobbit, he eats a first and second lunch, always from Cups. During late nights when I was tied up here on the floor, he would turn down the lights and deejay for our colleagues—something called Club Jeff. And while he is a foodie, his highest culinary loyalty is Cheesecake Factory.

Jeff's parents, Maria and Carlos, are wonderful people from Quito, Ecuador. He is proud of them, and I hope you know, we are proud of you. To Maria, Carlos, Shane, Ronald, his beloved nanny Eloysita, and grandmother Rosa, it is important for you to hear that you raised an amazing and incredible young man, whose integrity and work ethic exceeds anything I have seen among others, and you are the base for his success here in the Senate and in life.

I have been blessed to know Jeff, both professionally and personally, and we have come through some of the most challenging and difficult moments in our country's recent history together: President Trump's two impeachments, Joe Biden's Presidential campaign, my own reelection to the Senate, January 6, the whole Biden Presidency, and two of the most legislatively frenetic years in history and a global pandemic.

During the pandemic, a core group of six of us came into my offices day in and day out and worked hard. We spent a huge amount of time together—hard days and long nights, working through that crisis. Through the pandemic, Jeff was always there.

He has made me a better Senator and a better colleague. He is responsible for and shares in my biggest successes, and his contributions to me, to the country, and to our State are too numerous to mention.

I will close with James 2:18:

Show me your faith apart from your works, and I will show you my faith by my works.

In a town that has its fair share of self-promoters, Jeff has devoted himself to others and does so with humility, discretion, and poise. In an institution where there is often a scramble to occupy the spotlight, Jeff chose to labor behind the scenes and give credit to others. In a culture where some feel entitled to professional awards, Jeff has earned everything he has achieved many times over.

It was no surprise that once Jeff decided to look for new opportunities, he has had many compelling options. I am proud of him and the next steps he will take in his life.

When I shared the news that Jeff would be moving on from our team, the three most important women in my life—and I don't mean Morgan, Chelsea, and Trinity of our office, but I

could; I mean my mother, my wife, and my youngest, Margaret—were so sad to see him go because they have come to trust and admire him the way so many of his colleagues do. He is genuinely a member of our family, and we will deeply miss him.

While Jeff is leaving my office next week, he will always be a part of that small group of people I most appreciate, admire, and respect. I look forward to the lifetime of friendship I know we will share.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 43

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I would like to call up Risch first-degree No. 1, also known as amendment No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. RISCH] proposes an amendment numbered 43.

Mr. RISCH. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 10, delete “hereby repealed” and insert “repealed effective 30 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that legal authorities permitting the detention of terrorists and the litigation position of the United States regarding the detention of terrorists held in whole or in part under the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) would not be weakened by such repeal”.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, fellow Senators, I rise today to present this amendment as part of the process, as we process this repeal of the 2002 AUMF matter before the Senate right now.

This particular exercise that we are doing, the amendment process is frequently fraught with political messaging. I am happy that so far the amendments that we have been processing have not been that sort of amendment and that is that it was intended to be a political message. This one is not. Prior ones are not. The ones that are pending really are not.

And the reason for that is what we are doing here in discussing the 2002 AUMF repeal is taken seriously by every single Member of this body—Republican, Democrat, everyone is acting in good faith as they process this.

This is one of the most important things each of us do as a U.S. Senator, that being the question of committing our young men and women to actual kinetic force on the field.

When this was put in place, it was considered deeply and seriously by this body, and as we look to repeal it, the same is true. And I think everyone is headed toward the same objective and that is to see that this is done properly.

That is the purpose of this amendment to the actual repeal that is in

front of us. This amendment would conditionally repeal on a certification from the Secretary of Defense that detention authorities and the litigation position of the United States with respect to detention would not be weakened.

And this is offered in good faith. It is offered because yesterday, just as an example—yesterday we had a hearing with the Secretary of State. And I asked him three questions about this, about whether they actually use it, whether it was important, and whether repealing it would weaken our position on detention and on litigation regarding detention, and the Secretary of State said that it would.

So the purpose of this is to clear up what I think is a flaw here. It certainly isn’t intended by anyone. I think everyone would want us to have as strong a position as we possibly could when we are in detention or litigation. So this simply requires us to replace the language with some other language, and then we would get the certification or a determination by the lawyers.

So I offer it in good faith. I think it is an absolutely correct thing to do if indeed the body is going to move to actually repeal the 2002 AUMF.

Again, I want to congratulate every Member of this body for working on this very important issue in good faith. I think this moves the issue further to a better position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. I would seek permission to speak for a minute in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KAINE. This is offered in good faith—and I appreciate my colleague—but it is completely unnecessary for the following reason: The White House and the Department of Justice have both stated, there is no one currently detained pursuant to the 2002 authorization. It is not being used as a ground for detaining anyone.

I was at the hearing yesterday, and my colleague from Idaho is correct, Secretary Blinken talked about repeal of the 2001 authorization could affect detention and said we should not do a repeal if there is not a replacement.

But the administration’s position on the 2002 authorization is that there are no military activities, including a single detention, where we are using the 2002 as justification.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against the certification requirement. Keep this bill a clean repeal of the 1991 and 2002 authorizations.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 43

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 43.

Ms. HASSAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Boozman	Grassley	Rosen
Britt	Hagerty	Rounds
Budd	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	Mullin	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Ricketts	

NAYS—52

Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schmitt
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Braun	Klobuchar	Sinema
Brown	Lee	Smith
Cantwell	Lujan	Stabenow
Cardin	Manchin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Van Hollen
Casey	Menendez	Vance
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hawley	Paul	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NOT VOTING—7

Cramer	Fetterman	Sanders
Durbin	McConnell	
Feinstein	Moran	

The amendment (No. 43) was rejected. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The senior Senator from Texas.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, every day, I hear from my constituents, the people I represent in Texas—some of the 30 million people I have the honor of representing—and they ask me why they aren’t seeing more solutions offered by the U.S. Congress to the problems that they confront in their everyday lives.

Family budgets are being clobbered by inflation. People are spending significantly more money just to get by on housing, groceries, utilities, and other basic expenses. Inflation has remained at 5 percent or higher for each of the last 22 months. Of course, we have seen it soar to the highest level in 40 years, but it consistently outpaces wage growth, giving the average worker a pay cut, and folks—too many of them—feel like they just can’t catch a break.

As if that weren't a big enough financial headache, some are now questioning the stability of the U.S. banking system. In the last 2 weeks, two U.S. banks—big banks—have collapsed, and a group of major banks has now launched a rescue mission to save another from meeting the same fate. Texans are wondering: Are these isolated events or a sign of worse things to come? The memories of the 2008 financial crisis are fresh in many people's minds, and they are terrified that we will soon find ourselves in familiar territory.

But families aren't just stressing about their finances; they are also worried about their safety. The surge in violent crime that began in 2020 hasn't let up. In many places, it is getting worse. Given the wave of fentanyl overdoses, especially among teens, parents are terrified that their child could become the next victim. They are outraged that fentanyl and illegal drugs are flowing across the southern border, and they want to know why more isn't being done to stop it.

Of course, folks in Texas and across the country aren't just worried about the illegal drugs that came across the border and took the lives of 108,000 Americans last year. That is bad enough. They are also worried about the flood of unchecked migration across the border. Over the last couple of years, the Biden administration has broken nearly every record in the books when it has come to border crossings. We have seen a complete breakdown of law and order as thousands of migrants cross the southern border each and every day. And, yes, my constituents are baffled when they read news stories that say that some of the migrants will have to wait 10 years before they can even begin immigration court proceedings. With all of these problems, folks are trying to understand, how did we get here, but, more importantly, they want to know what are our leaders doing about it.

Across the country, each and every day our constituents are asking for answers, and they want to see some action. Every day, I get phone calls from folks back home or people who write to me about these problems, whether it is inflation or crime or drugs or the border crisis or one of many other topics.

They ask me: When will the U.S. Senate take action? Unfortunately, I can't offer them much reassurance based upon the Democratic-led Senate's track record so far this Congress.

No doubt about it, the majority gets to control the agenda here in the Senate, whether it is at the committee level or here on the floor. As a Member of the minority, there is not anything I can do under the Senate rules to force the majority leader to take action on a particular topic or to insist that a chairman of a committee that has jurisdiction actually mark up legislation or hold hearings.

So, clearly, Democrats control the Senate. Their leadership continues to

put all of these important and pressing issues on the back burner.

Just look at what the Senate has done or, rather, look at what it has not done since the beginning of this year. The Senate confirmed several Federal judges and a handful of other nominees in the last 4 weeks. We overturned a dangerous DC crime bill, which would have softened penalties for criminals and endangered the lives of residents and visitors to our Nation's Capital. We nullified a Department of Labor rule that encouraged fiduciaries to support woke policies at the expense of Americans' retirement accounts and pensions. That is the end of the list.

Those are the only items the Democratic-controlled Senate has passed in the last 4 weeks—nothing to address the border crisis, nothing to combat inflation, nothing to stem violence, nothing to deal with the drugs that are taking the lives of our sons and daughters all across America.

The irony is, the two resolutions that did pass were Republican priorities. These weren't even things that our Democratic colleagues initiated. We were able, under the Senate rules, to force action, fortunately, on those. But we have seen in one case that the President has already vetoed one of those congressional review actions. Senator HAGERTY from Tennessee led the effort to overturn the dangerous DC crime bill. Senator BRAUN from Indiana pushed to stop the administration from gambling away Americans' retirement savings.

If you look at every vote the Senate has taken since the start of this Congress, you won't find much more—lots of nominations, a resolution designating January as National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month, which rightfully passed unanimously, but that is about it. That is what the American people have gotten from this Democratic majority in the Senate.

To be fair, it appears the Senate will soon vote on a bill to repeal the authorization for use of military force in Iraq. We took that procedural vote on this legislation last Thursday, which marked the first time this Chamber voted to even consider a standard piece of legislation this Congress—the first time. We voted on many nominations and a few resolutions, but that was the first true piece of legislation. It took 2½ months for our Democratic colleagues to put a bill on the floor—2½ months.

At the start of the 116th Congress, Republicans held the majority in the Senate. Members were sworn in on January 3, a Thursday. The following Tuesday, the Senate voted on a bill related to U.S. policy in the Middle East—sworn in on Thursday; Tuesday we were voting on substantive legislation. That is what leadership looks like: Identify your priorities; hold hearings; build consensus; put bills on the floor; and let Members do what they came here to do, which is to legislate, which is to address the priorities

of the American people, which are being ignored by this Democrat-led Senate.

When voters put your party in charge, you are expected to lead, but that is not what we are seeing. As we witnessed over the past 2 years, our friends across the aisle haven't used their majority to address the problems facing American families. They have simply been missing in action.

While inflation, crime, and the border crisis were raging, our Democratic colleagues who controlled the Senate agenda, the House, and the White House for the last 2 years had the power to pass just about any bill they wanted to address these priorities of the American people, but here is what the American people got instead: \$2.6 trillion in partisan spending bills, tax increases, handouts for labor unions, subsidies for wealthy people to buy electric vehicles, and nothing to address the concerns of working families.

Now that the Republicans hold the majority in the House, the era of one-party rule has come to an end, which is, frankly, great news. This new chapter of divided government requires Republicans and Democrats to work together. Unfortunately, we can't make any progress in the Senate or in the Congress unless the majority leader allows us to take up, amend, and to vote on legislation—legislation that addresses the priorities of our constituents, the people we represent.

I hope this sluggish pace, this snail's pace, will change. At some point in the coming months, Congress will need to address the debt ceiling. Given the current status of inflation and the instability of the banking system, defaulting on our debts is the last thing we need to do.

Given the current state of our fiscal house, it is also critical that we pass regular appropriations bills on time and through regular order in a transparent and open manner, unlike the bill the majority leader put on the floor last December, an omnibus appropriations bill which was the only way to fund the Federal Government because he would not allow the Senate to do its work in a transparent and orderly sort of way. So Members of the Senate had two choices: vote yes or vote no and shut down the government.

We also need to pass an annual defense authorization bill—something we have done for more than the last 60 years in each year—to make sure that our military leaders have the certainty they need to address the threats of today and prepare for the threats of tomorrow. I don't recall a more dangerous time for our country and for the world than we currently are living in; certainly, not in my time in the Senate, probably not since World War II, where you have a major power—the Russian Federation—invade a sovereign neighbor, as the Russians did in Ukraine; you have North Korea shooting off long-range missiles with nuclear weapons' capability; you have

Iran seeking to build a bomb; and then you have China threatening to invade a neighbor in Taiwan. So we need to pass that Defense authorization bill.

The Federal Aviation Administration needs to be reauthorized by the end of September; hopefully, addressing some of the near misses we have seen in some of the air traffic recently. My friend Senator CRUZ from Texas is leading these efforts on our side of the aisle.

We also need to reauthorize the tools that we need—namely, section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—to know what our enemies are doing, to prepare for those, and to deploy countermeasures.

We need to take action to address the humanitarian and security crisis at the southern border, to bring down drug prices for consumers, and to unleash the power of American energy.

We have seen what happened when Europe was dependent almost entirely on Russian oil and gas and then when Putin weaponized that dependency, what that meant to the countries of Europe as they scrambled for alternative sources of energy. The United States, as an energy producer, is part of the answer to that energy security problem, but we can't solve that problem, we can't continue to provide good, well-paying jobs for people who work in that industry, unless the government is willing to get out of the way and take its boot off the neck of the producers.

There is a lot of work that needs to be done, and I know the Presiding Officer wants to be part of that solution. We need more people in this Chamber, in this city, in this country who want to be part of solving these problems, but we can't do it until the majority leader who controls the Senate is willing to put bills on the floor that actually address the priorities and concerns of the people we represent. I hope he will give us that chance.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 25, S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Tim Kaine, Tina Smith, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tammy Baldwin, Patty Murray, Michael F. Bennet, Elizabeth Warren, Tammy Duckworth, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, March 23, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on S. 316 on Monday March 27, it be in order to consider the following amendments: Sullivan, No. 33; R. Scott, No. 13; Ricketts, No. 30; Cruz, No. 9; Hawley, No. 40; and Johnson, No. 11; that, if offered, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments at a time to be determined by the majority leader following consultation with the Republican leader on Tuesday, March 28, and that 60 affirmative votes be required for the adoption of these amendments, without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. So, Mr. President, before I finish the rest of the business, I just want to explain to everyone what happened.

A few moments ago, we entered into an agreement that puts the Senate on a path to repeal the Iraq AUMFs by early next week. By filing cloture today, we set up a vote for this coming Monday. If cloture is invoked, we will hold votes on additional amendments before final passage.

This has been a good process here on the floor. I was asked by several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to have a reasonable amendment process and then we could move the bill forward. I think we did, on a vote that got 70 Republican votes—or 70 total votes, or close to 70, on cloture last week. We have 11 amendments, and I think just about every Republican amendment that was asked for as of today was accommodated.

So this is a good thing, and I hope it can be a model for the future. We in the majority will allow amendments. Sometimes those votes are tough to take, but at the same time, the minority will not just be dilatory and allow us to move forward. That is what happened this week on AUMF, and I hope it portends good things to come as we work together to make this country an even better country.

Now back to other business.

MORNING BUSINESS

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 67, on the Lee amendment No. 22, to provide for the termination of authorizations for use of military force after 2 years. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 68, on the Rubio amendment No. 4, to require a certification. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 69, on the Risch amendment No. 43, to provide for a delayed, conditional repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.●

REMEMBERING RABBI MENACHEM M. SCHNEERSON

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the life and leadership of Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, a global spiritual leader known universally as the Rebbe, and head of the Chabad-Lubavitch movement.

The Rebbe was born in 1902 and lived through the darkest periods of history, escaping the evils of Russian communism and the horrors of Nazi Germany. In 1941, the Rebbe and his wife Rebbetzin Chaya Mushka arrived safely on the shores of the United States, where he worked tirelessly to resuscitate, rebuild, and guide world Jewry after the holocaust.

The Rebbe exemplified an ideal and value we need today: to give of ourselves selflessly for the betterment of those around us. The Rebbe urged us all to become ambassadors for goodness and kindness and explained that education must not be limited to the academics necessary for making a good living, but rather focus on the ethics, morals, and values that serve as the bedrock of civilization.

One result of the Rebbe's leadership is the Chabad-Lubavitch movement which, by following his teachings and example, became the world's largest Jewish educational organization. Today, there are more than 3,500 permanent Chabad-Lubavitch centers providing educational, religious, and humanitarian programming in all 50 States, including in my home State of South Dakota, and in 109 countries. The Rebbe's teachings and scholarship are published in more than 400 volumes and are translated in dozens of languages.

The Rebbe recognized America's unique role as a force for good and had meaningful relationships with several of our Nation's leaders, who saw him as the moral guide of so many. For the Rebbe, America was a beacon of light of historic proportions to be utilized in influencing the moral betterment of all humanity, and he often pointed to the words "In God We Trust" enshrined on our currency as a defining element of the great American story.

For more than four decades, every U.S. President has declared the annual observance of Education and Sharing Day in honor of the anniversary of the Rebbe's birth and in recognition of his contributions to the betterment of education for all people. In 1995, he was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal for his contributions toward education, morality, and acts of charity.

Education and Sharing Day represents an excellent opportunity for us to reflect on the Rebbe's vision and leadership. May we take his teachings to heart.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY WILLIAMS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Anthony Williams's decades of service with the U.S. Postal Service. Nearly 43 years ago, Mr. WILLIAMS began as a city carrier at the Rice Street Station in St. Paul, MN, and on March 3, 2023, he retired as the Minnesota-North Dakota district manager. During that time, Mr. WILLIAMS supported the Postal Service in its work processing and delivering 425 million pieces of mail each day, including everything from Social Security checks and life-saving prescriptions, to birthday and graduation cards.

When I think about Anthony's time with the U.S. Postal Service, I will always think about his commitment to problem-solving. In the face of polar vortexes, staffing shortages, and a global pandemic, he always found a way to regroup, examine the situation, and do what needed to be done to get Minnesotans and North Dakotans their mail.

While in a practical sense the U.S. Postal Service brings us our letters and packages, as the only organization with the logistical capability to reach every address in the Nation, it also brings our country together. That is the heart of what Anthony did through his decades of service, and I will always be grateful.

I hope that Anthony gets some much deserved rest and time with Cindy in retirement, and if I ever need to reach him, I know he is just a stamp away.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING IDAHO NUCLEAR CLEANUP MILESTONE

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I congratulate the Idaho Environmental Coalition that currently manages cleanup operations at the Idaho National Laboratory, INL, Site and Department of Energy, DOE, Office of Nuclear Energy contractor Battelle Energy Alliance for completing the transfer of all spent nuclear fuel from wet to dry storage more than 9 months ahead of the 1995 Idaho Settlement Agreement milestone. This is the culmination of more than two decades of work by DOE and many partners and contractors. It further reinforces DOE's commitment to meet-

ing its agreements with the State and following through on its promises to the citizens of Idaho.

Importantly, the completion of the wet-to-dry project ahead of schedule means risks are reduced, security is improved, and the environment is better protected earlier, rather than later. Dry spent nuclear fuel storage is considered safer than wet storage, as it reduces proliferation concerns and potential risk to area natural resources. Dry storage of spent nuclear fuel also better prepares it for transport to long-term storage when a permanent repository becomes available.

DOE has now met more than 90 percent of the Idaho Settlement Agreement milestones and more than 97 percent of all regulatory milestones with the State of Idaho. The completion of the wet-to-dry project frees up cleanup resources to further advance the next stages of the nuclear fuels mission. Thank you to all those involved in this momentous achievement, especially the exceptional and highly skilled employees involved in this project, for advancing and accelerating the cleanup at the INL and protecting Idaho's citizens. ●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:49 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Allie, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1093. An act to direct the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on implementation of the advanced capabilities pillar of the trilateral security partnership between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

H.R. 1159. An act to amend the Taiwan Assurance Act of 2020 to require periodic reviews and updated reports relating to the Department of State's Taiwan Guidelines.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1093. An act to direct the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on implementation of the advanced capabilities pillar of the trilateral security partnership between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1159. An act to amend the Taiwan Assurance Act of 2020 to require periodic reviews and updated reports relating to the Department of State's Taiwan Guidelines; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-783. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agri-

culture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electric Program Coverage Ratios Clarification and Modifications" (RIN0572-AC60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-784. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2024 Budget and Performance Plan; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-785. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Fiscal Year 2022 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Privacy Management Report received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-786. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "BLB2 and AMR3 Proteins in Potato; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10776-01-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-787. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Paraffin Waxes and Hydrocarbon Waxes, Carboxypolyethylene Resin, and Paraffin Waxes and Hydrocarbon, Oxidized, Lithium Salts in Pesticide Formulations; Tolerance Exemption" (FRL No. 10783-01-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-788. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pydiflumetofen; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 10195-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-789. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Delaware; Removal of Excess Emissions Provisions" (FRL No. 10222-02-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-790. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Glycerides, Soya Mono- and Di-, Ethoxylated; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10599-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-791. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a strategic assessment of the Joint Force readiness to accomplish the National Security Strategy (OSS-2023-0263); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-792. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office

of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of Defense" (RIN0790-AL21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, with respect to Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-794. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13848 with respect to the threat of foreign interference in or undermining public confidence in United States elections; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-795. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13536 with respect to Somalia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-796. A communication from the President and Chair of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Bank's Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2024, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-797. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Air Cleaners" (RIN1904-AF26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-798. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Operating Plan (AOP) for Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2023"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-799. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bacteriophage active against *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae*; Bacteriophage active against *Xanthomonas arboricola* pv. *corylina*; Bacteriophage active against *Xanthomonas arboricola* pv. *juglandis*; and Bacteriophage active against *Xanthomonas arboricola* pv. *pruni*; Exemptions from the Requirement of Tolerances" (FRL No. 10544-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-800. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modified Potato Acetolactate Synthase (StmALS) in Potato; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10775-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 326. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a study and clinical trials on the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of veterans with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. David J. Berkland and ending with Col. Adrienne L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 2023.

Air Force nomination of Col. Corey A. Simmons, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. George M. Wikoff, to be Vice Admiral.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Frederick W. Kacher, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Sean M. Carpenter and ending with Col. Norman B. Shaw, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Kristin A. Hillery and ending with Col. Michelle L. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Elizabeth E. Arledge and ending with Brig. Gen. Christopher F. Yancy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 31, 2023.

Army nomination of Col. Carlos M. Caceres, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Shoshana S. Chatfield, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Col. William F. Wilkerson, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Evelyn E. Laptook, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Ronald R. Ragin, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Brandon C. Anderson and ending with Col. David J. Zinn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. David R. Everly and ending with Col. Robert S. Weiler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Walter D. Brafford and ending with Capt. Robert J. Hawkins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Amy N. Bauernschmidt and ending with Capt. Forrest O. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023. (minus 1 nominee: Capt. Eric J. Anduze)

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Brian J. Anderson and ending with Capt. Julie M. Treanor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Casey J. Moton and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Stephen R. Tedford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Rick Freedman, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Kenneth W. Epps, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Stephen D. Barnett and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Jeremy B. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023. (minus 1 nominee: Rear Adm. (lh) Jeffrey J. Czerewko)

Navy nomination of Capt. Frank G. Schlereth III, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Joshua C. Himes and ending with Capt. Kurtis A. Mole, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Thomas J. Dickinson and ending with Capt. Dianna Wolfson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 16, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Harrell and ending with Brig. Gen. Jeannine M. Ryder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2023.

*Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. James W. Bierman, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. REED, Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Shane K. Doty, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Speight H. Caroon and ending with Teina D. Stallings Lilly, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nomination of Brandi Barnard King, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel S. Mcpherson and ending with Khurram M. Shahzad, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Matthew J. Andrade and ending with Jill M. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Adam James Cole and ending with Mary Zachariah Kurian, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Eric K. Wilke and ending with Ned L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kelli M. Bermudez and ending with Jenny L. Wylie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Lisa Carol Giugliano and ending with Ryan Lee Rand, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Joseph Catalino, Jr. and ending with Meiling C. Taylor, which nominations were received by

the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with James M. Bershinsky and ending with Lisa Ann Seltman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Gary Monroe Boutz, Jr. and ending with Jolana Ann Kubicek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nomination of John Charles Easley, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Robert M. Acosta and ending with Donna M. Whittaker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Nicole Dyan David and ending with Carrie L. Waltz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Karrie Megan Bem and ending with Jeffrey W. Scohy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Douglas A. Collins and ending with Jose Y. Munoz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nomination of Marquis A. T. Smith, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with James D. Akers II and ending with Jonathan R. Zito, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with David I. Amar and ending with Shaun Michael Zabel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Air Force nomination of Maximilian S. Lee, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Tolulope O. Akinsanya and ending with D016483, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023. (minus 2 nominees: Nicholas C. Dauschmidt; Zara M. Scribner)

Army nomination of Sashi A. Zickefoose, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Howard F. Stanley, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Bobby J. Chun, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Joshua G. Glonek and ending with Kelvin V. Simmons, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Alex J. Duffy and ending with Devlin P. Winkelstein, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Liza B. Crawford and ending with Derek A. Sanchez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy S. Stirm and ending with Julio Vera, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nomination of Renee R. Kiel, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Melissa B. Riestershartsell and ending with Thomas F. Robinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nomination of Kimberly A. Dilger, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Abigail R. Osman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Andrew J. Archuleta, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher C. Cross and ending with Jonathan D. Zagdanski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Michael J. Baierlein and ending with Eric D. Ziders, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Austin P. Abarr and ending with D016809, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with James H. Abney and ending with D015738, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Mitchell A. Ables and ending with D016368, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Peter B. East and ending with Joel A. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2023.

Army nomination of Matthew J. Clementz, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Samuel T. Kramer, to be Major.

Army nomination of Carla A. Kiernan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of John W. Brock II, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of John D. Horton, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Joel N. Buffardi, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Sarah D. Eccleston, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Nicholas P. Fiebke, to be Major.

Army nomination of Andrew J. Doyle, to be Major.

Army nomination of William T. Griggs, to be Major.

Army nomination of Megan L. Maloy, to be Major.

Army nomination of Kaitlyn M. Hernandez, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy I. Arcelay and ending with Earl E. Weigelt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Army nomination of Sara C. Adams, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christina G. Nalley, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew Adamczyk and ending with Havard M. Whiles, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Army nomination of Ashley S. Lee, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Timothy W. Lindeman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ebony Q. Starr, to be Major.

Army nomination of Sarah A. Delarosa, to be Major.

Army nomination of Mark T. Sopkiw, Jr., to be Major.

Army nomination of Justin T. Thomas, to be Major.

Army nomination of Rei T. Israel, to be Major.

Army nomination of Adam L. Fox, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jason L. Workman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Stephen J. Cumby, to be Major.

Army nomination of Stephen M. Anderson, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Jason W. Price, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of William M. Schweitzer, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Louis V. Scott, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Justin J. Reeb, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Elisabet Crumpler, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Kyle A. Aduskevich and ending with John M. Thorpe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Bramwell B. Arnold III and ending with Dannie T. Stimson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffery R. Biermann and ending with David A. Wakeman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Navy nomination of James H. Knight, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Space Force nominations beginning with Ross M. Boston and ending with Robert F. Wojcik, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nominations beginning with Jason M. Adams and ending with Jonathan L. Whitaker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nominations beginning with Christopher John Alban and ending with Costantinos Zagaris, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nominations beginning with Bridget L. Ajinga and ending with Brian K. Yoakam, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nominations beginning with John W. Anderson and ending with Abby Elizabeth Zven, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nominations beginning with Christina M. Akers and ending with Kathy E. Yorke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nominations beginning with Cassandra R. Hidalgo and ending with Eric J. Perez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023.

Space Force nomination of Edward E. Jones, to be Colonel.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina:

S. 952. A bill to establish an alternative use of certain Federal education funds when in-person instruction is not available; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 953. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a rural health center innovation awards program and a rural health department enhancement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 954. A bill to provide for appropriate cost-sharing for insulin products covered under private health plans, and to establish a program to support health care providers and pharmacies in providing discounted insulin products to uninsured individuals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 955. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 956. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve dependent coverage under the TRICARE Young Adult Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 957. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to restrict conflicts of interest on the boards of directors of Federal reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 958. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for the annual report on the trade agreements program and the national trade policy agenda to include an assessment of impacts on the national defense strategy and the national security strategy of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 959. A bill to amend the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 to require abortion providers to notify the National Human Trafficking Hotline of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 960. A bill to replace the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases with 3 separate national research institutes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 961. A bill to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Salem, Massachusetts, as the "Salem Maritime National Historic Park", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 962. A bill to protect individuals who face reprisals for defending human rights and

democracy by enhancing the capacity of the United States Government to prevent, mitigate, and respond in such cases; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 963. A bill to provide enhanced student loan relief to educators; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 964. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 965. A bill to establish a rural postsecondary and economic development grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 966. A bill to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 967. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to limit the ability of Federal Reserve banks to issue central bank digital currency; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 968. A bill to prohibit the procurement of solar panels manufactured or assembled in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 969. A bill to amend the National Quantum Initiative Act to make certain additions relating to quantum modeling and simulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 970. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish within the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce a China Economic Data Coordination Center; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 971. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the Medicaid coverage exclusion for inmates in custody pending disposition of charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 972. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the hiring and re-hiring of additional career law enforcement officers for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 973. A bill to prohibit Federal contractors from imposing racial hiring quotas, benchmarks, or goals; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. Res. 118. A resolution recognizing the contributions of Ciela Rorex, a pioneering county clerk who, in 1975, advanced civil rights for all couples seeking to be married; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. COONS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. Res. 119. A resolution recognizing the 202nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. WICKER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 120. A resolution designating March 23, 2023, as "National Women in Agriculture Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 121. A resolution designating April 5, 2023, as "Gold Star Wives Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 122. A resolution commemorating the 360th anniversary of the North Carolina National Guard; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 123. A resolution recognizing the week of March 19 through March 25, 2023, as "National Poison Prevention Week" and encouraging communities across the United States to raise awareness of the dangers of poisoning and promote poison prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. Res. 124. A resolution designating March 24th, 2023, as "National Women of Color in Tech Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. Con. Res. 7. A concurrent resolution condemning Russia's unjust and arbitrary detention of Russian opposition leader Vladimir Kara-Murza who has stood up in defense of democracy, the rule of law, and free and fair elections in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RISCH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Con. Res. 8. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 70

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to require the Bureau of Indian Affairs to process and complete all mortgage packages associated with residential and business mortgages on Indian land by certain deadlines, and for other purposes.

S. 305

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 305, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the United States Marine Corps, and to support programs at the Marine Corps Heritage Center.

S. 460

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to establish an urban Indian organization confer policy for the Department of Health and Human Services.

S. 537

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 537, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 547

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from North

Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 547, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 566

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 566, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 767

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 767, a bill to enhance mental health and psychosocial support within United States development and humanitarian assistance programs.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to require the Energy Information Administration to submit to Congress and make publicly available an annual report on Federal agency policies and regulations and Executive orders that have increased or may increase energy prices in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to allow the interstate sale of State-inspected meat and poultry, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 866, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to create a point of order against legislation modifying the number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

S.J. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 9, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5,

United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Lesser Prairie-Chicken; Threatened Status with Section 4(d) Rule for the Northern Distinct Population Segment and Endangered Status for the Southern Distinct Population Segment".

S.J. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 21, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices.

S. RES. 107

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 107, a resolution recognizing the expiration of the Equal Rights Amendment proposed by Congress in March 1972, and observing that Congress has no authority to modify a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment after the amendment has been submitted to the States or after the amendment has expired.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 965. A bill to establish a rural postsecondary and economic development grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Success for Rural Students and Communities Act. This bipartisan bill would help students living in rural areas achieve their higher education goals and connect them with the economic opportunities in their communities. I want to thank Senator HASSAN for coleading this legislation with me.

Today, employers often require something more than a high school diploma, such as a college degree, a skilled trade credential, or a professional certificate. Yet, rural students may face barriers to pursuing postsecondary education. Although rural students tend to graduate from high school at about the same rate as their suburban peers, they go on to enroll in college at a lower rate. Rural students also tend to have lower full-time retention rates in postsecondary education than their urban and suburban peers.

Maine's experience is consistent with these national trends. According to census data, two out of three Maine schools are in rural communities, and more than half of Maine students attend those schools. More than 86 percent of Maine students graduate from

high school, but only about 60 percent enroll in higher education right away. Unfortunately, an even lower percentage of Maine students go on to actually earn a degree, often leaving them with debt and without the credential.

The Success for Rural Students and Communities Act would help by encouraging the creation of community partnerships to promote strategies that make it easier for rural students to access college and career pathways. Community stakeholders—such as local school districts, colleges and universities, regional economic development entities, and community organizations—would join together to help students and their families navigate higher education opportunities and address barriers that too often stand in their way.

For example, many of these students are the first in their families to attend college, so they may have a more difficult time finding information about financial aid or selecting an educational program that meets their needs. Partnerships could work together to expose students to college campuses, courses, programs, and internships. They could also focus on the enrollment and completion rates of rural nontraditional students who did not pursue or complete postsecondary education after high school but may find they need additional credentials to pursue their chosen career path.

To help rural students gain the skills and experience needed to enter and succeed in the workforce, partnerships would also be encouraged to develop strategies for putting students on pathways into the high-demand jobs available in their communities. For example, partnerships could test various work-based learning opportunities, including apprenticeships, internships, and a sequence of courses on the path to a certain skill or job. By helping to connect students with good-paying jobs where they live, this bill would also ensure that rural communities benefit from their students' success.

In Maine's Aroostook County, the Aroostook Aspirations Initiative is using this model to help put students on pathways to academic and career success in their communities. The initiative collaborates with local community colleges and universities and with area businesses to offer seminars that guide students throughout their college educations. These seminars cover topics like time and stress management, budgeting and finances, goal setting, and transitioning from college to career. Certain seminars are focused on providing a more detailed look at various career fields, such as nursing, education, criminal justice/law enforcement, and banking/financial services. Students can also team up with employers in the area through internships that give them experience in the careers they wish to pursue.

Since 2012, the Aroostook Aspirations Initiative has served over 190 students, known as Gauvin Scholars, named for

Ray and Sandy Gauvin, who started the program. According to the initiative, their students have a 94-percent college graduation rate—well above the rate for their local colleges overall—and more than 90 percent of Gauvin Scholars remain in Aroostook County to live and work. Students who have participated in the initiative say it has helped them develop networking skills and make connections with employers throughout their communities.

The Success for Rural Students and Communities Act would support dynamic programs such as the Aroostook Aspirations Initiative and help students across the country who are seeking to achieve their college and career dreams. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 118—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CLELA ROREX, A PIONEERING COUNTY CLERK WHO, IN 1975, ADVANCED CIVIL RIGHTS FOR ALL COUPLES SEEKING TO BE MARRIED

Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 118

Whereas Clela Ann Rorex (referred to in this preamble as “Clela”) was born in Denver on July 23, 1943;

Whereas Clela's mother, Ruby Rorex, was a dance and theater teacher, and her father, Cecil Rorex, served for 30 years as clerk of Routt County, Colorado, where Clela grew up in Steamboat Springs;

Whereas Clela earned her bachelor's degree from the University of Colorado Boulder in 1973 and a master's degree in Public Administration from the University of Colorado Denver in 1981;

Whereas, in January 1975, at the age of 31, Clela became Boulder County Clerk and Recorder;

Whereas, in 1975, when a same-sex couple requested a marriage license in Boulder County, Clela consulted the assistant district attorney and learned that Colorado state laws did not specifically prohibit granting a marriage license to a same-sex couple;

Whereas, as a newly-elected county clerk, Clela issued a marriage license to Dave McCord and Dave Zamora, the first marriage license issued to a same-sex couple in the United States;

Whereas Clela was quoted in 2016 as saying, “After having been so deeply involved in the women's rights movements, who was I to then deny a right to anyone else? It wasn't my job to legislate morality.”;

Whereas, after issuing the first marriage license to a same-sex couple in 1975, Clela issued 5 more marriage licenses to same-sex couples over the next month;

Whereas national news outlets circulated Clela's groundbreaking story, after which she reported receiving a deluge of death threats and condemnation in hundreds of letters and phone calls to the Boulder County Clerk's office;

Whereas, despite the threats, Clela continued her advocacy efforts on behalf of the LGBTQ community, including by marching,

volunteering, and donating to LGBTQ efforts for decades;

Whereas, in 2014, a series of court rulings cleared the way for same-sex marriages in Colorado, and, in 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States legalized same-sex marriage nationwide, 40 years after Clela issued the first same-sex marriage license in the United States;

Whereas Clela was 78 years old when she died on June 19, 2022, in Longmont, Colorado;

Whereas, due to her advocacy for human rights, Boulder County, Colorado, declared July 23, 2022, to be “Clela Rorex Day”;

Whereas Clela should be recognized for her leadership as a national civil rights leader, paving the way for countless individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the contributions of Clela Rorex as a pioneer for civil rights and same-sex marriage;

(B) the respect and bravery Clela Rorex demonstrated when issuing the first same-sex marriage license in the United States; and

(C) the courage Clela Rorex exhibited following the threats she received when she issued marriage licenses to same-sex couples; and

(2) designates March 26, 2023, as “Clela Rorex Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—RECOGNIZING THE 202ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. COONS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. FETTERMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 119

Whereas the people of ancient Greece developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the founding fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek language, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas Petros Mavromichalis, the former Commander in Chief of Greece and a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821, “It is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.”;

Whereas, in an October 21, 1823, letter to Greek scholar Adamantios Koraes discussing

the ongoing Greek struggle for independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote that “[n]o people sympathise more feelingly than ours with the sufferings of your countrymen, none offer more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success”;

Whereas, on January 19, 1824, in a speech in support of his resolution to send an American envoy to Greece amid its struggle for independence, then-Congressman Daniel Webster recognized “the struggle of an interesting and gallant people...contending against fearful odds, for being, and for the common privilege of human nature”;

Whereas individual American Philhellenes, including future abolitionist Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, future abolitionist Jonathan Peckham Miller, and George Jarvis, traveled to Greece to fight alongside and provide aid to the Greek people in their struggle for independence;

Whereas the people of the United States generously sent humanitarian assistance to the people of Greece during their struggle for independence, often through philhellene committees;

Whereas Greece heroically resisted Axis forces at a crucial moment in World War II, forcing Adolf Hitler to change his timeline and delaying the attack on Russia;

Whereas Winston Churchill said that “if there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know which the outcome of World War II would have been” and “no longer will we say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks”;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Greeks were killed during World War II;

Whereas Greece consistently allied with the United States in major international conflicts throughout its history as a modern state;

Whereas the United States has demonstrated its support for the trilateral partnership of Greece, Israel, and Cyprus by enacting into law the Eastern Mediterranean Security and Energy Partnership Act of 2019 (title II of division J of Public Law 116-94) and through joint engagement with Greece, Israel, and Cyprus in the “3+1” format;

Whereas this support was bolstered in the United States-Greece Defense and Interparliamentary Partnership Act of 2021 (sub-title B of title XIII of Public Law 117-81), establishing a 3+1 Interparliamentary Group to discuss the expansion of co-operation in other areas of common concern;

Whereas the United States and Greece’s commitment to security cooperation led to the conclusion of a Mutual Defense Cooperation Agreement, which was updated in 2021, in order to enhance defense ties between the two countries and promote stability in the broader region;

Whereas the ongoing United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue reflects Greece’s importance to the United States as a geostrategic partner, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean and Balkans, and as an important NATO ally;

Whereas Secretary of State Antony Blinken traveled to Greece in February 2023, for the fourth United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue and along with the Prime Minister of Greece, Kyriakos Mitsotakis and Foreign Minister Nikos Dendias reaffirmed the importance of the United States-Greece relationship and pledged to continue and increase cooperation based on shared values and interests;

Whereas Greece and the United States have joined their democratic allies in standing in support of Ukraine following Russia’s unprovoked invasion and in December 2022, Foreign Minister of Greece Nikos Dendias said Greece’s “support towards the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Ukraine is principled and unwavering”;

Whereas the Government and people of Greece actively participate in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas Greece remains an integral part of the European Union;

Whereas the Greek-American community has greatly contributed to American society and has helped forge the strong ties between the United States and Greece;

Whereas the Governments and people of Greece and the United States are at the forefront of efforts to advance freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those efforts and similar ideals have forged a close bond between the peoples of Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2023, Greek Independence Day, with the people of Greece and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which those two great countries were founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends sincere congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 202nd anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed;

(3) commends the Greek-American community for its contributions to the United States and its role as a bridge between the two countries;

(4) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 202 years ago; and

(5) commends Greece’s support for the people of Ukraine in their fight for freedom against Russian aggression.

SENATE RESOLUTION 120—DESIGNATING MARCH 23, 2023, AS “NATIONAL WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE DAY”

Ms. ERNST (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. WICKER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 120

Whereas the United States proudly recognizes agriculture as one of the most impactful industries of the United States, and acknowledges the countless women who

help agriculture prosper both in the United States and abroad;

Whereas there are more than 1,200,000 female agricultural producers in the United States, making up more than 1/3 of the agricultural producers in the United States;

Whereas, in 2017, farms operated by women in the United States sold \$148,000,000,000 in agricultural products, accounting for 38 percent of the total agriculture sales in the United States for that year;

Whereas, in addition to leading farming operations, women working in agriculture make a difference across the United States in various commodity and industry fields, including research and development, manufacturing, sales and distribution, agricultural education, and agribusiness and advocacy, which extend benefits to individuals across the globe through the international trade of the United States;

Whereas the United States recognizes that women are vital in fostering the next generation of the agricultural workforce by promoting science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (commonly known as “STEM”) and agricultural education and entrepreneurial and community initiatives by serving as mentors for the 4-H Program, the National FFA Organization, the Cooperative Extension System, and numerous postsecondary agricultural science educator programs;

Whereas March is National Women’s History Month; and

Whereas female professionals, instructors, and leaders in the agricultural field should be celebrated for their efforts during National Ag Week, which takes place between March 20 and March 24, 2023: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 23, 2023, as “National Women in Agriculture Day”;

(2) recognizes the important role of women in agriculture as producers, educators, leaders, mentors, and more; and

(3) encourages all citizens to—

(A) recognize women working in agriculture; and

(B) praise the significant positive impact those women have on the food resources and the agricultural workforce of the United States by encouraging and empowering women to—

(i) enter the agricultural field, which is a high-demand field of work;

(ii) cultivate opportunities to lead; and

(iii) feed a hungry world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 121—DESIGNATING APRIL 5, 2023, AS “GOLD STAR WIVES DAY”

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 121

Whereas the Senate honors the sacrifices made by the spouses and families of the fallen members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. represents the spouses and families of the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability;

Whereas the primary mission of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. is to provide services, support, and friendship to the spouses of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, in 1945, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was organized with the help of Eleanor Roosevelt to assist the families left behind by the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was held on April 5, 1945;

Whereas April 5, 2023, marks the 78th anniversary of the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.;

Whereas the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States bear the burden of protecting the freedom of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the sacrifices of the families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States should never be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 5, 2023, as “Gold Star Wives Day”;

(2) honors and recognizes—

(A) the contributions of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.; and

(B) the dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Gold Star Wives Day to promote awareness of—

(A) the contributions and dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) the important role that Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. plays in the lives of the spouses and families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 122—COMMEMORATING THE 360TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTH CAROLINA NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 122

Whereas the North Carolina National Guard traces its roots to the Carolina Charter and the establishment of the Province of Carolina on March 24, 1663;

Whereas during the Revolutionary War, much of the organized militia of North Carolina became part of the North Carolina Line, fighting as far north as New York and as far south as Florida, including the Battle of Fort Moultrie, the Battle of Germantown, Valley Forge, and the Battle of Monmouth;

Whereas the unorganized militia fought in all of the battles in North Carolina, from the Battle of Moore’s Creek Bridge to the Battle of Guilford Courthouse;

Whereas, during the War of 1812, the militia of North Carolina provided coastal defense and a regiment of infantry during the Mexican War;

Whereas, in 1918, the 30th Division, consisting of units from the North Carolina National Guard and soldiers from South Carolina and Tennessee, fighting alongside other units from the United States and Australia, broke Germany’s Hindenburg Line, a decisive victory that helped bring World War I to an end;

Whereas the soldiers of the 30th Division received more Medals of Honor than any other division during World War I and more than half of the decorations given by the British to United States troops;

Whereas, in 1940, the 30th Division was one of the first 4 National Guard divisions called

into Federal service, a year before the United States entered World War II;

Whereas the 30th Division, now made up of 2 North Carolina Regiments (the 119th and 120th Infantry) and 1 Tennessee Regiment (the 117th Infantry), formed the nucleus of many new units that entered World War II ahead of their “mother division”;

Whereas, in 1948, the North Carolina Air National Guard was organized with an air defense mission;

Whereas the North Carolina Air National Guard was activated at the outbreak of the Korean War and a significant number of its personnel were assigned to Korea as individual replacements;

Whereas the North Carolina Army National Guard also saw several of its units activated for the Korean War, with engineer units deploying to Korea and members of anti-aircraft units deploying as individual replacements;

Whereas, in 1960, the mission of the North Carolina Air National Guard was changed from air defense to aeromedical transport;

Whereas, in 1966, the 145th Military Airlift Group of the North Carolina Air National Guard participated in aeromedical evacuation from war-torn Vietnam and was the first Air National Guard unit to fly into a conflict area in peacetime;

Whereas the North Carolina National Guard underwent multiple reorganizations after World War II, including the loss of the 30th Division, but the lineage of the 30th Division is perpetuated by the 30th Armored Brigade Combat Team;

Whereas, in the Gulf War, the North Carolina National Guard mobilized 4 battalions and 15 separate companies and detachments for service;

Whereas, since the tragedies of 9/11, North Carolina has deployed over 24,000 National Guard soldiers and airmen across the globe;

Whereas the National Guard is the oldest component of the United States military establishment and has a long and proud history stretching back 360 years;

Whereas, in war or peace, the North Carolina National Guard has been there, and will continue to be there, whenever or wherever needed by their country, their State, or their neighbor, as an “Always Ready – Ready Team”;

Whereas the North Carolina National Guard is currently composed of the 30th Armored Brigade Combat Team, 449th Combat Aviation Brigade, 130th Maneuver Enhancement Brigade, 113th Sustainment Brigade, 60th Troop Command, 139th Regiment, and 145th Airlift Wing;

Whereas, throughout its history, the North Carolina National Guard has protected and assisted their fellow North Carolinians during hurricanes, floods, winter storms, wildfires, and threats of violence;

Whereas North Carolina guardsmen have also assisted their fellow citizens following major disasters in other States, such as South Carolina, Louisiana, and South Dakota, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas March 24, 2023, marks the 360th anniversary of the North Carolina National Guard: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates March 24, 2023, as the 360th anniversary of the North Carolina National Guard; and

(2) commemorates and honors the continued service of the members of the North Carolina National Guard.

SENATE RESOLUTION 123—RECOGNIZING THE WEEK OF MARCH 19 THROUGH MARCH 25, 2023, AS “NATIONAL POISON PREVENTION WEEK” AND ENCOURAGING COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES TO RAISE AWARENESS OF THE DANGERS OF POISONING AND PROMOTE POISON PREVENTION

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 123

Whereas the designation of National Poison Prevention Week was first authorized by Congress and President Kennedy in 1961, in Public Law 87-319 (75 Stat. 681);

Whereas National Poison Prevention Week occurs during the third full week of March each year;

Whereas, in 2021 to 2022, poison centers managed more than 5,000,000 human exposure cases and information requests, including—

(1) opioid and fentanyl misuse;

(2) suicide attempts, including those among adolescents and teenagers; and

(3) accidental edible cannabis ingestion;

Whereas poison centers are on the front lines assisting throughout the United States with emergency disasters in our communities, including the East Palestine, Ohio, train derailment where Ohio poison centers are working around the clock with Federal, State, and local officials, as well as other poison centers including, the Pittsburgh Poison Center, to ensure that impacted communities have the resources they need to have their questions answered, and to provide guidance to local healthcare providers on how to assist people experiencing symptoms;

Whereas poison control centers responded during the COVID-19 pandemic to COVID-19 related surges by conducting poison safety and poisoning prevention outreach in a virtual format, and handled increases in cases relating to hand sanitizer and household cleaning products;

Whereas America’s Poison Centers works with the 55 poison control centers in the United States to track—

(1) more than 1,000 commonly used household and workplace products that can cause poisoning; and

(2) poisonings and the sources of those poisonings;

Whereas the National Poison Data System database contains over 447,000 products, ranging from viral and bacterial agents to commercial chemical and drug products;

Whereas local poison control centers save the people of the United States \$1,800,000,000 in medical costs annually;

Whereas America’s Poison Centers and poison control centers partner with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Food and Drug Administration, and State, local, Tribal, and territorial health departments to monitor occurrences of environmental, biological, and emerging threats in communities across the United States, including food poisoning, botulism, and vaping-associated lung injury;

Whereas, according to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, in 2020, an estimated 61,500 children younger than 5 years of age were treated in emergency rooms due to unintended poisonings;

Whereas, in 2021, children younger than 6 years of age constituted 41 percent of all poison exposures;

Whereas, from 2012 to 2022, the number of adolescents 10 to 19 years of age seen for a suicide attempt has nearly doubled, and that has disproportionately affected female adolescents;

Whereas, in 2022, more than 90,000 children 19 years of age and younger were treated in an emergency room due to unintended pediatric poisoning, and more than 90 percent of those incidents occurred in the home, most often with acetaminophen, edible cannabis, melatonin, ibuprofen, laundry packets, bleach, diphenhydramine, blood pressure medications, sedatives, and anti-anxiety medication;

Whereas, an analysis of the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System shows—

(1) an increased incidence of ingestion of dangerous foreign bodies like button batteries and high-powered magnets during the COVID-19 pandemic; and

(2) evidence that parents and caregivers sought care for foreign body ingestions either because they knew the relative danger of the object ingested or because they sought advice from available resources like the poison control centers;

Whereas 107,622 deaths due to drug overdose were reported in the United States in 2021, and the majority of those cases, approximately 71 percent, involved an opioid, primarily synthetic opioids like fentanyl;

Whereas, in 2021, the most common substances that individuals called the poison help line about were prescription and non-prescription pain relievers, household cleaning substances, cosmetics and personal care products, and antidepressants;

Whereas pain medications lead the list of the most common substances implicated in adult poison exposures, and are the single most frequent cause of pediatric fatalities reported to America's Poison Centers;

Whereas poison control centers issue guidance and provide support to individuals, including individuals who experience medication and dosing errors;

Whereas more than 40 percent of calls to the poison help line are from individuals 20 years of age or older, with nearly 50 percent of those calls involving patients older than 50 years of age, and a common reason for those calls is therapeutic errors, including questions regarding drug interactions, incorrect dosing route, timing of doses, and double doses;

Whereas normal, curious children younger than 6 years of age are in stages of growth and development in which they are constantly exploring and investigating the world around them, and are often unable to read or recognize warning labels;

Whereas America's Poison Centers engages in community outreach by educating the public on poison safety and poisoning prevention, and provides educational resources, materials, and guidelines to educate the public on poisoning prevention;

Whereas individuals can reach a poison control center from anywhere in the United States by calling the poison help line at 1-800-222-1222 or accessing PoisonHelp.org;

Whereas, despite regulations of the Consumer Product Safety Commission requiring that a child-resistant package be designed or constructed to be significantly difficult for children under 5 years of age to open, or obtain a harmful amount of the contents, within a reasonable time, children can still open child-resistant packages; and

Whereas, each year during National Poison Prevention Week, the Federal Government assesses the progress made by the Federal Government in saving lives and reaffirms the national commitment of the Federal Government to preventing injuries and deaths from poisoning; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the week of March 19 through March 25, 2023, as "National Poison Prevention Week";

(2) expresses gratitude for the people who operate or support poison control centers in their local communities;

(3) expresses gratitude for frontline workers supporting poison prevention during the COVID-19 pandemic;

(4) supports efforts and resources to provide poison prevention guidance or emergency assistance in response to poisonings; and

(5) encourages—

(A) the people of the United States to educate their communities and families about poison safety and poisoning prevention; and

(B) health care providers to practice and promote poison safety and poisoning prevention.

SENATE RESOLUTION 124—DESIGNATING MARCH 24TH, 2023, AS "NATIONAL WOMEN OF COLOR IN TECH DAY"

Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. PADILLA) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 124

Whereas National Women of Color in Tech Day acknowledges the challenges many women of color face in the field of technology (referred to in this preamble as "tech") and recognizes and emphasizes the importance of women of color in tech in the United States, including—

(1) Katherine Johnson, a former engineer at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) Marie Van Brittan Brown, who invented the first home security system; and

(3) Patricia Bath, who invented the Laserphaco Probe for the removal of cataracts;

Whereas evidence suggests that structural and social barriers in tech education, tech workforce development, the tech workforce, and venture capital investment in tech can disproportionately and negatively affect women of color;

Whereas women are underrepresented in tech and women of color often face additional systemic barriers in the tech ecosystem specifically and in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (referred to in this preamble as "STEM") fields generally;

Whereas underrepresented minority students often face an opportunity gap in STEM education in the United States;

Whereas women and girls of color often face an achievement gap in science and engineering education;

Whereas women and girls overall often face a large opportunity gap in computer science;

Whereas the competitiveness of the United States in the 21st-century global economy largely depends on developing STEM-literate citizens;

Whereas the demand for professionals in tech and computing fields is expected to increase substantially over the next decade;

Whereas, as of March 2023, data showed there were more than 750,000 open and unfilled cybersecurity jobs in the United States;

Whereas increasing the number of women of color in tech will be critical to building and maintaining a competitive tech workforce;

Whereas women of color currently make up 39 percent of the female population in the United States and are projected to make up the majority of women by 2060;

Whereas, according to a 2018 study by the Women of Color in Computing Research Collaborative, women of color in the United States earn less than 10 percent of the bachelor's degrees in computing and less than 5 percent of doctorates in computer science;

Whereas the low number of women of color in tech positions who have not received a bachelor's degree, or who earn certificates, demonstrates that women of color may not be taking sufficient advantage of alternative pathways for reskilling in computing-related areas or may not have adequate access or exposure to these pathways;

Whereas increasing the inclusion of women of color in the science and tech sectors can provide role models who can inspire students of all backgrounds and identities, including young girls of color;

Whereas diversity in any field incorporates different experiences and ideas that can ultimately lead to more creative and pioneering solutions to the current and future problems of the United States;

Whereas a May 2020 study by McKinsey and Company shows that companies with a diverse workforce often perform better, hire more qualified employees, have more engaged employees, and are better at retaining workers than companies that do not prioritize diversity;

Whereas communities of color are underrepresented in corporate leadership roles, including in the tech sector; and

Whereas a pipeline of qualified tech candidates of color is critical for future growth, particularly as the tech industry works to improve the recruiting, hiring, and retaining of candidates and employees of color: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 24, 2023, as "National Women of Color in Tech Day";

(2) recognizes the celebration of National Women of Color in Tech Day as a time to reflect on the many notable contributions that women of color have made to the field of technology in the United States;

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe National Women of Color in Tech Day with appropriate programs and activities;

(4) pledges to work to increase diversity and inclusion in the technology sector, including through robust plans to ensure recruitment, training, and retention of underrepresented minorities at all levels;

(5) commits to working to eliminate barriers to entering the technology sector faced by women of color and individuals from other underrepresented groups;

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to ensuring that all students have access to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (referred to in this resolution as "STEM") education for a 21st-century economy, including computer science education in particular;

(7) supports efforts to strengthen investments in, and collaborations with, educational institutions, including community colleges, historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Asian-American, Native American, and Pacific Islander-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions, and other minority-serving institutions, to sustain a pipeline of diverse STEM graduates ready to enter the technology sector; and

(8) urges the President to work with Congress to improve data collection, data

disaggregation, and dissemination of information for greater understanding and transparency of diversity in STEM education and across the workforce of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—CONDEMNING RUSSIA'S UNJUST AND ARBITRARY DETENTION OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION LEADER VLADIMIR KARAMURZA WHO HAS STOOD UP IN DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY, THE RULE OF LAW, AND FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS IN RUSSIA

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 7

Whereas, on April 11, 2022, Vladimir Kara-Murza was unjustly detained by Russian authorities for spreading supposedly “false information” in a speech in March 2022 to the Arizona House of Representatives;

Whereas Mr. Kara-Murza in his March 15, 2022, speech presented a defiant condemnation of Vladimir Putin’s policies and leadership outlining his corruption and malign intentions, and condemning the illegal war of aggression Putin has unleashed against Ukraine;

Whereas, prior to his arrest in April 2022, Mr. Kara-Murza was poisoned twice by agents of the Russian government and the Russian Federation in 2015 and 2017 with a military-grade agent banned internationally, likely in retaliation for his defiant stance in support of rule of law and democracy in Russia;

Whereas, despite having survived two assassination attempts and the subsequent side effects of these poisonings, Mr. Kara-Murza regularly returned to Russia to advocate for democratic representation in Russia;

Whereas Mr. Kara-Murza has consistently advocated for democracy in Russia and insisted that democracy in Russia must be advanced by Russians for all those living in Russia;

Whereas, in August 2022, new charges were brought against Mr. Kara-Murza for “carrying out the activities” of an “undesirable foreign organization” and his arrest was extended for his work as a leading member of Russian civil society;

Whereas, in October 2022, Mr. Kara-Murza was further charged unjustly with “high treason” in part due to his public condemnations of the Kremlin’s military aggression on Ukraine and domestic repressions;

Whereas Mr. Kara-Murza remains in pre-trial detention and faces a prison sentence of up to 24 years on high treason and other charges;

Whereas the state of Mr. Kara-Murza’s health has deteriorated and in addition to losing over 45 pounds, he was diagnosed with polyneuropathy, a condition that under Russian law should preclude him from his current detainment;

Whereas, as a result of his diagnosis, he has lost feeling in both his feet and has experienced symptoms similar to those he experienced following his 2015 poisoning due to peripheral nerve damage;

Whereas section 5599F of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117–263) condemned Mr. Kara-Murza’s unjust detention, expressed solidarity with Mr. Kara-Murza, his family, and all individuals imprisoned in Russia for their beliefs, and urged the United States and other ally governments to work

to secure the release of Mr. Kara-Murza and other citizens of the Russian Federation imprisoned for opposition to Vladimir Putin’s regime and his illegal war in Ukraine;

Whereas, in April 2022, Vladimir Kara-Murza was presented the McCain Institute’s Courage and Leadership Award for his unwavering commitment to fundamental values and his acts of selfless courage which have inspired the world;

Whereas, in October 2022, Mr. Kara-Murza was awarded the Vaclav Havel Prize honoring outstanding civil society action in defense of human rights;

Whereas the late Senator John McCain said Mr. Kara-Murza “is a brave, outspoken, and relentless advocate for freedom and democracy in Russia” and introduced Mr. Kara-Murza as “a personal hero whose courage, selflessness, and idealism I find awe-inspiring”;

Whereas, in March 2023, the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State imposed Global Magnitsky and other targeted sanctions on six Russians involved in Mr. Kara-Murza’s ongoing arbitrary detention, recognized his role as “a major advocate for the adoption of Magnitsky-style sanctions authorities by the United States, Canada, European Union, and United Kingdom to target human rights abusers and corrupt actors in Russia”, and called for his immediate release; and

Whereas Mr. Kara-Murza remains a political prisoner and a victim of Vladimir Putin’s authoritarian state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns in the strongest possible terms the unjust and arbitrary detention of Russian democratic opposition leader Vladimir Kara-Murza;

(2) calls on the Russian Federation to immediately release Mr. Kara-Murza and all other Russian opposition leaders who are detained as a result of their opposition to the Putin regime;

(3) calls on all Russian citizens to outright condemn Russia’s illegal and unjust invasion of Ukraine in the spirit of Mr. Kara-Murza’s defiant opposition stance in front of the Arizona House of Representatives in March 2022;

(4) expresses solidarity and calls for the release of all political prisoners in Russia and Belarus as well as Ukrainian citizens illegally held as prisoners by Putin’s regime in violation of the rule of law as a result of their support for liberal democratic values; and

(5) calls on the President of the United States and leaders from across the free world to work tirelessly for the release of political prisoners in Russia and increase support for those advocating for democracy in Russia as well as independent media and civil society which Mr. Kara-Murza has worked to further.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT TAX-EXEMPT FRATERNAL BENEFIT SOCIETIES HAVE HISTORICALLY PROVIDED AND CONTINUE TO PROVIDE CRITICAL BENEFITS TO THE PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RISCH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr.

MANCHIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 8

Whereas the fraternal benefit societies of the United States are longstanding mutual aid organizations created more than a century ago to serve the needs of communities and provide for the payment of life, health, accident, and other benefits to their members;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies represent a successful, modern-day model under which individuals come together with a common purpose to collectively provide charitable and other beneficial activities for society;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies operate under a chapter system, creating a nationwide infrastructure, combined with local energy and knowledge, which positions fraternal benefit societies to most efficiently address unmet needs in communities, many of which the government cannot address;

Whereas the fraternal benefit society model represents one of the largest member-volunteer networks in the United States, with approximately 7,000,000 people belonging to local chapters across the country;

Whereas research has shown that the value of the work of fraternal benefit societies to society averages more than \$3,800,000,000 per year, accounting for charitable giving, educational programs, and volunteer activities, as well as important social capital that strengthens the fabric, safety, and quality of life in thousands of local communities in the United States;

Whereas, in 1909, Congress recognized the value of fraternal benefit societies and exempted those organizations from taxation, as later codified in section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies have adapted since 1909 to better serve the evolving needs of their members and the public;

Whereas the efforts of fraternal benefit societies to help people of the United States save money and be financially secure relieves pressure on government safety net programs; and

Whereas Congress recognizes that fraternal benefit societies have served their original purpose for more than a century, helping countless individuals, families, and communities through fraternal member activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the fraternal benefit society model is a successful private sector economic and social support system that helps meet needs that would otherwise go unmet;

(2) the provision of payment for life, health, accident, or other benefits to the members of fraternal benefit societies in accordance with section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is necessary to support the charitable and fraternal activities of the volunteer chapters within the communities of fraternal benefit societies;

(3) fraternal benefit societies have adapted since 1909 to better serve their members and the public; and

(4) the exemption from taxation under section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of fraternal benefit societies continues to generate significant returns to the United States, and the work of fraternal benefit societies should continue to be promoted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 42. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 43. Mr. RISCH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 316, supra.

SA 44. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 45. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 46. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 42. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 10, delete “hereby repealed” and insert “repealed effective 30 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that legal authorities permitting the detention of terrorists and the litigation position of the United States regarding the detention of terrorists being held in whole or in part under the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) would not be weakened by such repeal”.

SA 43. Mr. RISCH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq; as follows:

On page 2, line 10, delete “hereby repealed” and insert “repealed effective 30 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that legal authorities permitting the detention of terrorists and the litigation position of the United States regarding the detention of terrorists held in whole or in part under the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) would not be weakened by such repeal”.

SA 44. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. DECLASSIFIED LIST.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall publish a declassified list of nations, organizations, or persons the United States is using force against or authorized to use force against pursuant to section 2(a) of the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 115 Stat. 224; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) (commonly known as the “2001 AUMF”).

SA 45. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force

against Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN DRUG CARTELS AS FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Drug Cartel Terrorist Designation Act”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that each of the drug cartels referred to in subsection (d) meets the criteria for designation as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(c) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

- (1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;
- (2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;
- (3) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;
- (4) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;
- (5) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;
- (6) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;
- (7) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;
- (8) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;
- (9) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;
- (10) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;
- (11) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and
- (12) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(d) **DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall designate each of the following Mexican drug cartels as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)):

(A) The Reynosa/Los Metros faction of the Gulf Cartel.

(B) The Cartel Del Noreste faction of Los Zetas.

(C) The Jalisco New Generation Cartel.

(D) The Sinaloa Cartel.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CARTELS.**—The Secretary of State shall designate any Mexican drug cartel, or any faction of such a cartel, as a foreign terrorist organization if such cartel or faction meets the criteria described in such section 219(a).

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit a detailed report to the appropriate committees of Congress regarding—

(A) each of the drug cartels referred to in subsection (d)(1) that describes the criteria justifying their designations as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)); and

(B) all other Mexican drug cartels, or factions of cartels, that the Secretary determines pursuant to subsection (d)(2) meet the criteria for designation as foreign terrorist organizations under such section 219(a), including the specific criteria justifying each such designation.

(2) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex;

(B) shall be made available only in electronic form; and

(C) may not be printed, except upon a request for a printed copy from a congressional office.

SA 46. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REVOCATION OF DESIGNATION AS FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.

Section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (5) or (6)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (5)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (5)(B)”; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (5) through (7) and inserting the following:

“(5) **REVOCATION.**—

“(A) **BY AN ACT OF CONGRESS.**—The Congress, by an Act of Congress, may block or revoke a designation made under paragraph (1).

“(B) **BASED ON CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), the Secretary shall revoke a designation made under paragraph (1) with respect to a particular organization if the Secretary determines, after completing a review in accordance with subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (4), that—

“(I) the circumstances that were the basis for the designation have changed in such a manner as to warrant such revocation; or

“(II) the national security of the United States warrants such revocation.

“(ii) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—A revocation under this subparagraph may not take effect before the date that is 45 days after the date on which the Secretary, by classified communication, submits written notification to the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore, the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate, and the members of the relevant committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of the Secretary’s determination under clause (i), including the justification for such determination.

“(C) **JOINT RESOLUTION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A revocation under subparagraph (B) shall not take effect with respect to a particular organization if Congress, during the 45-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary notifies Congress pursuant to clause (ii), enacts a joint resolution containing the following statement after the resolving clause: ‘That the proposed revocation of the designation of

_____ as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)(1)) pursuant to the notification submitted to the Congress on _____ is prohibited.’, with the first blank to be completed with the name of the foreign terrorist organization that is the subject of such proposed revocation and the second blank to be completed with the appropriate date.

“(ii) **EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.**—A joint resolution described in clause (i) and introduced within the appropriate 45-day period shall be considered in the Senate and in the House of Representatives in accordance with the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (x).

“(iii) **COMMITTEE REFERRAL.**—A joint resolution described in clause (i) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. A joint

resolution described in subclause (I) that is introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. Such a resolution may not be reported before the eighth day after its introduction.

“(iv) DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution described in clause (i) is referred does not report such resolution (or an identical resolution) within 15 days after its introduction—

“(I) such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such resolution; and

“(II) such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

“(v) PRIVILEGED MOTION.—When the committee to which a resolution is referred has reported, or has been deemed to be discharged from further consideration of, a resolution described in clause (i), notwithstanding any rule or precedent of the Senate, including Rule 22, it is at any time thereafter in order (even if a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, and all points of order against the resolution (and against consideration of the resolution) are waived. The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed.

“(vi) DEBATE.—Debate on a joint resolution described in clause (i), and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to the joint resolution, a motion to postpone, a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

“(vii) VOTE.—Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in clause (i), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the vote on final passage of the resolution shall occur.

“(viii) APPEALS.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in clause (i) shall be decided without debate.

“(ix) PROCEDURES.—If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of the Senate described in clause (i), the Senate receives a joint resolution described in clause (i) from the House of Representatives—

“(I) the resolution of the House of Representatives shall not be referred to a committee;

“(II) with respect to a joint resolution of the Senate described in clause (i)—

“(aa) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if not resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; and

“(bb) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the House of Representatives; and

“(III) upon disposition of the joint resolution received from the House of Representatives, it shall no longer be in order to consider the joint resolution that originated in the Senate.

“(x) SENATE ACTION.—If the Senate receives a joint resolution described in clause (i) from the House of Representatives after the Senate has disposed of a joint resolution described in clause (i) that originated in the Senate, the action of the Senate regarding the disposition of the Senate originated resolution shall be deemed to be the action of the Senate with regard to the joint resolution that originated in the House of Representatives.

“(D) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—The revocation of a designation under this paragraph shall not affect any action or proceeding based on conduct committed before the effective date of such revocation.”; and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (6).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 23, 2023, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 23, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 23, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 23, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 23, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 23, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMEMORATING THE 360TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTH CAROLINA NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 122, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 122) commemorating the 360th anniversary of the North Carolina National Guard.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 122) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, and upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy: the Honorable MARIA CANTWELL of Washington (ex officio as Chair, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation) and the Honorable MARK KELLY of Arizona.

The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public Law 102-586 and Public Law 111-211, and after consultation with the Republican Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Lourdes Rosado of New York (2 year term).

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 27, 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 27; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 25, S. 316; further, that the filing

deadline for first-degree amendments be at 3:30 p.m. and the cloture motion filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MARCH 27, 2023, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:11 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 27, 2023, at 3 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING 75 SEASONS OF SKY TAVERN'S JUNIOR SKI PROGRAM

HON. MARK E. AMODEI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sky Tavern, a local nonprofit that is celebrating the 75th season of their Junior Ski Program.

Located just 30 minutes from Reno, Sky Tavern was one of the area's earliest ski resorts. Motivated by her belief that sports were good for children, local skier and school-teacher Marce Herz convinced the resort owners to begin an affordable learn-to-ski program in 1948.

Since then, Sky Tavern's Junior Ski Program has taught over 100,000 area youth how to ski and snowboard.

Sky Tavern has switched hands a few times over the decades; most recently in 1991, when a group of dedicated parents formed the current non-profit organization that manages the Junior Ski Program and maintains the property. Today, the Sky Tavern Junior Ski Program is the oldest and largest volunteer staffed ski school in the United States.

Notable alumni of the program include David Wise, Olympic gold medalist in the halfpipe, and Tamara McKinney, one of the top American alpine racers.

While this program has turned out some of our nation's best skiers, I would suggest that Sky Tavern's most significant achievement has been to make skiing, snowboarding, and other winter sports more accessible for local children.

Winter sports are a way of life in northern Nevada. From keeping the prices low to helping children with disabilities enjoy the slopes alongside their peers, Sky Tavern has reached countless children who would not otherwise have had the opportunity to participate in this great northern Nevada tradition.

I commend the team at Sky Tavern for carrying on Marce Herz's noble vision and positively impacting the lives of Nevada's children.

RECOGNIZING MS. ANNA MARIA HODGES

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Anna Maria Hodges who became the first woman of color and Afro-Latina to hold the position of Clerk of Circuit Court of Milwaukee County, Wisconsin. Ms. Hodges is a consummate professional with decades of hard-earned experience, leadership abilities, impressive work ethic, and commitment to justice and innovation.

Elected by the people of Milwaukee County on November 8, 2022, Ms. Hodges assumed

office on January 2, 2023, and directs the administrative, recordkeeping, and clerical services that support the Milwaukee County Circuit Court.

Ms. Hodges leads a staff of nearly 300 employees, supervises the management of approximately 150,000 annual cases, and administers a budget exceeding \$42 million. In addition to her statutory duties as the Clerk of Circuit Court, Ms. Hodges serves pursuant to the Milwaukee County General Ordinances as Director of the Milwaukee County Division of Court Services, supervising additional fiscal and administrative services supporting court operations, and provides direction to Milwaukee County's Jury Management Office.

As the Clerk of Circuit Court, Ms. Hodges continues upon her nearly three decades of work expanding public access to our justice system and ensuring efficient court operations. Ms. Hodges' priorities include achieving excellence in customer service, increasing professional development and training opportunities for her office's dedicated personnel, and responsibly administering the records and funding entrusted to her office. Ms. Hodges' service as Clerk of Circuit Court marks only the most recent step in a three-decade career in public service.

A public servant for nearly 30 years, Ms. Hodges previously served as Acting Clerk of Circuit Court in early 2022, Chief Deputy Clerk of Circuit Court from 2018 to 2022, and as Assistant Chief Deputy Clerk of Circuit Court and Civil Division Administrator from 2006 to 2018. She has also served as Court Coordinator and Deputy Director of Litigation Services for the First Judicial Administrative District, as Deputy Director of the Milwaukee Office of former Governor Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin, and as Constituent Services Specialist in the office of former Milwaukee County Executive Francis Thomas Ament.

A resident of Brown Deer, Wisconsin, Ms. Hodges graduated magna cum laude from Cardinal Stritch University with a Bachelor of Science in Management. She is a proud mother and grandmother and is active in her community and church.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I am honored to recognize Anna Maria Hodges and her lifelong commitment to public service and Wisconsin. I look forward to seeing Ms. Hodges' contributions and accomplishments as Clerk of Circuit Court.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF LITTLE SILVER

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Borough of Little Silver, New Jersey on the 100th anniversary of its incorporation. It is my honor to join with its officials

and residents in celebration of this historic milestone.

A part of Shrewsbury Township until 1923, Little Silver has evolved from farmland, woods, and saltwater marshes to a bustling suburb of diverse restaurants, specialty shops, and small businesses. With its location on the water and its proximity to New York City, the area has attracted visitors from the north that have transformed Little Silver from a seasonal resort to the community it is today. Despite its development over the years, Little Silver has maintained its distinct charm and character.

Tracing its history back before its incorporation, the borough has several historical landmarks including its railroad station, post office (which now serves as a museum), and Sickles Market, that began as a farm stand over 100 years ago and is still in operation today. In the 1800s, John T. Lovett opened a nursery that became the largest employer in the area and well known across the country, supplying national retail businesses such as Sears Roebuck. Many of the town's residents can trace their roots back generations. One of the oldest sites in the borough, the Parker Homestead, was inhabited by the same family for 300 years, who were original settlers of the area.

In its 100th year, the borough is governed by Mayor Robert Neff and council members Kevin Brennan, Chris Smith, Donald Galante, Michael Holzappel, Doug Christensen, and Stephanie Brannagan.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in marking the 100th anniversary of the Borough of Little Silver and celebrating its rich history.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 40th anniversary of the Leadership Council Southwestern Illinois.

The Leadership Council Southwestern Illinois was chartered in 1983 and now serves over 230 members who are dedicated, community-minded leaders in industry, education, the military, and government throughout the Metro East region.

Assisting institutions throughout the counties of Bond, Calhoun, Clinton, Jersey, Macoupin, Monroe, St. Clair, and Washington, the Leadership Council Southwestern Illinois helps to unify the region for growth by promoting general welfare and economic development.

The Leadership Council Southwestern Illinois' many accomplishments include the re-accreditation of the Southwestern Illinois

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Levee System, helping earn three Abilene Trophies for building a strong and vibrant community surrounding Scott Air Force Base, catalyzing economic growth through a regional development plan, and leading numerous important infrastructure projects including major river bridge improvements in the last decade.

Please join me in congratulating the Leadership Council Southwestern Illinois on its 40th anniversary and wishing the council continued success in strengthening our communities for years to come.

RECOGNIZING CPL. HELEN M.
LATTAL

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of the late Corporal Helen M. Lattal, a proud World War II veteran who passed away in March at the age of 103.

Helen enlisted in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) in 1942. In 1943, President Roosevelt transformed the WAAC into the Women's Army Corps, giving women full military status. She served in the headquarters of the 8th Air Force of the Army Air Corps under the command of Gen. Jimmy Doolittle.

After the war, she returned to the United States and worked as a counselor for soldiers. In her later years, she would serve as a volunteer with the Red Cross. She was a 57-year member of the American Legion where she served a term as post commander.

Cpl. Lattal's life's work is an example of the patriotism, sacrifice, and commitment we associate with the military. We are grateful for her dedication to this country, and we will miss her.

HONORING COUNCILMAN JIM
BULLARD

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to commemorate the life of former Piscataway Councilman Jim Bullard. Councilman Bullard passed away on February 15, 2023, after a life filled with numerous personal and professional accomplishments.

Throughout his life, Councilman Bullard exhibited hard work and an interest in learning. The son of James and Eileen Bullard, Councilman Bullard was born and raised in the Bahamas. He graduated high school at the age of 12 and worked various jobs where he consistently demonstrated character and leadership before moving to the United States to continue his education. He received his associates degree from Miami-Dade Community College and his bachelor's degree from Lowell Technological Institute (UMass Lowell). He worked as an electrical engineer for RCA, Honeywell, and AT&T Bell Labs. He remained at AT&T for 29 years until his retirement in 2006.

Elected to represent Ward 2 on the Piscataway Township Council in 2010, Councilman Bullard served three terms, until De-

cember 2022, and led the Council as President in 2013. Throughout his tenure, Councilman Bullard promoted senior services, recreational programs for children, and improvements to parks.

A long-time advocate for seniors, Councilman Bullard served on the Senior Citizen Advisory Commission and the Office of Aging & Disabled Services Advisory Council and helped start the Senior Buddy Program which partners high school seniors with senior citizens to improve computer skills.

In addition to his work with the senior population, Councilman Bullard volunteered his time with the Piscataway Little League, Piscataway Community Television, the Metlar-Bodine House Museum, and the Piscataway Recreation Board, among others. He was deservedly recognized for his efforts by various organizations, including the Jersey Access Group, Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital, and the Middle Atlantic Regional Babe Ruth Baseball Hall of Fame.

Councilman Bullard received a heart transplant in 2006. As he did throughout his life, Councilman Bullard approached transplant surgery with determination and a positive attitude, recovering quickly and devoting time to supporting organ donation programs and patients. He helped raise funds for organ donation for Hahnemann University and served as President of the Second Chance Heart Transplant Chapter and Support Group.

Councilman Bullard leaves behind a loving family, including his beloved wife of 45 years, Lois, their children, grandchildren, and his siblings. His generous spirit was a joy to everyone he met, and he will be remembered fondly by all those whose lives he impacted.

Mr. Speaker, Councilman Bullard was a dedicated public servant and an active member of the community. He was deeply committed to serving the residents of Piscataway and his leadership and enthusiasm will truly be missed. I know I join with his family, friends, colleagues, and community in paying tribute to his memory.

PROVIDING APPROPRIATE RECOGNITION AND TREATMENT NEEDED TO ENHANCE RELATIONS WITH ASEAN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 2023

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for passage of the PARTNER with ASEAN Act, bipartisan legislation I introduced with Congresswoman YOUNG KIM of California to strengthen the longstanding relationship between the United States and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

For nearly six decades, ASEAN has worked to promote stability, prosperity, and multilateral cooperation in Southeast Asia and has become a critical part of the diplomatic architecture of the broader Indo-Pacific. Together, the ten member nations of ASEAN represent the world's fourth-largest market, and U.S. trade with ASEAN accounts for hundreds of billions of dollars a year. Last fall, the U.S. and ASEAN agreed to elevate their relationship to a Comprehensive Strategic Partnership.

In 2017, I co-founded the Congressional ASEAN Caucus with Congresswoman ANN WAGNER to foster greater dialogue on Capitol Hill around issues related to Southeast Asia. Today's consideration of the PARTNER with ASEAN Act comes from years of bipartisan work by our Caucus, and I also want to recognize the contributions of the bill's original co-sponsor Representative Steve Chabot, who was a leader on Asia policy issues in Congress for many years.

The United States was the first non-member country to appoint an ambassador to ASEAN, and Congress has long recognized the regional and global importance of ASEAN. Despite the bipartisan consensus about the importance of ASEAN centrality, the United States has yet to accord ASEAN the routine diplomatic privileges that we provide to similar groupings like the Organization of American States, African Union, or European Union.

The PARTNER with ASEAN Act would authorize ASEAN to be designated as an international organization with full diplomatic privileges and open new avenues for U.S.-ASEAN cooperation, including the potential establishment of an ASEAN mission in the United States. It has bipartisan support in the Senate, where a companion bill was introduced earlier this month, and President Biden has committed to signing the bill into law once it reaches his desk.

At a time of increased global focus on the Indo-Pacific, the PARTNER with ASEAN Act makes a simple change that will have an outsized impact on our international relations. I thank Congresswoman KIM for her partnership on this bill, and I also want to recognize the work of Erik Ashida, who served on my staff until last month and played an instrumental role in moving this legislation forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the swift and bipartisan passage of the PARTNER with ASEAN Act and applaud the longstanding commitment of this body to maintaining strong relationships with our partners in the Indo-Pacific.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH
BIRTHDAY OF DAVID FULSTONE

HON. MARK E. AMODEI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my Happy Birthday wishes to Mr. David Fulstone, who will celebrate his 100th birthday on Saturday, April 1, 2023.

David Hill Fulstone was born on April 1, 1923, in San Francisco, California as the second of five children to the late Fred and Dr. Mary Fulstone. Raised in Nevada's Smith Valley on the family sheep ranching operation, the values of hard work and service were instilled in David at an early age. Throughout his youth, he worked as a ranch hand, and especially loved sheep camp.

He was also the star of the Smith Valley Bulldogs basketball team, before graduating in 1942. After high school, David pursued his passion and bought his own farm, growing hay, garlic, and onions.

In 1945, David married his best girl and forever dance partner, Angelina Margaroli. They were faithfully married for 63 years until

Angelina's passing in 2008. Over the years, they were blessed with two children, DeeAnn Fulstone and David Hill Fulstone II, and four grandchildren.

David was an active member of the Farm Bureau, traveling across the country to many of the annual meetings and advocating on behalf of Nevada's farmers and ranchers. He even received the Farmer of Year Award, the result of his tireless support of the agriculture community.

While David retired from farming in 2010, he continued to love gardening and often shared the rewards of his labor with everyone in town.

David's contributions to his community go beyond farming. From becoming the longest and oldest member of the Yerington Rotary Club to serving as a board member of the Lyon County Hospital Council, northern Nevada has benefited greatly from his time and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me and the people of Nevada in honoring this outstanding citizen and family man on his 100th birthday.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBERT
PRAETZEL

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Robert "Bob" Praetzel, an extraordinary conservationist, attorney, and community leader, who passed away on February 4, 2023, at the age of 97.

Bob was born in San Francisco in 1925 and spent most of his life in Marin County, where he developed a passion for nature hiking on Mount Tam and fishing in San Pablo Bay. He joined the Navy during World War II and spent three years in the allied forces. After the war, Bob pursued his education at the College of Marin, UC Berkeley, and Hastings Law School. His professional career spanned 60-years in Estate Planning and Probate.

Bob became a renowned pioneer in protecting Marin County's open space. As one of the lawyers who challenged the development of the largest real estate projects in the county, Bob is credited with preserving the Marin Headlands and creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. His efforts have immeasurably shaped the landscape of Marin and will live on through the conservation of its natural beauty for years to come.

Bob was also a passionate community volunteer, serving on numerous philanthropic and conservation boards in Marin County. He served as President of the Marin Bar Association and was founder and President of the Estate Planning Council. Additionally, he was an active volunteer for many charitable organizations and worked hard to secure funding for environmental groups such as the Trust for Public Land, Cal Trout, Ducks Unlimited, Resources Renewal Institute, and the Marin Agricultural Land Trust.

Bob is remembered as an avid outdoorsman who enjoyed backpacking, hiking, and duck hunting, and shared many adventures with his wife of 66 years, Nancy, and their four children, Susanna, Matt, Eugenia, and Anne

Marie. Even in his mid-90s, Bob was still active and highly motivated by his family, referring to them as his pride and joy. He leaves behind his wife, children, numerous grandchildren, and his siblings, Lola Saylor and Patrick Praetzel.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Robert Praetzel was a well-respected community figure who will be missed, and whose many contributions to the region are a legacy worthy of congressional recognition. Please join me in extending condolences to Bob's family and many friends, and in expressing my deep appreciation for the positive impact he has left on the community and the environment.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF DETECTIVE SERGEANT
MASON GRIFFITH

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of fallen officer Detective Sergeant Mason Griffith.

Detective Sergeant Griffith exemplifies small town America and the commitment to service. He was a Detective Sergeant of the Hermann Police Department, the Chief of Police of the Rosebud Police Department, a Reserve Deputy of Gasconade County Sheriff's Department and a member of the Gerald-Rosebud Fire Department. On March 12, Sergeant Griffith was shot and killed in the line of duty. He leaves behind a loving wife, two children, and an entire community who will deeply miss him.

This tragedy stands as a somber reminder to our Nation that law enforcement officers and their families sacrifice every single day to ensure our families are safe. We will never have another Sergeant Griffith, and for that our entire community is worse off. We will forever remember him as a man committed to his family and community and as a hero who gave his life to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in offering our deepest condolences to the Griffith family, his fellow officers, and the entire community who are suffering this tragedy.

TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST
CANCER DAY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a congresswoman and a champion of health care initiatives, and as an advocate for breast cancer survivors, I rise today to commemorate Triple Negative Breast Cancer Day.

Breast cancer is a devastating disease that affects far too many of us. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, about one in eight women will get breast cancer in her life, impacting hundreds of thousands of Americans each year.

I am particularly concerned about the disparities in breast cancer that leave women of color even more vulnerable to this deadly dis-

ease. While the many reasons are complex, it is critical that we continue to support research to get answers and to break down barriers to help save lives. For example, I have long been concerned about the impact of breast density, which can make cancers more difficult to detect on a mammogram. Additionally, dense breasts have been identified as a risk factor for developing breast cancer, according to the FDA. I applaud the FDA for its recent efforts to help ensure that patients are provided with accurate and timely information about the impact that breast density and other factors can have on the risk for developing breast cancer as part of a comprehensive breast health strategy.

Yet, we have so much more to do to help save lives especially when it comes to aggressive and deadly forms of breast cancer, like triple negative breast cancer. Women with triple-negative breast cancer often face a worse prognosis and limited treatment options.

This is why we need to increase funding for research for breast cancer, including for those who are fighting the triple negative variety. We need to find better ways to detect it early and to develop new treatments that will give women with triple-negative breast cancer better options in their fight against cancer.

But funding for more research is not enough. We also need to ensure equity and access to high quality and affordable treatments for all those with breast cancer, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. Women from marginalized communities often face barriers to accessing care such as high co-pays for additional testing beyond a basic mammogram, and we must work to break down those barriers.

No woman should have to fight breast cancer alone, and no woman should be denied the care she needs because of where she comes from or how much money she makes. We must come together as a community to ensure that all fighting breast cancer have access to the care and treatment they need.

I urge my colleagues to join me in the fight against breast cancer and to support increased investments in critical research for those battling triple-negative and other forms of breast cancer research and ensuring equity and access to care for all women with breast cancer.

NOW IS THE TIME TO UPDATE
RAIL SAFETY AND CONNECTIVITY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in the past five months, we have seen three major Norfolk Southern train derailments in Ohio, including one that occurred in my district, and another which traveled right through the heart of my district in northwest Ohio before it burst into flames in East Palestine.

It's been more than a month since that Norfolk Southern train disaster in East Palestine, Ohio. Twenty of the 38 railcars that derailed were carrying dangerous chemicals; now hundreds of Ohio and Pennsylvania families are rightfully frightened that their water is contaminated. Since then, another train derailed 28 railcars in Springfield, Ohio. Thankfully no hazardous contaminants spilled.

These accidents follow a dangerous 21-car Norfolk Southern derailment last October in Sandusky—in my district. There, paraffin was spilled onto the street and washed into and clogged the town's sewer system. For nearly five months the vital main artery into Sandusky remained impassable, and Norfolk Southern has not cleaned it up.

In northern Ohio, rail is the spine of our economy. To compete in a global economy and avoid expensive supply chain delays, industrial and agricultural America should think big about modern rail. Improving rail safety, giving people more transportation options, and expanding access to national and global markets are critical to our nation's future.

But that sort of thinking is not happening. Indeed, we're not even getting rail safety right, and that should be the floor, not the ceiling. Norfolk Southern repairs lag at many main arteries, including the one between Toledo and Sandusky.

There's no reason for this other than pure greed. Over the past four years, Norfolk Southern has reaped more than \$31 billion in profits. You would think it would invest even a relatively small part of that enormous profit to protect its workers, its host communities, and the general public so that such disasters would not happen. But you'd be wrong.

The derailments in Sandusky and in East Palestine were not isolated events. In 2022, the Federal Railroad Administration reported more than 1,000 instances of trains derailing. Since last October's Sandusky crash, I've tried to reach Norfolk Southern's CEO. I want to discuss the bipartisan infrastructure law that Congress passed last summer. My colleagues and I want to hear his ideas for rail improvements across America's northern corridor from Pittsburgh through East Palestine, Sandusky, Toledo, and west to Illinois.

Members of Congress, both Democrat and Republican, representing this congested corridor are eager to address aging rail infrastructure, increased traffic, and easement separation of freight and passenger service. Yet Norfolk Southern's leadership won't even return our calls.

The stakes are too high for more delay. America's northern rail corridor is a critical access point for goods from Canada, our largest trading partner; it's equally critical for getting goods to and from our ports, which enable America to ship goods all over the world—and helped rejuvenate our auto and steel industry.

With the bipartisan infrastructure law funds, it's time to bring together rail workers, railroad executives, regional transit authorities, and state and federal agencies to discuss how to use this money. How do we ensure higher safety levels? What's the right mix of passenger and freight rail? Should we use smart cars with electric track or focus on traditional heavy rail? Should we elevate our trains or run them on the ground? These are just a few questions that need answers.

We need to connect to Detroit and Canada. We need to connect Detroit and Toledo to the deep-water ports along the Atlantic that allow for year-round container shipments. Providing our landlocked region steady access to deep-water ports would be a game-changer for America's industrial corridor. Addressing the very real health and safety issues for the impacted workers, residents, and communities in and around Sandusky and East Palestine is the immediate priority.

We must also look to the future and come together to protect workers and deliver transformative and safe commercial and passenger rail solutions. The tools are at our disposal. The money is there. And the time is now. Let's do what we in the industrial Midwest do best: let's get to work.

RECOGNIZING THE DELANO JOINT
UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two schools in the Delano Joint Union High School District (DJUHSD), which were recently selected as Exemplary Dual Enrollment Awardees by the California Department of Education.

Since 1911, the Delano Joint Union High School District has been committed to the academic excellence of students in the Central Valley. The district is one of the highest achieving in the state and focuses on preparing their students with the skills they need to be successful in a variety of careers. In addition to strong academics, DJUHSD provides their students with outstanding athletic and performing and visual arts programs. Delano High School and Robert F. Kennedy High School were both designated as Exemplary Dual Enrollment Schools and will hold the prestigious title for two years.

The California Department of Education's Exemplary Dual Enrollment program award was started to recognize school districts who provide successful dual credit opportunities to students, allowing them to receive college credits while still in high school. DJUHSD was selected as an awardee based on the demonstrated excellence of their dual enrollment program, which is provided through a partnership with Bakersfield College. The district was one of nine districts to receive the award.

The district's dual enrollment program offers students an opportunity to advance their education in a variety of different fields. Dual enrollment credits also provide students with a financial incentive, by allowing them to earn college credit without paying for the college course. The program's success has been made possible by the many teachers, counselors, and faculty across the district, whose contributions have helped to advance and expand the program to play a vital role in the Central Valley education system. The education heroes in our school districts are forging the next generation of industry leaders in our state.

I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Delano Joint Union High School District for receiving the California Department of Education's inaugural Exemplary Dual Enrollment Award.

RECOGNIZING LT. COLONEL RICHARD CAMERON ANSHUS FOR OUTSTANDING MILITARY SERVICE

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lt. Colonel Richard Cameron Anshus, a Vietnam Veteran from O'Fallon, Illinois, with an extensive and rich military career.

Lt. Colonel Anshus graduated from West Point in 1970 and went into the service during the Vietnam War. His OH-6 helicopter was shot down by enemy fire during a reconnaissance mission; and he was captured and held as a Prisoner of War for 25 months, until he was liberated on March 27, 1973. Upon repatriation, Lt. Colonel Anshus continued his service. He worked at several bases around the United States and internationally, assisting in various operations. For eight years, Lt. Colonel Anshus was the Army Liaison Officer to the Air Mobility Command at Southern Illinois' Scott Air Force Base, where he retired in 1997.

For his bravery and service to country. Lt. Colonel Anshus has been awarded three Bronze Star Medals, two Purple Hearts, two Meritorious Service Medals, three Air Medals, two Army Commendation Medals, and a Prisoner of War Medal.

During his retirement, Lt. Colonel Anshus has been active member of his O'Fallon community. He is a lifetime member of O'Fallon's Sportsman Club, a member of First United Methodist Church, and a member of the O'Fallon Noon Rotary Club, where he has won several awards for his service.

Please join me in honoring Lt. Colonel Anshus for his dedicated service and all he has contributed to his country and community.

CONGRATULATING THE GREATER
CINCINNATI CHAPTER OF THE
MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA (MOAA)

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Greater Cincinnati Chapter of the Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), which celebrates the 50th anniversary of its charter this month.

Over the past half-century this Chapter has served the Cincinnati metropolitan area, fostering community among retired, active, and former officers of the uniformed services and providing useful services for them and their families.

Since March 1973, the Chapter has been a leading advocate for all personnel of the uniformed services. Its members have served faithfully as MOAA's ambassadors, supporting programs that make a difference in the lives of others, going the extra step to give back to our community, Ohio, and our Nation in the truest sense of servant leadership. I am proud to be a member of this Chapter.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating the Greater Cincinnati Chapter of the Military Officers Association of America, and extending our very best wishes for its continued success.

COSPONSORSHIP OF H.R. 830—HELP COPAYS ACT

HON. JAKE AUCHINCLOSS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored H.R. 830, the HELP Copays Act, to ensure that patients have affordable access to lifesaving care, prescription medication, and treatments. This bill would require health insurance plans to apply third-party payments, financial assistance, discounts, and other reductions in out-of-pocket expenses for an enrollee toward their cost-sharing requirements. I support this bipartisan effort to reduce out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs.

Should the bill move forward in the legislative process, I recommend limiting its provisions to drugs without a generic competitor. This ensures that patients who only have access to one expensive, branded drug to treat their condition can access payment assistance from manufacturers, but also incentivizes the use of lower-cost, generic drugs when possible. Narrowing the bill in this manner would prevent pharmaceutical manufacturers from abusing copay assistance programs to steer patients toward branded drugs that burden our healthcare system as a whole. I urge Congress to move forward with this proposal to provide relief to patients who may be forced to delay lifesaving care due to high cost-sharing and copay requirements.

RECOGNIZING KEVIN P. DONOVAN, A.O.H. PAUL "HOOK" O'MALLEY DIVISION 4 MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Kevin P. Donovan, who will be named the 2023 Man of the Year by the Ancient Order of Hibernians Paul "Hook" O'Malley Division 4. Kevin will be honored at their annual gathering this very day.

Kevin is the son of Marian Elizabeth Lockard Donovan and the late Daniel John Donovan. He was raised with his eight siblings in the Keyser Valley section of West Scranton. He grew up attending St. David's Church and playing baseball at the Lackawanna Little League. He was selected to play on the All-Star team and helped lead the team to several championship titles.

Kevin is a 1987 graduate of West Scranton Senior High School. While at West Scranton, he stood out as a member of the cross country and track and field teams. He clinched numerous district medals, including second place in the district cross country championship meet. He was also the Jordan Relays champion in track and the southern division track champion. He still holds several records in

both track and cross country at West Scranton High School. He was a two-time state qualifier as well as a member of the varsity wrestling team.

Kevin has worked as a roofer for Local No. 30 out of Philadelphia for 30 years. He currently works for the Lackawanna County Housing Authority SEIU Local No. 668.

Kevin is a more than 30-year member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and a current officer in the Paul "Hook" O'Malley Division 4. He is a dedicated volunteer with many community charitable organizations and a parishioner at St. Patrick's church where he is a member of the Holy Name Society.

Kevin is married to Michelle Lynch Donovan, and they have three children, Kevin, Kacey and Liam. He is also the proud grandfather of his grandson Braydon.

I am honored to join with the Ancient Order of Hibernians Paul "Hook" O'Malley Division 4 to recognize Kevin as the Man of the Year for his lifelong service to the community. May he continue to feel called to serve and support others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 2023, I was unable to cast my vote on H. Res. 1159—To amend the Taiwan Assurance Act of 2020 to require periodic reviews and updated reports relating to the Department of State's Taiwan Guidelines.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 145.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to be present on March 22nd.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 144, and YEA on Roll Call No. 145.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. MICHAEL ALLEN

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate Dr. Michael Allen, who passed away on February 25, 2023, in Santa Monica, California. He was a beloved husband, father, and grandfather and a distinguished professor at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).

Michael Allen was born on April 1, 1941, in East Sussex, England to Frederick "Jack" Allen and Ena Muriel Allen. As a young boy, Michael excelled in school, becoming one of the top students at his grammar school and eventually enrolling at Wadham College, Ox-

ford University. After receiving his Bachelors and Masters degrees at Oxford, Michael made his way to the United States, teaching at Ohio University. In 1970, he received his doctorate at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, where he also met his wife, Elena. That same year, Michael received a job offer to serve on the faculty at UCLA.

Michael quickly distinguished himself as a professor and scholar. While his teaching focused on the range of English literature from the Anglo-Saxons to Milton, his research focused on the philosophical, theological, and mythological issues raised by fifteenth century Italian Platonists. Throughout his time at UCLA, Michael served as a faculty lecturer with the UCLA Travel Study program. He also took on many leadership positions at UCLA and wrote or edited approximately 21 books. By the time he retired in 2012, Michael had received many prestigious honors, including the Eby Award for Undergraduate Teaching, UCLA's top teaching honor.

Michael dedicated his life to academia and his family. He was a sought-after lecturer, enthralling audiences with engrossing lectures and discussions on philosophical and literary topics. He inspired generations of UCLA students as he made past worlds and perspectives come alive through his lectures, courses, and books. He loved hiking, botany, cooking, traveling, literature and most of all, his family. Michael was an inspiration to so many people and touched so many lives with his intellectual curiosity and love of storytelling. His loss will be felt by his friends, family, and the many communities he has affected.

Michael is survived by his wife, Elena; sister, Patricia; sons, Ben and Will; daughters-in-law, Claudia and Melanie; three grandchildren, and a dog. May his memory live on in his many contributions to his community and family.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO RECOGNIZE THE COMMENCEMENT OF RAMADAN, THE MUSLIM HOLY MONTH OF FASTING AND SPIRITUAL RENEWAL, AND COMMENDING MUSLIMS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD FOR THEIR FAITH

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud, as the longest serving Muslim in Congress, to introduce legislation to recognize the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and wish Muslims around the world a Ramadan Mubarak! I thank the endorsing organizations that joined this important resolution: Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), Islamic Relief, and the Muslim Public Affairs Council.

I am honored to partner with my Muslim colleagues, Rep. RASHIDA TLAIB and Rep. ILHAN OMAR to introduce this resolution in the House of Representatives to recognize Ramadan and the various contributions of Muslims in the U.S. and worldwide. Ramadan is of great importance to Muslim Americans and 1.9 million Muslims globally. We are reminded during this

holy month of the rich diversity and many contributions that Muslim Americans have made in every sector of society. Diversity is a corner stone of American society and success. Our American Muslim community is a vital contributor to our nation's diversity, as well as to the talents, perspectives, and achievements that diversity brings.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the religious significance of Ramadan and wishing Muslim Americans and Muslims around the world a prosperous month by signing on to this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE SGT. JACK
MCGREEVEY MEMORIAL PARK

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the dedication of the Sgt. Jack McGreevey Memorial Park in Carteret, New Jersey. I join with borough officials, employees, residents, and the McGreevey family in paying tribute to the life and service of Sgt. Jack McGreevey.

A Marine Corps veteran who served in Guam, China, and Japan during WWII and as a Sergeant and Drill Instructor during the Korean War, Sgt. McGreevey was a fierce advocate for veterans. In his capacity as a Legislative Aide for state Senator Joseph Vitale, Speaker Craig Coughlin, and Assemblywoman Yvonne Lopez, Sgt. McGreevey worked with local veterans to secure benefits. In addition, through his service with various veterans' organizations, Sgt. McGreevey was an effective voice on behalf of the veteran community and fought to promote their priorities and support their needs.

Sgt. McGreevey was a friend to everyone. His affable demeanor left an impact on everyone he met. He exemplified honor, integrity, and professionalism throughout his life, and I am confident his commitment to service will continue to inspire others.

Mr. Speaker, once again, it is my honor to commemorate this dedication ceremony in remembrance of Sgt. Jack McGreevey. Sgt. McGreevey honorably served our Nation and the veterans' community, and his selflessness, duty, and civic engagement are truly deserving of this recognition.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF
LINDA GREENBLATT

HON. MARCUS J. MOLINARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Linda Greenblatt who

passed away on March 18 of this year. Linda was a devoted mother, wife, and pillar of her community who will be dearly missed by all who knew her.

Linda will long be remembered for her contributions to both the town of Red Hook and Dutchess County, New York. She taught history and social studies at Red Hook Middle and High Schools, was an election coordinator for the Dutchess County Board of Elections, and a member of numerous community groups.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring the memory of Linda Greenblatt. While we mourn her passing, we celebrate her life and the legacy she leaves behind. May her life and memory always be a blessing.

CONGRATULATING ROBERT J.
"RJ" DUKE SHORT ON HIS 89TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. RALPH NORMAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Robert J. Duke Short, U.S. Senate Official, on the occasion of his 89th birthday and to wish him a joyous birthday celebration.

Mr. RJ Short was born in Moultrie, Georgia on March 31, 1934. He graduated from North Georgia College in 1956, with a Bachelor of Science degree. Upon graduating from college, he worked as an industrial engineer before going back to school. He then attended Palmer College, in Port Orange, Florida afterward, to become a chiropractor. Mr. Short then joined the U.S. Army where he courageously served his country from 1957 to 1961.

After spending five years in the Army serving our great country, he joined the Department of Treasury for 2 years before becoming a Senior investigator for the Senate subcommittee on Internal Security.

Mr. Short quickly rose through the ranks to become the Republican staff director and Chief investigator for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in which he served for 12 years.

In 1989, Mr. Short served 15 years as Chief of Staff to Senator Strom Thurmond, a Republican from South Carolina. He was also a Counselor to the Chief Judge of the United States of America Military Court Appeals.

Duke and his wife, Denise, happily married on May 23, 1992. Mr. Short has risen above many personal challenges and has been a great public servant for his country. He is the epitome of the American success story. Duke has also been decorated with many awards and achievements for his hard work throughout the years. Mr. Short has been listed as a

noteworthy and honorable U.S. Senate official by Marquis Who's Who. He is a recipient of the United Service Organizations Appreciation award, Employees Support of Guard and Reserve Appreciation award, named one of the fifty most Powerful Staffers in Congress by Roll Call, honorary judge of The United States of America Claims Court, and Palmer Academy Chiropractic fellow. In 2002, Governor James Hodge gave Mr. Short the Order of the Palmetto, the state of South Carolina's highest honor. Robert J. Duke Short has set the gold standard for his years of dedicated service and commitment which will long be remembered and for that we all join in saying thank you, and wish him a happy birthday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 2023

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote today on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 241, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for the vote on Agreeing to H. Res. 241, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 406, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for the Passage of H. Joint Res. 30, I would have voted "no." This legislation would block the Department of Labor's recent rule, entitled "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights," which clarifies that fiduciary planners may consider environmental, social and governance (ESG) risk when making investment decisions. I commend the Department of Labor's ESG rule, which will assure beneficiaries that their retirement savings will not be subjected to the pendulum swings of changing policy. Fiduciary planners must not have their hands tied when it comes to considering ESG factors that pose legitimate economic risks to Americans' benefit plans.

Had I been present for the Bonamici Amendment No. 5, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for the Crane Amendment No. 6, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for the Davidson Amendment No. 7, I would have voted "no."

Additionally, had I been present for Fitzpatrick Amendment No. 8, I would have voted "aye."

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S917–S942

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 952–973, S. Res. 118–124, and S. Con. Res. 7–8.

Pages S932–34

Measures Reported:

S. 326, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a study and clinical trials on the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of veterans with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder.

Page S931

Measures Passed:

North Carolina National Guard 360th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 122, commemorating the 360th anniversary of the North Carolina National Guard.

Page S941

Measures Considered:

Authorizations for Use of Military Force Against Iraq—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S917–29**

Pending:

Schumer Amendment No. 15, to add an effective date.

Page S917

Rejected:

By 19 yeas to 76 nays (Vote No. 67), Lee Amendment No. 22, to provide for the termination of authorizations for use of military force after two years. (Pursuant to the order of Wednesday, March 22, 2023, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S922–23**

By 32 yeas to 63 nays (Vote No. 68), Thune (for Rubio) Amendment No. 4, to require a certification. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Page S923**

By 41 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 69), Risch Amendment No. 43, to provide for a delayed, conditional repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. **Page S927**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 23, 2023, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 27, 2023.

Page S929

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that if cloture is invoked on the bill, on Monday, March 27, 2023, it be in order to consider the following amendments: Sullivan Amendment No. 33, Scott (FL) Amendment No. 13, Ricketts Amendment No. 30, Cruz Amendment No. 9, Hawley Amendment No. 40, and Johnson Amendment No. 11; that if offered, Senate vote on or in relation to the amendments at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, following consultation with the Republican Leader, on Tuesday, March 28, 2023; and that 60 affirmative votes be required for adoption of these amendments, without intervening action or debate.

Page S929

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, March 27, 2023, Senate resume consideration of the bill; and that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments be at 3:30 p.m., and the cloture motion filed during the session of Thursday, March 23, 2023, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 27, 2023.

Pages S941–42

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101–595, and upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Senator Cantwell (ex officio as Chair, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation), and Senator Kelly.

Page S941

Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 93–415, as amended by Public Law 102–586 and

Public Law 111–211, and after consultation with the Republican Leader, announced the appointment of the following individual to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Lourdes Rosado of New York (2 year term).

Page S941

Messages from the House: Page S930

Measures Referred: Page S930

Executive Communications: Page S930

Executive Reports of Committees: Pages S931–32

Additional Cosponsors: Page S934

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S934–39

Additional Statements: Page S930

Amendments Submitted: Pages S940–41

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S941

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—69) Pages S922–23, S927

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:11 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 27, 2023. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S942.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Transportation, after receiving testimony from Pete Buttigieg, Secretary of Transportation.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 3,059 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine the posture of United States Northern Command and United States Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2024 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Glen D. VanHerck, USAF, Commander, United States Northern Command and

North American Aerospace Defense Command, and General Laura J. Richardson, USA, Commander, United States Southern Command, both of the Department of Defense.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine enhancing consumer protections and connectivity in air transportation, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey N. Shane, former Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Sara Nelson, Association of Flight Attendants-CWA, AFL-CIO, William J. McGee, American Economic Liberties Project, and Heather Ansley, Paralyzed Veterans of America, all of Washington, D.C.; Trent Moyers, Chelan Douglas Regional Port Authority, East Wenatchee, Washington; and Diana L. Moss, American Antitrust Institute, Boulder, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 118th Congress:

Subcommittee on Energy: Senators Sanders (Chair), Wyden, Heinrich, Hirono, King, Cortez Masto, Hickenlooper, Hawley, Risch, Murkowski, Hoeven, Cassidy, and Hyde-Smith.

Subcommittee on National Parks: Senators King (Chair), Sanders, Heinrich, Hirono, Kelly, Daines, Lee, Murkowski, and Hyde-Smith.

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining: Senators Cortez Masto (Chair), Wyden, Heinrich, Hirono, King, Kelly, Hickenlooper, Lee, Risch, Daines, Murkowski, Cassidy, and Hawley.

Subcommittee on Water and Power: Senators Wyden (Chair), Sanders, Cortez Masto, Kelly, Hickenlooper, Risch, Lee, Hoeven, and Cassidy.

Senators Manchin and Barrasso are ex-officio members of all subcommittees.

CYBERSECURITY VULNERABILITIES TO ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the steps needed to address the cybersecurity vulnerabilities in the United States' energy infrastructure, after receiving testimony from Push Kumar, Director, Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response, Department of Energy; Robert M. Lee, Dragos, Inc., Hanover, Maryland; and Stephen L. Swick, American Electric Power, Columbus, Ohio.

2023 TRADE POLICY AGENDA

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's 2023 trade policy agenda,

after receiving testimony from Katherine Tai, United States Trade Representative.

MODERNIZING THE GOVERNMENT'S CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine modernizing the government's classification system, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Goitein,

Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law Liberty and National Security Program, Thomas Blanton, George Washington University National Security Archive, and Patrick G. Eddington, Cato Institute, all of Washington, D.C.; and John P. Fitzpatrick, former Director, Information Security Oversight Office, Westminster, Colorado.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 41 public bills, H.R. 1733–1773; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 27–28; and H. Res. 246–250, were introduced. **Pages H1407–09**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1411**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1155, to prohibit the phase out of gasoline and prevent higher prices for consumers, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 118–13);

H.R. 1158, to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act with respect to new critical energy resources, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 118–14);

H.R. 1141, to repeal the natural gas tax (H. Rept. 118–15);

H.R. 1140, to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to waive application of certain requirements with respect to processing and refining a critical energy resource at a critical energy resource facility, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 118–16);

H.R. 1131, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to authorize the use of flexible air permitting with respect to certain critical energy resource facilities, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 118–17);

H.R. 1130, to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–18);

H.R. 1121, to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing (H. Rept. 118–19, Part 1);

H.R. 1085, to require the Secretary of Energy to direct the National Petroleum Council to issue a report with respect to petrochemical refineries in the United States, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 118–20);

H.R. 1070, to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide the owner or operator of a critical energy resource facility an interim permit under sub-

title C that is subject to final approval by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–21);

H.R. 1068, to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–22);

H.R. 1115, to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–23);

H.R. 1058, to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–24, Part 1);

H. Con. Res. 14, expressing disapproval of the revocation by President Biden of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline (H. Rept. 118–25, Part 1);

H.R. 1023, to repeal section 134 of the Clean Air Act, relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund (H. Rept. 118–26);

H. Con. Res. 17, expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not impose any restrictions on the export of crude oil or other petroleum products, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–27); and

H.R. 1335, to restart onshore and offshore oil, gas, and coal leasing, streamline permitting for energy infrastructure, ensure transparency in energy development on Federal lands, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–28, Part 1).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Carl to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1331**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:26 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H1334**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Wednesday, March 22nd.

Providing Appropriate Recognition and Treatment Needed to Enhance Relations with ASEAN Act: H.R. 406, to provide for the treatment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeand-nay vote of 388 yeas to 33 nays, Roll No. 148.

Pages H1347–48

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights”—Presidential Veto: The House voted to sustain the President’s veto of H.J. Res. 30, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights”, by a yeand-nay vote of 219 yeas to 200 nays, Roll No. 149 (two-thirds of those present not voting to override).

Pages H1383–86

Subsequently, the veto message (H. Doc. 118–18) and the joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce. **Page H1386**

Parents Bill of Rights Act: The House considered H.R. 5, to ensure the rights of parents are honored and protected in the Nation’s public schools. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, March 24th.

Pages H1348–83, H1386–96

Agreed to:

Bacon amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that requires Local Education Agencies (LEA) to provide the parents of a child who is a student in an elementary school or secondary school the number of school counselors in that school;

Page H1375

Foxx amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that amends H.R. 5 to align the list of rights school districts must provide notice of to actions school districts must take; amends a sense of Congress to express support for parents fundamental rights to direct the education of their children and that courts should use the strict scrutiny test to evaluate laws involving those rights; **Pages H1375–76**

Boebert amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that amends Section 104 to include Parent’s Right to Know if their child’s school operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities to permit a person whose biological sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for women or girls; **Pages H1376–77**

Boebert amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that amends Section 104 to include Parent’s Right to Know if their child’s school allows a person whose biological sex is male to use restrooms or changing rooms designated for women or girls;

Pages H1377–78

Fitzpatrick amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that amends the bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States (GAO) to submit a report to Congress on the cost of the requirements of H.R. 5 to SEAs, LEAs, and elementary and secondary schools and requires the report to also analyze and evaluate the impact of H.R. 5 on protecting parents’ rights in the education of the children (by a recorded vote of 386 yeas to 39 noes, Roll No. 153);

Pages H1383, H1388–89

Garbarino amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that provides that nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, should be construed as authorizing or granting parents the ability to deny any student who is not their own child from accessing any books or other reading materials otherwise available in the library of their child’s school;

Page H1389

Lawler amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that ensures this bill does not impose requirements on non-public elementary or secondary school;

Pages H1391–92

McCormick amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that establishes that parents will be granted the opportunity to address their school board regarding a complaint about a violation of parental rights; and

Pages H1393–94

Miller (OH) amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that expands the definition of schools to include secondary career and technical schools.

Pages H1395–96

Rejected:

Bonamici amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that sought to strike line 1 and all that follows in H.R. 5 (by a recorded vote of 203 yeas to 223 noes, Roll No. 150); **Pages H1378–81, H1386–87**

Crane amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that sought to add a private right of action for parents to hold schools accountable for not honoring the rights set forth in Title I and Title II of this bill (by a recorded vote of 61 yeas to 365 noes, Roll No. 151); **Pages H1381–82, H1387**

Davidson amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that sought to prohibit federal funds under Title I and Title II from going to a local educational agency unless they hold an open enrollment period (by a recorded vote of 89 yeas to 338 nays, Roll No. 152); and

Pages H1382–83, H1387–88

Jacobs amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that sought to strike “at no cost” in the new paragraph (1)(A) of section 1112(e) of the ESEA, as added by section 104(2) of the bill.

Pages H1390–91

Proceedings Postponed:

Green (TN) amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that seeks to revise the bill to include the right to timely notice of any major cyberattack against their child’s school that may have compromised student or parent information;

Pages H1389–90

Jacobs amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that seeks to strike the provisions relating to reviewing professional development materials in sections 104 and 202;

Page H1391

Massie amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that seeks to add a sense of Congress that the authority of the Department of Education and the Secretary of Education to operate or administer any office or program related to elementary or secondary education should be terminated on or before December 31, 2023; and

Pages H1392–93

McCormick amendment (No. 17 printed in H. Rept. 118–12) that seeks to establish parents’ right to be informed of non-curriculum-based initiatives and events, and allows parents to opt-in their children to such initiatives and events.

Pages H1394–95

H. Res. 241, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 218 yeas to 205 nays, Roll No. 147, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 219 yeas to 204 nays, Roll No. 146.

Pages H1337–45, H1346–47

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yeas-and-nays votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1346, H1346–47, H1347–48, H1385–86, H1386–87, H1387, H1387–88, and H1388–89.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Committee Meetings

A REVIEW OF TITLE VII: USDA IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation, Research, and Biotechnology held a hearing en-

titled “A Review of Title VII: USDA Implementation of Research Programs”. Testimony was heard from Chavonda Jacobs-Young, Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Justice, Office of Inspector General. Testimony was heard from Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Department of Justice.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the U.S. Forest Service. Testimony was heard from Randy Moore, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and Mark Lichtenstein, National Budget Director, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Schrier, Tokuda, and Flood.

PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Day”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the Department of Defense. Testimony was heard from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary, Department of Defense; General Mark A. Milley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Michael J. McCord, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Energy. Testimony was heard from Jennifer Granholm, Secretary, Department of Energy.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Radewagon and Garcia of Texas.

APPROPRIATIONS—LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Library of Congress. Testimony was heard from the following Library of Congress officials: Carla Hayden, Librarian of Congress; Maria Strong Associate Register of Copyrights, and Director of Policy and International Affairs, U.S. Copyright Office; and Mary Mazanec, Director, Congressional Research Service.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Commerce, Office of Inspector General. Testimony was heard from Peggy E. Gustafson, Inspector General, Department of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on Army Military Construction and Family Housing. Testimony was heard from Rachel Jacobson, Assistant to Secretary, Installations, Energy, and Environment, U.S. Army; and Lieutenant General Kevin Vereen, Deputy Chief of Staff G9, Installation Management Command.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State Foreign Operations and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the Department of State. Testimony was heard from Antony Blinken, Secretary, Department of State.

PRESIDENT BIDEN’S FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST AND ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing entitled “President Biden’s Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request and Economic Outlook”. Testimony was heard from Janet Yellen, Secretary, Department of the Treasury; and Shalanda Young, Director, Office of Management and Budget.

U.S. MILITARY POSTURE AND NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES IN THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Military Posture and National Security Challenges in the Greater Middle East and Africa”. Testimony was heard from Celeste Wallander, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense; General Michael Kurilla, Commander, U.S. Central Command; and General Michael Langley, Commander, U.S. Africa Command.

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION: IMPACTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ARMED SERVICES

Committee on Armed Services: Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “Diversity, Equity, And Inclusion: Impacts to the Department of Defense and the Armed Services”. Testimony was heard from Gilbert R. Cisneros, Jr., Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; Agnes Schaefer, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Army; Frank R. Parker, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Navy; and Alex Wagner, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Air Force.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND INNOVATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cyber, Information Technologies, and Innovation held a hearing entitled “Science, Technology, and Innovation at the Department of Defense”. Testimony was heard from Heidi Shyu, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Department of Defense; and William LaPlante, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense.

THE PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2024

Budget Request”. Testimony was heard from Shalanda D. Young, Director, Office of Management and Budget.

BREAKING THE SYSTEM: EXAMINING THE IMPLICATIONS OF BIDEN’S STUDENT LOAN POLICIES FOR STUDENTS AND TAXPAYERS

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development held a hearing entitled “Breaking the System: Examining the Implications of Biden’s Student Loan Policies for Students and Taxpayers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TIKTOK: HOW CONGRESS CAN SAFEGUARD AMERICAN DATA PRIVACY AND PROTECT CHILDREN FROM ONLINE HARMS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “TikTok: How Congress Can Safeguard American Data Privacy and Protect Children from Online Harms”. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 1338, the “Satellite and Telecommunications Streamlining Act”; H.R. 675, the “Secure Space Act”; H.R. 1339, the “Precision Agriculture Satellite Connectivity Act”; H.R. 682, the “Launch Communications Act”; H.R. 1353, the “Advanced, Local Emergency Response Telecommunications Parity Act”; H.R. 1345, the “NTIA Policy and Cybersecurity Coordination Act”; H.R. 1354, the “Information and Communication Technology Strategy Act”; H.R. 1370, the “Communications Security Act”; H.R. 1360, the “American Cybersecurity Literacy Act”; H.R. 1340, the “Open RAN Outreach Act”; H.R. 1343, the “ITS Codification Act”; H.R. 1377, the “Promoting U.S. Wireless Leadership Act”; H.R. 1341, the “Spectrum Coordination Act”; H.R. 501, the “Block, Report, and Suspend Suspicious Shipments Act”; H.R. 498, the “9–8–8 Lifeline Cybersecurity Responsibility Act”; H.R. 485, the “Protecting Health Care for All Patients Act of 2023”; H.R. 467, the “Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act”; H.R. 801, the “Securing the Border for Public Health Act of 2023”; and H.R. 1603, the “Homeowner Energy Freedom Act”.

FOLLOW THE MONEY: THE CCP’S BUSINESS MODEL FUELING THE FENTANYL CRISIS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled “Follow the Money: The CCP’s Business Model Fueling the

Fentanyl Crisis”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE STATE OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY IN 2023: GROWING CONFLICTS, BUDGET CHALLENGES, AND GREAT POWER COMPETITION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The State of American Diplomacy in 2023: Growing Conflicts, Budget Challenges, and Great Power Competition”. Testimony was heard from Antony Blinken, Secretary of State, Department of State.

RENEWED U.S. ENGAGEMENT IN THE PACIFIC: ASSESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Indo-Pacific held a hearing entitled “Renewed U.S. Engagement in the Pacific: Assessing the Importance of the Pacific Islands”. Testimony was heard from Jane Bocklage, Deputy and Senior Advisor to the Special Presidential Envoy for Compact Negotiations, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; Craig Hart, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Asia Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development; Holly A. Haverstick, Director, International Affairs and Foreign Policy Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard; and Keone Nakoa, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Insular and International Affairs, Department of the Interior.

CISA 2025: THE STATE OF AMERICAN CYBERSECURITY FROM A STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection held a hearing entitled “CISA 2025: The State of American Cybersecurity from a Stakeholder Perspective”. Testimony was heard from Tina Won Sherman, Director, Critical Infrastructure Protection and Transportation Security, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

SECURING AMERICA’S MARITIME BORDER: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS FOR U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled “Securing America’s Maritime Border: Challenges and Solutions for U.S. National Security”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Lower Half Jo-Ann F. Burdian, Assistant Commandant for Response Policy, U.S. Coast Guard; Jonathan Miller, Executive Director, Air and Marine Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Brigadier General Sean T.

Boyette, Director of the Joint Staff, Florida Army National Guard, Joint Force Headquarters; and Heather MacLeod, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, U.S. Government Accountability Office.

2022 MIDTERMS LOOK BACK SERIES: ELECTION OBSERVER ACCESS

Committee on House Administration: Subcommittee on Elections held a hearing entitled “2022 Midterms Look Back Series: Election Observer Access”. Testimony was heard from Benjamin Hovland, Commissioner, U.S. Election Assistance Commission; Lisa Lyons, County Clerk, Kent County, Michigan; and public witnesses.

LOOKING AHEAD SERIES: OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

Committee on House Administration: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled “Looking Ahead Series: Office of the Attending Physician”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Brian P. Monahan, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, Attending Physician, Office of the Attending Physician, U.S. Congress and U.S. Supreme Court.

FREE SPEECH: THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION’S CHILLING OF PARENTS’ FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government held a hearing entitled “Free Speech: The Biden Administration’s Chilling of Parents’ Fundamental Rights”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries held a hearing on H.R. 764, the “Trust the Science Act”; H.R. 886, the “Save Our Seas 2.0 Amendments Act”; H.R. 1245, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to re-issue a final rule relating to removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1419, the “Comprehensive Grizzly Bear Management Act of 2023”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Boebert, Rosendale, Hageman, and Bonamici; Steven Guertin, Deputy Director for Policy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Nancy Wallace, Marine Debris Program Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Brian Nesvik, Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 200, the “Forest

Information Reform Act”; H.R. 1473, the “Targeting and Offsetting Existing Illegal Contaminants Act”; H.R. 1567, the “Accurately Counting Risk Elimination Solutions Act”; and H.R. 1586, the “Forest Protection and Wildland Firefighter Safety Act of 2023”. Testimony was heard from Chris French, Deputy Chief for National Forest Systems, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

ATF’S ASSAULT ON THE SECOND AMENDMENT: WHEN IS ENOUGH ENOUGH?

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Energy Policy, and Regulatory Affairs; and Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government Surveillance of the House Committee on the Judiciary held a joint hearing entitled “ATF’s Assault on the Second Amendment: When is Enough Enough?”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

UNPACKING THE WHITE HOUSE NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation held a hearing entitled “Unpacking the White House National Cybersecurity Strategy”. Testimony was heard from Kemba E. Walden, Acting National Cyber Director, The White House.

ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY: THE FUTURE OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS AND BEYOND

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Advanced Air Mobility: The Future of Unmanned Aircraft Systems and Beyond”. Testimony was heard from Parimal Kopardekar, Director, Aeronautics Research Institute, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and public witnesses.

UNLEASHING AMERICAN POWER: THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEXT GENERATION ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Unleashing American Power: The Development of Next Generation Energy Infrastructure”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Small Business Administration”. Testimony was heard from Isabella

Guzman, Administrator, U.S. Small Business Association.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION: NAVIGATING THE COMPREHENSIVE PASSENGER EXPERIENCE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled “FAA Reauthorization: Navigating the Comprehensive Passenger Experience”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REVIEW OF FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST FOR FEDERAL MARITIME TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT OF 2022

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled “Review of Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request for Federal Maritime Transportation Programs, and Implementation of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Ann C. Phillips (Retired), Administrator, U.S. Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation; and Daniel B. Maffei, Chairman, U.S. Federal Maritime Commission.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting to Authorize the Women Veterans Task Force. The Women Veterans Task Force was authorized.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025”. Testimony was heard from Denis R. McDonough, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.

WHY HEALTH CARE IS UNAFFORDABLE: THE FALLOUT OF DEMOCRATS' INFLATION ON PATIENTS AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Why Health Care is Unaffordable: The Fallout of Democrats' Inflation on Patients and Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUDGET HEARING FOR THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AND DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on National Intelligence Enterprise held a hearing entitled “Budget hearing for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Energy, Department of State, and Department of the Treasury”. Testimony was heard from Carrie Thompson, Chief of Intelligence, Office of National Security Intelligence, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice; Ken Wainstein, Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security; Steven K. Black, Director, Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence, Department of Energy; Ryan Young, Executive Assistant Director, Intelligence Branch, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Brett Holmgren, Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Research, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State; Shannon Corless, Assistant Secretary, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Department of the Treasury; and Rear Admiral Rebecca Ore, Assistant Commandant for Intelligence, U.S. Coast Guard. This hearing was closed.

THE CCP'S ONGOING UYGHUR GENOCIDE

Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The CCP's Ongoing Uyghur Genocide”. Testimony was heard from Nury Turkel, Chair, U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing entitled “Member and Public Witness Day”, 9 a.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 1338, the “Satellite and Telecommunications Streamlining Act”; H.R. 675, the “Secure Space Act”; H.R. 1339, the “Precision Agriculture Satellite Connectivity Act”; H.R. 682, the “Launch Communications Act”; H.R. 1353, the “Advanced, Local Emergency Response Telecommunications Parity Act”; H.R. 1345, the “NTIA Policy and Cybersecurity Coordination Act”; H.R. 1354, the “Information and Communication Technology Strategy Act”; H.R. 1370, the “Communications Security Act”; H.R. 1360, the “American Cybersecurity Literacy Act”; H.R. 1340, the “Open RAN Outreach Act”; H.R. 1343, the “ITS Codification Act”; H.R. 1377, the “Promoting U.S. Wireless Leadership Act”; H.R. 1341, the “Spectrum Coordination Act”; H.R. 501, the “Block, Report, and Suspend Suspicious Shipments Act”; H.R. 498, the “9–8–8 Lifeline Cybersecurity Responsibility Act”; H.R. 485, the “Protecting Health Care for All Patients Act of 2023”; H.R. 467, the “Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act”; H.R. 801, the “Securing the Border for Public Health Act of 2023”; and H.R. 1603, the “Homeowner Energy Freedom Act”, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 158, resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to transmit, respectively, certain docu-

ments to the House of Representatives relating to congressionally appropriated funds to the nation of Ukraine from January 20, 2021, to February 24, 2023, 9 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on House Administration, Communications Standards Commission, organizational meeting, 9:30 a.m., 1309 Longworth.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 1246, to authorize leases of up to 99 years for land held in trust for federally recognized Indian tribes; and H.R. 1532, to authorize any Indian Tribe to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer real property to which that Indian Tribe holds fee title without the consent of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture, hearing entitled “Budget hearing for the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, Military Service Intelligence Components, and Military Intelligence Program”, 8:30 a.m., HVC–304 Hearing Room. This hearing is closed.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Biden Administration’s 2023 Trade Policy Agenda with United States Trade Representative, Ambassador Tai”, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, March 27

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, March 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 316, Authorizations for Use of Military Force Against Iraq, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill at 5:30 p.m. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the bill is at 3:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 5—Parents Bill of Rights Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Amodei, Mark E., Nev., E245, E246
 Auchincloss, Jake, Mass., E249
 Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E250
 Bost, Mike, Ill., E245, E248
 Carson, André, Ind., E249

Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E249
 Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E246
 Chu, Judy, Calif., E249
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E247
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E247
 Lieu, Ted, Calif., E249
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E247

Molinaro, Marcus J., N.Y., E250
 Mooney, Alexander X., W.Va., E249
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E245, E247
 Norman, Ralph, S.C., E250
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E245, E246, E250
 Valadao, David G., Calif., E248
 Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E246, E248



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.